YASIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Subcommittee on Finance and Budget Call taking place on this Tuesday, 24th of January, 2017 at 15:00 UTC.

On the call today Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Kaili Kan, Glenn McKnight, Andrei Kolesnikov, Judith Hellerstein, Javier Rua-Jovet, Ali AlMeshal, Sebastien Bachollet, Alfredo Lopez, and Eduardo Diaz.

On the Spanish Channel we have Harold Arcos, Alberto Soto.

We have received an apology from Nadira Alaraj.

And from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Robert Hoggarth, Leo Vegoda, Becky Nash, and myself, Yasim Nazlar.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

And finally, if I could please remind all participants to state their names before speaking, that's only for the transcript purposes but, also for the interpretation purposes as well. Over to Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. This is the meeting in which we're going to do our first formal review by the Finance and Budget Subcommittee of the budget request. We have 25 requests. The meeting is scheduled to be an hour, which means on the average we cannot spend more than two minutes on each one. We are almost certainly going to go over. So I would ask if anyone believes they will not be able to stay longer, please

---

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

let us know so that so that we can try to reorder the requests to make sure that you're covering you. If staff can try to make sure that any interpretation can be done going over, hopefully, at least 20 or 30 minutes. I can't see us doing it in much less time than that.

I would like to change the order of the agenda, however, and do Next Steps now because I don't want to run out of time for that it's an important issue. The real issue is what our timing is going forward.

Is Rob on the call yet, by the way? I see he's in Adobe Connect, I'll assume he is here.

These requests in theory are due on the 30th of January. That is six days from now. I do not see how we can possibly do the review today and even assuming we finish it, have these revised as necessary and then submit them.

So the real question – and I'd like to take a straw poll of those in Adobe Connect right now or anyone on the phone can speak up – do you believe the FBSC must meet to review the revised proposals or do you want to delegate that to me and staff or maybe to one other person to work on it? Question is do we need another FBSC Meeting before these are submitted or do you want to delegate the final approval or final revisions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a question.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So if we let seven people to decide on the final one, if there's a [doubt], you can call the owner of the proposal, right? [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Our proposals that need changes after this meeting are going back. The question is, who is going to do the review and say are they finalized or do they still need work or something like that? Okay. It's going to be a really tight schedule. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thanks, Alan. I think with the pressure of time assuming that there are not significantly major overhauls and we would expect the delegator, the authority group to go, "Whoa, this is a bit above and beyond" and maybe reach out to us on list. I think delegation is perfectly reasonable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. That means we do not schedule a meeting or do you recommend we schedule a meeting and cancel it, if necessary?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I [inaudible] on that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the scheduling of the meeting that's the critical question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I'm about to be on my annual four days leave. I've only got, I think, 11 or 12 ICANN calls scheduled in that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're not looking for another one. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Provided that we review them all and that if there are major changes, say if we make some major changes to proposals, then I think maybe we should have another meeting. But if we have only minor changes to some or if we're rejecting some or something like that then we can delegate. But I think if there's some major changes or other stuff that needs to get done then I do want another meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Certainly they'll go out to the mailing list but the window is going to be really short. My feeling is we need an extension, and the question is how much of an extension can we be allowed without endangering the processing of our proposal?

                         Rob, do you have anything? Would one week be too much or do we need a little bit less than that? Rob said he won't be able to speak later, but implied he could speak now. But I'm not sure if that's correct or not.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: It does imply that I can speak now, Alan. This is Rob, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yes, we can.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Great. I think that is a question more appropriately asked of… I'm sorry, Becky and Taryn to put you all on the spot. But, they're the ones who have all the processing work and everything else that they're doing in terms of collecting the various requests. So I don't know what flexibility there is in the timing of the process. Becky or Taryn you may be able to share that to see if there's any possibility for additional time for submission.

TARYN PRESLEY: Thanks, Rob. This is Taryn Presley.

BECKY NASH: Hi.

TARYN PRESLEY: Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Becky.

BECKY NASH: No, please go ahead, Taryn. I was just going indicate you could respond.

TARYN PRESLEY: Oh, okay. Yes, we do have some flexibility built into the schedule so we could possibly go until February 10, if that would help. I think that would be the very last date that we've been given extension for in order to get all the requests in and process them. And, of course, we would extend that to all SOs and ACs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. I hope we're not going to need the full 10 or 11 days which you've just indicated. But a week, I think, will allow us to make sure that what you get is something that we're prouder of and you're likely to have to do perhaps less work in processing them. So, I think we'll go ahead with that assumption and given that we probably will schedule a meeting roughly a week from now or maybe a little bit over a week from now. All right. Let's go on to the substance of the discussion, however, and the requests. If you can put up the summary, please, first. These documents that we're putting up are all linked in the agenda, so you can pull them up on your own screens if you wish.

That's a summary of what we have in front of us, there are 25 requests total. Seven are coming under the auspices of the ALAC and I'll note if you look at the document names if you pull them up one by one, some of them have RALO names, even though they are now under the ALAC. That's because that's where they originated and we haven't renamed the documents. But they are being submitted as ALAC requests and we'll go through those.

We have ranging from two to five per RALO, a total of 18 among the RALOs. I just want to highlight one thing as we go forward that is,

specifically, there is a ALAC request that is looking at funding of the ALAC in general at IGF, essentially to put a presence of At-Large at the IGF. We know there are many At-Large people who attend, many of them at their own expense, but there's nothing coordinated. This is going to attempt to do that.

However, that is a new request from the Outreach and Engagement Committee or, at least, I believe that's where it originated. There are also individual requests from AFRALO and APRALO as has been the norm for session at the global IGF. In total among those three requests we are asking for 13 people to be sent to the IGF. That, I think, is dreaming in technicolor and I think we're going to have to somehow rationalize these three requests if we're going to go forward with all three as opposed to having them be completely independent. So as we're talking about the individual requests we'll look at them further, but I just wanted to highlight that intersection between the requests in three of the different areas.

If there are no specific comments, I'd like to go through the ALAC ones first and if you could bring up the ALAC document. What you'll be seeing on the screen and is linked into the agenda are the actual full requests put into a PDF and linked together. These include, among other things, edits that Heidi has made in a few cases and comments or edits that I have made.

The first one for ALAC is the ALAC Strategy Session. That is the session that we have been trying to hold at the end of an ICANN Meeting to allow the leadership team to do a bit of a post-mortem and to do some planning. We have not had a lot of success in doing that well. It's often

crammed into a time which doesn't allow it to be done properly. Several meetings we have not been allowed to do it at all and we're trying to formalize that. There will be a session like this held at Copenhagen. But, again, we're doing it in some awkward situation. We have been denied any changes to travel, so some ALT members may not be able to attend it and we're trying to formalize this and build it into our regular structure.

Any questions? I'm presuming everyone on the Finance and Budget has at least glanced at these requests. They've been on the wiki for quite some time now. All right. If there are no questions on that one, we'll go on to the second one.

The second one is Real-Time Captioning. This is a NARALO project that has been moved under the auspices of the ALAC. I have made a number of suggested changes. The request starts off by saying that we really think this should be an At-Large request, it should be ICANN. It should be a much wider scope than we are talking about. But if ICANN is not going to take that on in this budget year, then we're ramping up the usage within At-Large to cover more in additional languages and various different sessions. The request is essentially unchanged with the exception of the introduction being reworded, the request is essentially unchanged from what we had before.

Any comments or questions? And, specifically, I'm looking to the people who originated this, if you have any input at this point. Judith, go right ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN   Since I originated the proposal, I will speak about it. On the application you asked about if how we're often captioning outside of Adobe, you possibly may not understand that a lot of people used to StreamText link. So, within Adobe it's a pod, but there's also the ability just to run the StreamText link if you have low bandwidth.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I wasn't aware of that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN   So that's what lot of people are doing on their mobiles is running the StreamText link. And then, if they have a question they jump on Adobe for a second, put the question in the chat or asked to be called on the phone, they can call. So that's what they do and so that's why it's up there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN   Are there any other questions you have?

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other questions on this particular one? Rob, if you want to jump in on any of them, please feel free. As we said, this one is one really think shouldn't be ours anymore. But, if ICANN is not willing to step up to it in a big way then we're happy to do a third pilot here.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, Alan. I think that your strategy should be twofold. You already have the language here to potentially make the case for it in your public comments on the main budget. Taryn and Becky are free to either agree with my suggestion there or criticize it. I mean, they're there to process it not really to make any of the judgments. But in terms of just strategic approach, this does seem to be an important component of increasing the effectiveness, the engagement of your community and having this highlighted as a point in the main budget conversations would be a useful supplement and actually as I think an appropriate overall strategy, if you guys want to see this continue. I think it clearly has a great opportunity for continuation as a pilot program, but to really push it forward I think you want to make this more of a campaign. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We certainly will do that, but the order is that the special budget requests come first.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hopefully, you will not reject it in this pass and it gets rejected on the global sense. But that's why we're putting this forward in both sides. All right. Next request. If someone else on staff can scroll the pod, I would appreciate that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan, the document is synched so you can scroll it. Or would you like me to scroll it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I personally do not want to scroll it. If someone else can do that, that might help everyone else.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Sure. Of course, I'll do it for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It does mean you have to find out where the next one starts. It's not always obvious. The next one, I believe, is GSE Funding of RALO Activities. Apparently, it's really hard to find.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi, while we are waiting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go right ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just for the procedures' sake. If there are no comments, does that mean that they are going to be submitted as is?

ALAN GREENBERG: If there are no comments here, other than the comments that I have inserted, then they will go back to the submitters for confirmation that those changes are okay and will be submitted as is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Got it.

ALAN GREENBERG: But, I do expect other people to be looking at them. And if you have any comments in the next 24 hours or so then, please, we need to know about them.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So you'll send them back to the person who wrote them for final view.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct. Just for the record, we're looking for Page 10. Whoever is scrolling, you've gone past it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This one, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Heidi, can you go into this one? This is the one where we are asking for funds for local RALO activities. The last year was GSE has

$10,000. The process in which to avail oneself to get that money was not clear until recently. And can you explain why you think it's important to put this one in again?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. I think it's important that the RALOs do have some access to funds for small activities such as getting materials, banners, brochures, either activities at events. I think it's important that they do that whether this is done by this request or some other means is another question. But this one is basically, as Alan said, a continuation of a Fiscal Year 17 project that was started a little bit late. We do now have a [inaudible] and it's already being used. However, I just want to point out that the only time that it has been used there were actually funds already within ICANN that took care of that request. So the funds of this project were not used. So again it's useful to have funds available, but it's actually through this request [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I notice how you on Page 2, I did make a couple comments. One, there seems to be a word I don't understand, which I think is just some characters left over between two sentences. And the other part is the process is not understood, I don't understand. I understand there's now a process for request funds. It's not clear how we actually get the money. Is this something that the person spends locally and then gets reimbursed for? I presume ICANN is not going to pay a local printer's bill or something like that. So perhaps that part needs to be flushed out a little bit to say exactly what it is we believe

we're asking for. Other than that, I think we're happy to go ahead. Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. I'm a bit sleepy and I didn't really understand what was going on. But I can also give my opinion as well. Is that correct? As a participant? Is that right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please, but quickly.

ALBERTO SOTO: I think we should continue this because we have heard about this at a very late stage. And so, as RALOs we are free to deal with stuff that is still pending and that we haven't been able to submit. So maybe we can do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm working on the assumption that "No Comments" mean people are supporting a particular request. I'll note we're 26 minutes into a one-hour call right now on Item Number 3 of 25. No more comments on this one, then let's scroll to the next one, please. We're looking for Page 14.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Alan, which one is that?

ALAN GREENBERG: The next one is IGF Funding for At-Large. This is a request that was done through, I believe, originated with Outreach and Engagement. We have a fair number of comments at this point. I have very strong concerns that we are being over-ambitious and may end up getting very little because of it. I agree totally that we need to start ramping up an At-Large presence. Currently, the main focus of ICANN activities that is centrally ICANN is board and staff only with a fairly large net component of people attending IGF.

I believe At-Large has a good presence at the meetings and, therefore, there should be a formal At-Large presence which includes inclusion in participation in centrally organized events, use of the ICANN booth if we don't have a separate booth for At-Large and things like that. But I think this proposal needs to be coordinated with the regional requests or they may have to be rolled into this one or something. Otherwise, I think we're going to be asking for much than we're likely to get and at that point the choices get made by staff of what to support and not by us. Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I think a rollup is probably a reasonable situation here and obviously I'm speaking with the specific bias of the generic approach that the APRALO application is. The matter and workshop, which is the focus of, I believe, both the RALO proposal is always contingent on any such workshop being accepted by IGF. So it is not impossible, in fact, occasionally it has happened that we have people

who've put forward workshops. There is, in fact, been support being provided by this process by ICANN. But the workshops do not make it through the primary filter which is the IGF process and, therefore, this contingency is utilized.

So I think there's benefits in some form of combining of this. And the reason I think it makes sense is because if you are being actively engaged in a workshop, you can also be effectively utilized as part of the overall presence. What I don't see is if you are being supported to be there for some overall presence that you can actively be somehow bought in to increase our participation rate in workshops and panels. That's not necessarily the case, it may be that someone tapped you on the shoulder and said, "Hey, come and sit on this panel." But I do think if we can find some sort of coordination of this it would be better. So I'm suggesting that people whose workshops are accepted should be used as worker bees as well, as opposed to what really wouldn't work the other way around. I think that reduces your risk.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I tend to agree. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think what this one is asking for is a separate booth. And the reason why they're asking for a separate booth is that of the success of NCUC and some others who had separate booths. I do see some synergy so that if we intend to support the other proposals from AFRALO and APRALO to come and give a presentation, if they're being sponsored by ICANN money then yes they should also have to have time in the booth

to pay for that and they should be together. But I don't think using the ICANN booth is a good idea. It's a worst case scenario. Their booth is very small and often they don't really have room for other groups to sit and have discussions. When two groups are having discussions at the same time, it gets very confusing.

So I think we need to have our own booth and we need to also have our own promotional material and I guess have material from all the RALOs there and not just At-Large material, but every single, individual RALO material. So I agree with that. I think that and I do agree also with also [Maureen] and others what they put in. So why think you can roll up the other one, I also have a few problems with that and I support this one and getting at least some core people put on and then it be supplemented by people if we're voting for their proposal to get in then they can go in. And maybe reduce the amount, so instead of having five people reduce it to two or three and then those people can supplement the booth and so we'll have the coverage.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith. A couple of comments. First of all, although you just said we need our own booth, that isn't what this proposal says. This proposal says we can share a booth. Number two, the size of the booth and how many chairs in it can be something that ICANN has under control. So if the booth is to be used more than arranging for car pickups for board members then it could be changed and At-Large. I think that's something that needs to be discussed. But, moreover, if this request was only talking about a booth, I don't think that we'd be

EN

having this discussion right now. It's also asking for five people and I think that's really the issue.

Can I request that over the next couple of days the originators of this request talk to the people who are in charge of the two RALO requests we have from AFRALO and APRALO and see if we can somehow combine them into something that is more likely to get accepted? And factoring it, of course, what Cheryl said that the RALO workshop request might get rejected, might not be accepted at the [MAG] level. So we have to factor all of that into it.

I would like to treat this particular request as a multi-year one. That is, let's get our foot in the door and establish that At-Large should have a presence without necessarily demanding a huge amount of funding that goes along with it. And certainly use of a booth is part of that and then ramp up as we go forward. So I would like to remand it back to the people who originated it for a revision and I'm available to talk should anyone want to go ahead on that.

Next proposal is the Effective Policy Development and Tracking System. When I say remand it back to the participants, that is not the request as submitted, but the one on the wiki right now with the comments from a number of people on it.

Okay. We should be on Page Number 19 and I found this proposal… I wasn't quite sure how it fit with an overall ICANN initiative that was looking at tracking of policies, tracking of documents. And, perhaps, if Dev or Glenn can speak up, it seemed to be an over-ambitious project if it was just for us and somehow linked to existing projects. So I'm not

quite sure on your thoughts on this one. At one point it does talk about under Deliverables, things about per RALO, but seems to be a more global project over and above that.

Glenn doesn't have a microphone. Dev? And Dev is typing, "Not one ready." I don't know what that, not one ready means. Judith, is that you, go ahead, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to remind everyone, we're on a tight schedule so be concise, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I talked to Glenn about this. What the idea behind this was, was that there is no mechanism for tracking, besides At-Large policy comments, there are comments that are made by individuals. And so those comments on different proposals, there's no mechanism for tracking without going to the actual document, writing down the name and then having an idea of which people in the RALO submitted the comments. This is an ICANN-wide issue. GNSO has no method of tracking that either. They go and they write down the names.

This, from what I understand from Dev and Glenn, this was designed to get some kind of tracking mechanism so maybe when you submit comments the bubble comes up and you will be asked your

constituency, you type that in and then that can be created to send a note to either staff or someone else of who's been writing comments from each constituency. And that way we have an idea without a huge manual process of who's been writing policy comments, which includes whether At-Large policy comments or individual policy comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Clarity. Are we talking about people who comment on the public comment or people who put a comment on one of our wiki pages?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, public comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Like a proposal, for example, when Janice put out her proposal for the changes in the fellowship, five people from At-Large commented. But there was no way [for staff] without going to each page and seeing, "Oh, five comments in, I need to write this down who they were." This would be a mechanism, a technology thing that will pull information for each constituency.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I think we have a discontinuity. Dev was going to speak. But let me identify what I'm seeing as a problem. Your view of what this is does

not go along with the wording here. It talks about policy documents per RALO. It says one of the results is going to increase the number of policy statements and reporting to each RALO and GSC the number of policy statements. So this looks like it's focused more on policy statements from the RALOs and not comments in the ICANN public comment. Dev, if you can elaborate, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Are you hearing me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, this is Dev [Inaudible]. Sorry, I didn't have my microphone on me at the time. I agree this will pose a [inaudible] kind of lead because we wanted to meet the deadline. So the idea behind it is that we really don't have a good sense of history of our policies. And often we are asked what were the policies that [inaudible] need under our topic, let's say, WHOIS, for example. What exactly has happened to those policies? What were the outcomes of those comments?

So what this is trying to bring is a sense of policy history, a bit of tracking of who's who of the people that are making input into this and, therefore, could be identified as subject matter [expert]. This is all going back to all of the ATLAS II recommendations which talks about policy tracking, metrics and so forth. I've often heard [inaudible] many GSCs

are asking questions some RALOs asking, "What are your policy inputs?" And there really is no way of really tracking this.

So [preliminary] aspect of it that has been done on the At-Large website where we have tracked our policy advice in some categories. But [inaudible] a little bit more searchable and so forth. So that's why it's not really asking, there's no dollar amount. It's really just having a coordinated meeting for us to brainstorm what we want and for ICANN staff to then help develop [inaudible]. I wasn't aware what the GNSO doesn't have tracking. [Inaudible], I suppose yes. This could be expanded into a wider project for the GNSO. But we were more focused on the ALAC than the At-Large and how we could better track policy input.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly for any public comment the public comment tool does analyze each of the comments and responds to them. That is being done pretty diligently. Certainly it's done very diligently for GNSO ones. But it's being done reasonably diligently for non-GNSO ones also in the public comment. Now, I don't believe there's any effort to consolidate those and track who makes comments, which certainly could be done. But there's a large focus in the text of this thing on RALO policies and right now there are relatively few RALO policies developed and very few comments made by people within RALO or people within At-Large individually on the public comments and it is talking about developing a project and testing, developing what presumably is software and testing it. So I think this needs some clean up before we go forward with it and

maybe it's something which is a bit aggressive to get submitted within the next week. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Just very quickly, Alan. Yes, that's usually a staff reporting of what happened, what consolidation department comment. But, one, you have to know where to dig very deep into the ICANN pool of where to find that information. And, two, there's still no tracking of the outcomes of what happened afterwards. So if we want to see arc of what has happened of a policy discussion, the input collected, advice given, what were the outcomes, what changed? What didn't change? I think that's what this is trying to answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, for the individual comments there are documents like that right now. They're normally attached to the public comment or to the outcome of the PDP or whatever it is. But all I'm asking here is that this report be consistent with what you're saying. And right now there are some differences. I don't think there is a reference to the public comment process here. It seems to be talking mainly about RALO things. So at the very least, I think it needs to be cleaned up and you can then decide at that point whether to submit it or not. Olivier, please go ahead and then Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÈPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Just to say that this is really the Phase 1 of the putting together the designing of the policy management process system. One question which we've been asked on many occasions in which unfortunately I currently can't answer. I'd like to hear if you can answer it, but I don't think you have the data is what impact has the ALAC had on policy at ICANN? Some people in the GNSO seeing nil, zero and we don't have the figures to come back and give this as real figures. So that is really the first phase to implement a system that will be [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. I'm not sure this request as written does it. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you. Along the lines of what Olivier just said. I think this might be a multi-year request and then incorporated into the normal policy development reporting process. So, perhaps, the first year it could ask for some funds within ICANN where the PPS could explore some technology and a format that could be used. And then the next year we can put perhaps some ability to start the process implementing it. So it might be incorporated in a multi-year approach. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Okay. Heidi, can you also look into what the status is… when I became Chair as we were transitioning from Olivier to me, the first Director's Friday Afternoon Session which is now being abolished identified policy tracking and finding policy documents and things as a

key strategic issue. It was assigned, I believe, to Chris Gift. I don't know if that project has died or is in progress. If you, perhaps, can find out that and coordinate with the people working on revising this proposal. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÈPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go right ahead.

OLIVIER CRÈPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I was just going to say from what I remember there were several other projects in place. SSAC was putting together a project to track their documents. The GNSO, I think, had also a project that was tracking some type of finding of their policy. And the GAC, I believe, was also working on this and, therefore, there was a small group that was put together [inaudible] that was supposed to follow up on that. My understanding is that what we need has nothing to do with any of the other SO and ACs are looking at.

Our request goes way further than this. I have no idea where that project went and I recall that it was taking way too much time. And the last time I asked a question about this which must have been over a year-and-a-half ago was that staff was deeply involved in the CCWGI [stewardship] transition and, therefore, there were no resource to, not even volunteer time to look at this. I really want this to be back on the table, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think that was quite accurate. ICANN did hire a librarian to look and starting to organize all of our data and make it accessible. So I think we need an update and this proposal needs to be made self-consistent so it matches what people are talking about because right now as it's written, it doesn't do that.

I note where we have 12 minutes left in this meeting and we have done 4 or 5 out of the 25. I'm not quite sure how we're going to go ahead. If anyone has any proposals, please speak up.

The next proposal is Travel Funds for the GAC Liaison. I don't think there's any question that we need this and if anyone has any comments, please speak up quickly. Hearing nothing, I'm presuming it will go ahead with whatever comments have been made.

The next one and the last one for ALAC is the APRALO General Assembly. This one was originally submitted as an APRALO request. However, given that the ALAC has proposed and has received approval from ICANN to integrate its general assemblies and summits into the overall budgeting process, then I think this is reasonably an ALAC request. I have reworded some small parts of the request to factor that in and specifically note that ICANN has said in their response to our budget proposal last year that we no longer have to submit these in this process. But they didn't provide any other way either to make sure that we would do it. So we are putting through this request although it may not be necessary to fund it through the special budget request process.

I also noted that in response the ALAC was asked to submit annually two months before the budget process the six plans and we hadn't done that, but we are in the process of doing that now. So other than the changes that were associated with integrating it into the Fiscal Year 17 request that we made, I don't believe any other changes were made to this request. If anyone has any comments then please… There was one small comment on Page 4 which I would appreciate if the APRALO people would address.

Anything else? Judith, go right ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I would love to answer that question because we asked that same question to Heidi and Sylvia about and we were told that there wasn't funding. So as Glenn and I are running our GA, we asked if we could have funding for a second person [inaudible] ALS to come and we were told there was no funding for that. So it would interesting if that rule has changed and we can have funding. Because right now we were told no funding was available.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.   You're talking about whether there's funding available for a second person from an ALS if that person is otherwise funded. I believe that's what you're talking about, correct?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. In the past our practice has been that that person is the funded person and we didn't double count that ALS. But this proposal seems to read differently which is why I'm asking them to be explicit. In the past we certainly have not provided multiple funding with the exception of ALAC members who do not belong to an ALS, they have been funded for the few cases where we've had general assemblies outside of the ICANN Meetings. But that's not the issue here. The issue is simply clarity on what they're requesting. All right. Do we have people from AFRALO on the call right now?

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Hi, Alan. I see that we have only Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. I don't see anyone else from AFRALO Region.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. He is not one of the formal members, I believe. Is that correct?

YEŞIM NAZLAR: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We'll skip AFRALO. We do have APRALO. Let us go on to that one.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the first request is the request for attendance at the Apricot Meeting. I only had one very small comment that there was a reference to a Sri Lankan Meeting with no idea what year it was, where it was, when it was and I've suggested a date be put in there. Other than that, I didn't see any particular things that merited comment at this point.

I see Judith's hand is up, please Judith, again, everyone needs to be brief because we're really running very late. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My comment relates to several of these APRALO and AFRALO ones. Question is the rules are clearly stating that this is not outreach. It says on the top, if a proposal is made on the outreach it should go through the CROPP program and not the special request process. Several of these are outreach within that RALO such as the Apricot Meeting and several other ones they are CROPP requests and should be put through the CROPP request and not through this process – if we're following the rules. Now, if the rules are different then we should change the rules because then we could have put in proposals in the RALO that were like this, but we were following the rules.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Does anyone for APRALO have a comment? I will note that under Type of Activity, although it does list outreach, it's not at the front of the list. It does talk about training and education opportunities. Anyone from APRALO?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I think that that's one of the things that we wanted to impress on our application that it isn't just outreach. And APRALO has become very much involved in the whole Apricot process and this training and our involvement in the AP Star sessions which is a gathering of all the AP Organizations related to internet. This is the major event of the year and for the Leadership Team to make themselves known and to give APRALO a better profile within the AP Organizations themselves helps us keep in touch with other activities and what's happening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. You may want to take it under advisement and reword it slightly to say, although there may be outreach components while you're there, that is not the reason you're going, if that indeed is the case.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other comments? In answer to Judith – and I can't speak on behalf of ICANN staff – but I would suspect if something is perceived as being largely outreach, it will be rejected and not funded. But, of course, that's out of my control.

Any other comments on this one? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, the next one is a Funding for the Armenia Regional IGF.

MAUREEN HILYARD: If I could just add something to this. It is a request that's come from an ALS member. We did ask our ALSs for contributions and a few came through and we'd like to put this one through and it's an IGN [Sig] application.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It probably needs a little [inaudible] but it was a short timeframe and we did ask them to do most of the work themselves. So if it needs some additional work, we'd be happy to help.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I think there's something that can be learned from other IGF and Internet governance proposals. This one seems particularly thin and moreover at the end, they're talking about one or more experts whereas earlier they're talking about multiple experts. So I think it needs to be consistent. So if we can remand this one back and for some revisions. Any other comments on it?

I'm rather dubious that we can continue on this path very far with asking ICANN for funding for Regional IGFs. The number of requests is going to blossom to the point where it's not practical to do it. But I don't know if we're at that stage yet at this point or not. I see comments in the chat of yuck, why?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Don't ask, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I see, it has to do with chickens and rats. All right. I don't want to know. Dev, please go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just an observation though. My query goes more to why don't you just approach the Regional GSC for help with possible funding of such events and that can be used as opposed to simply an At-Large request. Because I think ICANN, when you put ICANN to do IGF funding, they're usually very responsive.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the answer is people are using the AC/SO budget request process to get the attention of GSE, and by using this process, they are forcing themselves to actually fill out a form which Heidi then brings to GSE. That's my take on it.

I don't think we have ever funded one of these ourselves through At-Large. I may be wrong on that, but that's what my memory says. So, I'm not optimistic that it will be funded by the At-Large budget request process. History says it may well be funded by GSE, and if that's the case, maybe we need to formalize that process so we're not both tied to the budget year and for us doing work that essentially has no real effect on the outcomes for the At-Large requests.

Perhaps Heidi can talk to us about that some other time and see if we can streamline this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, Alan –

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Yes, go on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. What is the decision on this one then?

ALAN GREENBERG: The decision is I think that we will keep this one just as we have in the past with no expectations it will be funded, other than being brought to the attention of GSE. But nevertheless, there's some cleanup that has to be done on this, and some expansion of it to give it more flesh.

I don't think the FBSC is going to refuse to do it, but I think we need to streamline our processes so we're not just acting as a conduit to GSE. But we need to make sure there is another conduit to GSE.

Next request is the INSIG, the Indian Internet School of Governance. That one, again, is in the exact same situation. It was not funded through At-Large last time. I'm not sure if we have any real expectation that it would this time. I'm not 100% convinced that there's credibility in an Indian School of Governance happening in some place that is not India, but I will not raise that issue myself. The flights are not that far.

Does anyone have any other comments on this one? If everyone is happy –

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan –

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, sorry.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, I support your [thing]. That was exactly my comment. Why are we having an Indian School of Governance at ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi? If we're going to fund it, we should fund it in India.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone from APRALO have any comments?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I assumed that it was a sort of the model of the India. If fact, I would have to get some clarification from Satish. It was his effort [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: It's very much a second Indian School of Internet Governance.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Satish would have to answer that one. We need to get back to him. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so we're reverting that one back. But in any case, I have no hope or belief that this will be funded as an At-Large-funded project. But we seem to be content at the moment for having things routed to GSE through this process, and if ICANN Rob and ICANN Finance are not against it, I can live with it. But we should make sure that they know we know that we're not really asking for money out of the At-Large allocation out of this.

Next project from APRALO is – and I believe – no, it is not. Second to last one, and it is – can someone from a RALO tell me how to pronounce APIGA without having it sound like a pig?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. This particular application was just made on the – again, in consultation with our ALSes. It was just last year when they had the Internet Governance Academy, the APRALO wasn't actually consulted as to who they might invite, and they put out their own process, had their own process, which is fine, except that APRALO does have a leadership program of its own and we would have really appreciated some input. And we just felt that if additional applicants were possible and there was funding that was needed, that we would like to be able to offer a couple more applicants to that, their own process.

We just wanted to actually have [inaudible] who we might be able to include into an academy such as this, which was very successful and using the processes that APRALO has in place already.

ALAN GREENBERG: Who is running this Asia Pacific Internet Governance Academy? Have we lost Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: The APAC Hub, Jia Rong and Kelvin and [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh. That was not clear from this proposal. It does say that somewhere. Okay, at this point it's not clear what this proposal is asking. It implies it's asking for money, but then says, "We want input in how people are chosen."

So, I think if you want this application to stand, you have to be a little bit clear on what you're asking for. And again, it sounds like it may not be a real budget request that should go through this process.

MAUREEN HILYARD: This was a very late application, so yes, it probably isn't as well sort of constructed as it could be, but we'd like to put it forward, and again, give them some time to redo it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll make a comment, and it's directed at Heidi and any other ICANN people who are on this call. I'm starting to get the feeling more and more that we are using the budget request to get attention from people because we believe if we simply talk to them directly, we'll be ignored or forgotten.

And if that's the case, we really need to fix the original problem and not just use this as a conduit to various other groups in ICANN. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Alan, I think that you're on the right track. I would add that these requests give you, At-Large, the opportunity to show that the types of activities work effectively, and then ICANN staff see that and recognize it, and bring them into core at some point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that, but they're being brought into core from funding from other organizations, and not through the AC/SO budget process. So, I think we need to make sure we have good communication lines. This may be the best one to use, but it sounds like we're mangling a process. And again, not on this call, but we really need to talk about it more. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just a question to Maureen. Is there any way that this request could be linked to the ICANN Academy? I mean it could stay like a

collaboration between the APAC Hub and the ICANN academy. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not Maureen, but I'm going to try to answer. I suspect there is no connection whatsoever between the ICANN Academy and the governance academy that's been set up by the Hub. So, if that's the case, ICANN internally has to do some work. Maureen, if that was the wrong answer, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, it's similar. It's more an organization thing, and we can work on the proposals. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Heidi, is that a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We're eight minutes after the hour. How much time do we have with our interpreters? Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Alan. Sorry, I was trying to unmute. They already confirmed me that they will be able to go over for ten minutes, but now they've given update that no problem with them. We can just keep on.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll just continue. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: So, [inaudible]. Yes. Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Next one is EURALO. If we could put that one up, please. Sorry, there's one more. I don't think we need to discuss it because we already have discussed it, it's the APRALO request for the global IGF, and that's the one we already need some coordination with our other requests. If we can go on to EURALO, please.

Very modest, only two requests from EURALO. The first one is an IGF workshop. This is also at the IGF. Phrased somewhat differently than the other ones, but nevertheless, another IGF workshop, and I think this one we probably need to, again, coordinate with the global IGF one.

I don't know if anyone has any specific comments. I did note that under type of meeting, it was listed primarily as outreach, and under those auspices and given the fact that the next IGF is within Europe, this is not likely to be funded under those conditions.

So, I would suspect this needs at least some revision, but also needs to coordinate with the Outreach and Engagement project. Any further comments on this? Hearing none, seeing none, the next one is the ICANN [student] [inaudible].

Olivier or Heidi, remind me, the one we did last year ultimately not funded, or was funded by ICANN?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It was not funded.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was not funded. All I can say is based on how this one is worded this year, including listing all of the ICANN people who show up to this meeting, if ICANN chooses to say this is not an ICANN-class meeting and we should not be funding people for it, they better come up with a different reason.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Olivier. And that's presuming, of course, that EURALO is smart enough to remove the word "outreach" from its main purpose. Go ahead, Olivier.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. You will notice that apart from a few wording changes and updates, this request is exactly the same as last year, which is the same as the year before and the one before and the one before.

We're building a collecting of rejections on this so as to be able to show Göran Marby the fact that this is not being ever funded whilst he's also attended. It's interesting. Of course, last year it was the first year that Göran was attending it, so we couldn't show the rejection to him, but this year, we will. We by now I think have pretty much given up on it being funded.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a question. Somewhere along the way – and I don't remember whether there was in this thing or on their website – it said that they're limited to 40 participants in the program. Did I read that correctly?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then all of these people are known entities. You're not reaching out to any of them. Get rid of the word "outreach".

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What we're doing – okay, we'll take the outreach out, fair enough. That's fine, but what we're basically doing is putting an end user representation inside these discussions. Ever since [student] [inaudible]

started, the end user representation has been the poorest out of all of the SOs and ACs and [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: You made that case well in the proposal. I would suggest –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's interesting that ICANN doesn't want to do that though. It's something that I find very bizarre.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And it seems to be wanted that there's no end user representation on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. I would suggest this is akin to the APRALO request thing. We are now participating in Internet governance activities and we should continue to be part of the game. You may want a couple of small changes to it, but I'm taking it as a challenge to ICANN to dare to refuse it again. But that's a personal position, not as Chair of the ALAC.

If we could go on – do we have LACRALO people formally? I know Alberto is on the call, but I don't believe he's a formal FBSC member. Do we have any LACRALO FBSC members on the call?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Alan, just give me one second, please. Let me check the members.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I thought that – well, Harold is on the call [at least.] He's a member, and I thought Humberto was also on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I haven't seen or heard Humberto, but maybe he is. Harold is [inaudible]

YESIM NAZLAR: He's on the Spanish channel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Which he?

YESIM NAZLAR: Humberto is on the Spanish channel.

HUMBERTO CARASCO: He is here on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Humberto and Harold are on the call. Then let's go ahead with the LACRALO requests. We have four requests. The first one is creating

leaders in LACRALO. Alright, would anyone from LACRALO want to give a very brief summary of what this is? Because this is a new thing that we haven't talked about before. Very brief. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: The summary is the following: we have had many meetings in many ICANN meetings, especially in the last ICANN meetings there were ALAC members who have said they have been able to exercise their function only as from the second year and once the second year has progressed, because of the amount of things that they didn't really have before they were appointed.

So, the idea is that we would like to level up through the courses that are already available in ICANN and to provide the necessary knowledge that any leader needs to get to their projects by having their ICANN knowledge.

So, this would provide them with the possibility to exercise their roles as ALAC members, Chairs, or secretaries with all the knowledge they need. This is not applicable only for LACRALO, it could be applicable for all the RALOs, and it requires translation because the teachers would be within ICANN and I would get no money from this. So, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Yes, I was going to note it's primarily Adobe Connect remote participation. I think the proposal needs a little bit more work in terms of linking the skills you're teaching with why that is going to be helpful for people taking on roles within LACRALO, and I also

think you probably want to add in a component of ICANN policy issues, because when we call people leaders within At-Large, it's not necessarily just running the organization but it's participating in the policy things.

So, I think you're going to need some sort of primers into what's going on in ICANN, what are the current hot topics and getting people started to be up to speed on that. I think the proposal needs a little bit more work, but I would think it's a good thing. And I would probably suggest it's a pilot project for other RALOs. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I like the idea, but my question is, how is it different from an orientation session that staff could give or staff can work with the leaders? So, I am not understanding – and this is also my question on the NARALO one that's like this – how this is not something that staff cannot do and work with the RALO to get this one or to get speakers. Or it could be one of these capacity building programs that Tijani does. I don't see how this is any different from that, and why it should be a special budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it's not clear it is a special budget, other than Adobe Connect sessions. And I can't speak on behalf of Alberto, but I would presume that this would use ICANN staff and would use existing materials when it's applicable. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes. I made a proposal three ICANN meetings ago, and Tijani said this was covered by the capacity building. And I said, "No, because these were already leaders or they were already exercising the roles of a leader but they complained that they weren't really trained to lead a group with the necessary knowledge." That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think you need to think about how do people get into this program, and to what extent, what is the next step after they finish it. Because we don't suddenly have leadership openings coming in every eight months. So, I think this certainly requires a little bit more refinement, but I don't see any reason that we can't put it through and see what happens.

Next proposal is a Roundtable Challenges for At-Large Community and Latin America, Caribbean. That's on page four. Any comments on that one? My comments are, first of all, there's a reference to a meeting that's not yet scheduled, but it should say that. It's not clear.

The second is it's not clear how this relates – if at all – to the LACRALO mediation program that's going on right now. I note all the sections at the end are not filled in, including deliverables.

Humberto, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: The truth is that this is – the idea we have is to create a roundtable for a discussion in an event that even though it does have the dates, there is no venue decided, and what they're looking for is that they have set

certain ICANN goals but we want to refine these projects to make it fit into the ICANN goals. So, what we want is to have a roundtable that would be included in a sort of a paper compilation or a presentation compilation that can serve as educational material for the At-Large community within LACRALO. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. In terms of location, my comment just says that you should note in the paper for the ICANN people who aren't going to do their own research that you didn't omit the location, it's not yet set. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. I like this request, and particularly in that there is an extension until about the 11th of February. There would be time to see the results of the LACRALO assembly, and if there is indeed some follow-up that might be useful to continue the process that the assembly is dealing with. So, perhaps this can be sort of put on a hold until during or after the assembly, and then we can see where the need might be. And also, I'm just wondering if there would be flexibility on the location of the event, on the sidelines of a meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think regardless, if this is going to go ahead, there has to be some work done on the proposal. There are just too many sections that are blank, including deliverables, which I don't think

is acceptable. So, I will remand this back to LACRALO and hope a new version comes out. Next request.

This is capacity building of ALS LACRALO in the ICANN ecosystem. This proposal, my comment, it needs a lot of work and the funding level indicated is just so far out of the range of anything that's going to be accepted that if we're going to propose it, it's going to have to have a lot more clarity, and specifically on the items that have dollar amounts, a lot more information on just what they're asking for.

From what I can tell, they're asking us to buy a PC for each one of 54 people attending a meeting, and that doesn't sound like it's probably what it's asking. There are descriptions of digital literacy material asking for $100,000 U.S. and I don't know what that means, so again, if this is going to be submitted, I think it's going to have to have extensive revisions done to it.

Humberto, your name is on it as Chair. Are you going to take responsibility for that, or how will that be handled? We can't in good conscience submit this proposal as it is right now. It's as far as I can tell using well over half of all of the AC/SO funds, and that's somewhat unrealistic. Humberto, go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Well, my name is on the document because I – in fact, it was Johnny Laureano who participated in the proposal, but my name is there. We didn't have the opportunity to analyze, to review these proposals, so I would suggest that you let me go back to the proposal and to discuss it with Johnny Laureano and see how we can get into details with the

proposal, how we can elaborate it a bit more so that we can comply or meet the requirements for this request. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I will note that any proposal that reaches the FBSC is supposed to have the support of the leadership of the RALO. So, I understand time was difficult this time around. I also note that this proposal is asking for travel for 54 people, which is essentially a general assembly, and there's no way that that's going to be funded within our normal process. So, we look for a revised version coming back on this one.

The next one, the last one is the Internet for Development and Social Transformation, a meeting in Venezuela. Now, it's not clear what – again, what this report is asking for. If it's asking for funding for the meeting itself, then it's a GSE proposal, it's nothing to do with At-Large. It's not clear whether it's asking for LACRALO participants to go to the meeting or asking for Adobe Connect for people who aren't at the meeting.

It's somewhat confusing, so again, I think at the very least this needs some refinement and some clarity as to exactly what it is that it's asking for. Harold, go ahead, please.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you very much, Alan. Just confirming, can you hear me okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay, thank you. So, this is a request for carrying out the third meeting for Internet and Social Transformation. That is the name of the meeting. This is the third time this meeting will take place. In previous opportunities, we had the presence of our Vice President, Rodrigo De La Parra together with some other people from LACNIC and the ISOC chapters, and some people from other associations.

In this case, we would like to have 80%, if you will, of this meeting to hold this meeting online. So to have 20% of participants face-to-face participants, and the rest, 80% would be connected only online. So, there are certain people living outside Venezuela, certain speakers who are not in Venezuela, and it is there where we need the support. We need support for at least three people, or no more than three people.

On the other hand, we would also need the support for the Adobe Connect. We need that tool in order to promote remote participation so that people in the RALO may participate in the meeting remotely. That is to say, they can participate through the Adobe Connect in the sessions, and of course, to do the follow-up of the event. So, that's why we are presenting the proposal. So this is a meeting that at the end will have workshops.

Since we have the confirmation – and once we have the confirmation of the event, there will be roundtables organized, and people participate in these roundtables so that on the day of the event, people may have a

proposal or they may have opinions already created to discuss topics that are on the ICANN agenda.

So, that is how the event is a kind of exercise so that they can work all together on different topics, interesting topics, and these topics are presented in the second day of the event. So, this is the event, and the idea here – of course, we had certain discussions with our colleagues in Mexico, in Cuba, in South America because they're willing to participate simultaneously and they will call participants to this meeting.

In the two previous editions of the meeting, we had more than 600 participants and 250 approximately were there face-to-face. They were physically present on the venue. So, that is the idea of the event. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alright, then I will assume that this proposal will come back to us, cleaning it up and making it clearer exactly what is being requested, and filling in the parts that have not been filled in right now.

Judith notes in the chat that the Adobe Connect I don't think is an issue as long as there are not a lot of dial-outs that are required, but I'll leave that up to Heidi to talk to you about directly, Heidi or Silvia. Harold, I assume that's an old hand.

Alright, next is NARALO. If we could have that document up, please. Alright, we're 30 minutes past the official end of this call. NARALO is the

only one we have left, and if we could try to go through this moderately quickly, I would appreciate it.

The first one is the North American School of Internet Governance. I must admit I was somewhat confused, because although it was called the North American School of Internet Governance, it is talking about the vast majority of people coming from Puerto Rico and being conducted, I believe, in Spanish.

So, I think we need some clarity as to exactly what it is requesting. Like the other schools of governance and regional IGF meetings, it sounds like this is largely a GSE proposal and not an ALAC proposal. And I note there is some lack of clarity in that it's talking about 200 people in one place and 100 in another.

I think we have decided that these GSE-like proposals will stay within our domain, although we're not really expecting them to be funded that way. But does anyone have any comments on the other issues I raised, and specifically, is this a North American school or is this a Puerto Rican school? Eduardo, go right ahead. I cannot hear you yet if you're speaking.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay. I think Eduardo is typing something. Well, on the allowance of people issue, the number of people issue, I think what the proposal says is that it's 100 per day, so that's the total, the 200 with the two-day event. A two-day event that would take place right before the ICANN meeting in San Juan in March.

I think we can look into the language issue. I think Puerto Rico is pretty bilingual, but I think the fact is that Puerto Rico is in the North American region, and the Spanish language is spoken in Puerto Rico [inaudible]. So I don't understand the language complication raised by Alan in the sense that there are several languages spoken in North America, mainly French, Spanish, English and some other indigenous language actually, so I don't think the language issue should be a complication here.

In terms of what we're trying to do, there haven't been schools of Internet Governance in North America – there have been other events like this, several events [inaudible] not a North American school, so we want to start that tradition in Puerto Rico, and as you know, we turn this into a yearly event in different parts of North America where there are different [inaudible].

Puerto Rico is going to have some particular [inaudible] Puerto Rico characteristics, but I think we can always take a look back at what we've put into the paper. I think it's a good chance to get something new rolling. I think it's going to be in San Juan of course a great speakers and resources that we can leverage for our students in Puerto Rico or maybe faculty and to get the Internet topic discussed well is something that doesn't happen as much as it could [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Yes, but let me address two comments that Javier made before we continue. The reference to 100 I was talking about was in item number two. It said 100 individuals be registered for a two-day capacity building meeting, and in the previous paragraph it says 200 individuals. All I was suggesting is those made to match each other.

In terms of the naming and language, I wasn't criticizing where it would be or who it would be focused on or the language, I was simply noting that it is being billed as the North American School of Internet Governance, but then the text refers to largely focused on Puerto Rico. I would strongly suggest that you bill this as the first North American School of Internet Governance, with this first version being held in Puerto Rico with a focus on that territory. And of course, because of that, being in Spanish is quite reasonable.

So, I'm just suggesting that you have it consistent with the title and then the description, which will make it much more likely to be funded, and describe it as the pilot project the first occurrence of such a School of Internet Governance in North America which you would envision moving around to different places. There was no criticism of the specifics, but just continuity. Yes, Eduardo, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I hope you can hear me now. I think Javier covered the essence of what we're doing here. And definitely, we can clarify this and take your comments into consideration to make this more focused as to what we want to do.

So, we can change this, and also there is a note here that we're not clear what we're looking for. And you know, we're really looking for – we're trying to do this two days before ICANN, and we may bring people who are coming to Puerto Rico anyhow, but we need to have funding for two days, probably for hotel and per diems. That's basically what we're looking here for.

And I have a call with Chris Mondini and Joe Catapano to talk about this to see if we can use ICANN facilities from this there, other than going somewhere else to do it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Eduardo. And no problem with that. I note that what you just said is correct, that you may well be looking for a few extra days. The request says you're not looking for any funding at all on the travel side. So again, just clean it up and make it consistent, and I think it's clearly a GSE project, but I would think that they would be delighted to fund it, assuming we make the whole thing [whole] together.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, we'll do that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The next item is the Public Media Initiative. I don't think Evan is on the call. This basically says that ICANN doesn't do a really good job at public relations in terms of informing the public what we do and what the importance of what we do is. And of course, it came up in relation to the criticism of the IANA transition.

Again, I don't see the connection with At-Large to be honest, other than that we would likely have some people who would be glad to contribute to helping make this work. But I think it's – again, since this seems to be their only way we can get into the ICANN system, I think it's a delightful thing to propose and see where it goes. Judith, do you have any comments?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I didn't get a chance to review the project beforehand, like Humberto. Although they gave a little snippet of the project earlier, it was very unclear what they were going to be proposing. So, we couldn't give any approval or rejection of these things, so that's why we're not necessarily approving it.

We think, like you, it's something that Communications should be doing. It shouldn't be something that the RALO be doing, and it should be only a RALO. We don't necessarily think that it's something that we would like to put in forward as a RALO-supported project. It could be an ALAC or it could be a Comms-supported one, but I don't think it should be a RALO-supported one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I have no problem moving it up to an ALAC one. How do other people feel about that? Again, I don't see it being funded out of the AC/SO funds. It's either going to be adopted by Communications or rejected, but I think it's a fine thing to put through. I think it's an area that ICANN does not do a good job at, and if we can raise some consciousness of it, I don't mind using this process to do that.

Anyone else have any thoughts? Anyone have any objection to raising it to an ALAC project with the understanding we're not really looking for any money for it? We have a couple of checkmarks and comments in the chat. We will do that. Heidi, if you can make a note.

Next proposal. And if you haven't watched the two videos that are pointed to in it, I suggest everyone do. They do prove the point.

Next one is the Global Indigenous Persons Mentorship Program in Support of Fellowships. I'm not quite sure I understand the title, although I understand what the program is that you're talking about. And we are on page – do you have it? We do have it. Okay.

The document needs a little bit of cleanup in that there are some good introductory sentences two thirds of the way through the document that probably should be at the first section. But other than that, I think everyone has agreed that it was an interesting program and we would like to continue it at this point.

Anyone have any comments? Hearing none, seeing none. Have we tired everyone out? I can certainly sympathize with that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I was communicating with Loris on this a few times, and I will double check that the meetings that are referenced are only in Fiscal Year 18. I think that there's a little bit of extension beyond that time period, and we need to ensure that activates are only within Fiscal Year 18. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. I see staring at me is ICANN 63 in October, 2018, which is Fiscal Year 19. So, that does need to be cleared up also.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. And again, Cheryl and you may recall that the original proposal for the indigenous fellowship was indeed a global one, so this is what is actually the next sort of formal step into making this into a more cross-ICANN or a cross-At-Large program. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Does that mean it should be promoted from a NARALO to an ALAC project? As far as I could see, the details were still North American focused at this point.

HEIDI ULLRICH: They are, but I think that's because Loris is based here. But I think it clearly does say that it needs a global approach to that. So perhaps, it should go up to ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: But in that case, it really has to say it's not just focusing on the North American people and groups. So, that will require someone who can – can I ask you to work with the folks who did this one and try to...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because I know your time is not easy the next two weeks. Alright, next proposal is Demystifying of Tools and Getting Comfortable with Videoconferencing. We have two hands up and I have a comment which I will make first, if I may.

That is, this is talking about getting people involved, and I think it should be linked to the initiative that the ALAC approved in Hyderabad to start getting messages out to people other than the ALS representatives. The context of this makes a lot more sense if we're looking at a larger group than just a single person per ALS, and I think it will have a lot of strength if we do it from that context. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: This is one of the ones we saw – we heard a little bit about but we didn't see. And I don't necessarily approve of it, but I don't see why it's not something that staff cannot do already in working with an ALS and helping them explain during like an orientation session for these people on what is being done or helping organize and orientation session.

They can use the Adobe Connect platform, and I think they seem to be wanting an orientation session. So maybe staff can provide that. I don't think they seem to be wanting anything else, so I'm a little confused about what they're wanting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you, Judith. Heidi, can I ask you or someone from staff to talk to Maritza and find out is this something you can simply do within your own auspices, or is it in fact acting for resources that we don't have available?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I will do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I had the same thoughts as Judith. This is pretty much what ICANN staff can do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, either revise it as necessary or withdraw it if it's simply something we're going to do as a matter of course.

Next item, the last item is the Canadian Speakers Bureau, and my comment on that one is we should describe this as a pilot program

which could then be used in other jurisdictions, not necessarily limited to NARALO. Judith, go right ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm also not understanding this one in the sense that, doesn't Communications or GSE already have a speakers bureau that we could tap? This seems like a GSE proposal, and they could send speakers to them and even talk on different topics. I don't know why we need a special Canadian group.

ALAN GREENBERG: My reading of this was they were looking for people, not necessarily ICANN but also with an ALAC and At-Large focus which the ICANN Speakers Bureau – which last time I was involved in it, we were told we cannot be on that list because it's just for people like Board members and staff. So, I think this one is a much more At-Large focus than that one is. If indeed the ICANN Speakers Bureau has widened significantly, then you may be correct. Heidi, do you have any knowledge of this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I know it still exists, and I think that you're correct that in its current state, it still does focus on staff and others. I believe, Alan – while I have the floor – this request also has a community member or someone being paid for their work. I thought that I saw that, and if that is the case, then that is not under the criteria allowed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't notice that. In any case, both Judith and Glenn say they do not support it and propose to withdraw it, so it's withdrawn at this point. Doesn't require any further discussion.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, we have now finished this one. I'm told Tijani is on the call. I don't know if he can speak or not. We're going to back to the two AFRALO discussions. One of them will not require much discussion at all for reasons that'll become obvious.

We have an absolutely hard stop in 11 minutes. The interpreters cannot go past that. So, we are limited in time. The two AFRALO requests are one for a session at the global IGF. Tijani, you were not on the call earlier when we discussed the other RALO IGF sessions and the Outreach and Engagement one and we said that we do not believe we can present all of these to ICANN in their current state. The total number of people requested is far too large, and clearly, if we fund the RALO ones that we're not going to fund a central one anywhere near that level. That was part number one, and part number two, the Outreach and Engagement one really is a multi-year request and we just want to get our foot in the door with some level of coordination and maybe a booth and grow from there, but not try to be too overambitious.

We decided that the presenters of the IGF RALO requests – and there are three of them – and the Outreach and Engagement people should work together to try to either roll them into a single proposal or somehow factor them in so they mesh well together, because right now they were written completely separately.

So, I don't think we need any further talk on the IGF one. If you can speak and have any comments, please, but we did spend a significant amount of time earlier in the meeting on that. But I think we will like to focus on the participation in the African IGF.

There are several other requests that focus on the regional IGFs. The general conclusion we came to is those are largely either outreach ones which fit into CROPP or they're GSE-funded projects, but for the moment we are happy to put these projects in knowing they're not likely to be funded as At-Large projects.

But I'm not sure there's anything unique to the African one different to the other regional IGF ones. But Tijani, if you can speak, go ahead. Tijani says he agrees to work with others and on the global IGF one. He cannot speak.

If you can just confirm that what I said about the African IGF one is reasonable, that is to the extent it's outreach is CROPP, but to the extent it's funding for the IGF or participation in it other than outreach, it's largely GSE focus, although we are putting in other proposals that are similar to that. And we certainly will be happy to do this one as well. Yes, okay, if it's not outreach then it clearly is a GSE type of proposal like

the other regional IGF ones, and I presume that Heidi will be talking to GSE about it.

Alright, we've now somehow managed to address all 25 proposals. For those who weren't on the call initially, we will have an extension that could go as far as February 10th, but I honestly don't think we want to go anywhere near that far. I would like to have this ready to go – let me look at what the date is – round about February 7th, which is essentially two weeks from now.

That says we can give the people who are working on these proposals, send it back to them for returning to us perhaps by next Monday, and then we can schedule a meeting, and that's the 30th. And then we can schedule a meeting late in that week, or very early on the week of the 6th to finalize these and put them in.

If there are not significant changes, we may cancel that meeting, but I think we should have one on the books. I don't want to go any farther than that. That's edging into the time where we're going to start intensive work on the At-Large review, and I think people are going to have just too many things on their hands if we delay much past that.

Does everyone agree on that plan going forward? So we will turn these requests all back to the original's proposers and the RALOs, to be returned to us no later than the end of next Monday. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Alan, I just want to thank you very much for taking this on. I think you did the vast majority of the work this time, given my schedule,

which I very much appreciate. And you have really taken it to the next level, so this is best practice and we will do this hopefully from the staff side next year. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'll be delighted to have that happen. Thank you all. Thank you for putting up with a two-hour call when we had a one-hour call scheduled. The number of people who have stayed with us is impressive.

Heidi, one item I did not raise in this is the use of our liaison travel funds. We never got that clarified. I would ask you to speak to Rob since I think you're in the same place at the moment, and get some clarity on that. And if we cannot align what they said is the answer with the text in the answer, then we will put another request in.

Specifically what we're asking for is the ability to take our liaison travel slots and reassign them at the ALAC level to other people if the liaisons do not need them. The answer last time came back as yes, but then the following text said no. So, we would like the same answer in both title and the sections. And if we can leave that with you to get back with me privately, and either we will resubmit the request or we will have clarity. Thank you all.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, everyone.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned, so you will now be disconnected. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]