
EVIN ERDOGDU:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Monthly Teleconference on Tuesday, the 25th of April, 2017, from 4:00 UTC to 6:00 UTC. Today on the call we have with us Alan Greenberg, Javier Rua-Jovet, Maureen Hilyard, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Alberto Soto, Leon Sanchez, Harold Arcos, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Julie Hammer, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjo Lansipuro, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Barrack Otieno, [inaudible], as well as Maritza Aguero on the Spanish channel.

For apologies, we have Wafa Dahmani and Holly Raiche. From Staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber, Yesim Nazlar, and myself, Evin Erdogan, I will also be doing call management. And our interpreters today, on the French channel we have Isabelle and Jacques, Veronica and Claudia on Spanish, and on Russian, Galina and Maya. And with that, I'll turn it over to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and welcome to the April ALAC meeting. Does anyone have any modifications or comments on the agenda or any other business to add? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we'll assume the agenda is accepted. And the first item is Outstanding Action Items. There is zero minutes allocated, so I will take it that there are no action items needing the attention of the ALAC. Pausing to make sure that's correct. Hearing no one correct me, the next item is ALAC Policy Development Activities. There is a lot going on and I will turn the call over to Ariel.

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.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan, this is Ariel speaking. Apologies in advance for my voice, because I got a little sick. So the first one is recommendations to improve ICANN's transparency, and the public comments already closed, but we managed to communicate with the staff, the ALAC would submit a statement later. And then we just submitted a statement with ratification pending. The ratification booth will open today at 23:59 UTC. So just as a FYI, please watch your email.

ALAN GREENBERG: That one had a staff summary due some time in May, so I didn't feel too guilty about that one.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, thank you Alan. So, the second one is on the interim paper cross community working group and use of names of countries and territories as top level domain. I see that Maureen has drafted a statement, and this is already posted on Wiki, and I see that Alan has provided comments, too. So in my communications with Maureen, she likes to keep the commenting open until at least today, and receive some feedback from the ALAC members on the call, or later via the email, but we need to submit a statement as soon as possible, because the public comment already closed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, on that one, just to explain, if anyone looked at my comment, the gist of the comment that was drafted was quite correct, at least in my

mind, and I don't think there's any disagreement. The text, however, did refer to the next step, whatever it is, as a CWG and it almost surely will not be a CWG in some form. It's going to have to be something that doesn't exist right now, that is a joint ccNSO GNSO PDP, or at least something that has the power of a ccNSO PDP and a GNSO PDP. And since we don't know what the form is, I suggested rewording it to make it a little bit more vague and less specific as to the exact form. I don't think the intent changed at all from the previous wording, but I think Maureen is right to keep it open another day and make sure no one catches something wrong with it. Go ahead, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. Just to confirm, if we don't receive further comment, I will regard this as final and submit to the public comment forum and open the ratification votes. Is that what you intend to do?

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's certainly what I think is reasonable, but Maureen has the full control, so if she disagrees, then we'll do whatever is appropriate. But I think at this point there has been a lot of discussion, much more than there normally is on these kind of issues, and I think we're in pretty good shape.

ARIEL LIANG:

Okay, great. And I see Maureen commented too, so thank you. And the next one is on the internationalized domain name implementation guidelines. The public comment was extended to May 7th and based on

a previous ALT call, Andrei volunteered to review the public comments and will alert the ALAC whether it warrants a statement or not. So I'm wondering whether Andrei has any comment on that public comment.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Yes, it's Andrei speaking. There was a comment, there is an interesting discussion now going on in a universal acceptance working group regarding the horrific potential homographic attack, and it's all about the recommendations, the guidelines, and about the word "may" or "must" in Item 9 of the recommendation. I'm following it with great attention, because that was basically the old story about using the different scripts in the domain names, which may end up with a confusion. So the period has been extended, so I will keep my eye on it, and will report as it goes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you, Andrei.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Andrei. So I guess, just to make it clear, if you were saying that this is something okay, we don't need to comment on. After a few a days you would let me know whether you plan to draft a statement or just consider this as no statement?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Of course, I will.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, thank you. And the next one is on the draft 2016 African Domain Names and Market Study. Wafa is not on the call today, but she just sent a draft statement via email to Alan and Seun to take a look, but I know Seun is busy for family matters, and Alan, you probably haven't had a chance to read that yet. I just wanted to make sure you're okay before we post that on the Wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG: My position normally is if someone drafts something, I'm willing to have it posted. I may make comments against it later on, but I would not want to delay posting it from me looking at it, unless Wafa specifically wanted us to agree on it.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, I will post that immediately after the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did it also go to Tijani?

ARIEL LIANG: No, because Tijani is not listed as one of the penholders.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I see.

ARIEL LIANG: But I can forward the email, do you want me to forward the email to Tijani?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem just posting it at this point and we'll see where it goes.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay. I'll do that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ariel? Ariel?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ariel, I am here, I can speak about the comment on the FY-18 operating plan and budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I think it's on our agenda later, is it not?

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry Tijani, I skipped it. Yes, indeed, I skipped it. That's a more urgent one.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we put it on the agenda, but maybe I'm wrong.

ARIEL LIANG: It's there, it's just too many bullets and I skipped one bullet.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I thought there was a separate agenda item for it, but maybe not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Alan, this is Heidi. We're doing the fiscal year 18 additional budget requests, and I thought that Tijani was going to have some bullet points to discuss.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right, we'll defer this one until Agenda Item 12.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, okay I see that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: I think, back to Tijani and Tijani can talk...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, Ariel, we're skipping that item and we'll handle it under Agenda Item 12.

ARIEL LIANG: Oh, okay. I'm sorry, I wasn't paying complete attention, sorry about that. Okay. So the next one is on the proposed fundamental bylaws change to move the board governance committee's reconsideration process responsibilities to another board committee. And Leon volunteered to draft a statement and public comment will close on May 10th. And Leon just raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. Leon Sanchez. I am in the process of finalizing the statement, it's a very short statement. I will circulate it maybe tomorrow or the day after.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Leon. The next one is on the competition consumer trust and consumer choice review team draft reports and recommendations for new gTLDs. The public comment has extended to May 19th and we already have a draft statement posted on the Wiki and it's open for the whole community to comment on, and I know Holly has sent several emails encouraging members to provide comment, and I will post the link in the chat. Anybody wants to comment on this for now?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I haven't seen anyone. There's lots of discussion going on in the community about it. The gTLD PDP spent pretty much all of its session today talking about their responses to the parts of the report that refer to the PDP taking action. And it's interesting in that the report recommends that the PDP do certain things, and the recommendations of the review team do not go to the PDP, they go to the Board for approval. The Board is empowered to say certain things should be carried out, but the Board has no authority to tell the GNSO to actually do it. So it's an interesting set of interwoven responsibilities.

And of course, the GNSO is saying what if we don't want to do it, the Board will have the ultimate say so in refusing to accept the recommendations of the PDP. So it's going to be interesting. But in any case, as Holly has indicated, this is a really important comment and a really important task. We've had two people, Kylie and Carlton working very, very hard on this for the last almost year-and-a-quarter at this point and it's really important that people take the time to look at least the recommendations of the report and see to what extent they think

they can support or not support the comment that we've drafted. Back to you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. So for a large internal commenting period, I just want to provide you a quick state. By May 10th, you can still provide comment, so that we will have the final draft ready for voting. So that's the tentative date. So you still have a few days to look at the draft.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, if I may, Ariel, I do suggest people have a look at the actual review team report, and not just the recommendations. The reason I suggest it, is it is an amazing amount of work, and they're not finished it, this is still just a draft report, and there are still a number of areas they're still working on. The amount of work that they have put into it, and the complexity of some of the issues, is really amazing. I think all review teams, I've been on one, review teams work hard. But what they are producing and what they have gone through, makes some of the rest of the work we've done look like child's play. So I take my hat off to them. And I think it would be an interesting read. It's long, but I think everyone will learn something if you take some time to go over that report. Back to you, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you, Alan, for that comment. The next one is deferral of the country code names supporting organization review and the public

comment will close on the 19th of May. And Alan, you actually volunteered to draft a statement, and will consult with Maureen.

ALAN GREENBERG: I better put it on my to do list, then.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. So, the next one is on the GNSO community comment to new gTLD subsequent procedure and policy development process. The public comment just got extended, now will close on 22nd of May. And actually, Alan, that's another thing you can put on your to do list, and you actually volunteered to draft a statement in coordination with Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: I need to learn to keep my mouth shut. Noted, Ariel, thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. And the last one on this long list is recommendations to important SO/AC accountability, and that will close the 26th of May, and that's the third thing, Alan, you can put on your to do list. And actually it's probably on the to-do list of Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Someone should get after these people who aren't doing their job. That was Alan Greenberg speaking, for the interpreters and the transcript – that was a joke. Ariel, back to you.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you. So that's all the ones that ALAC already made decisions on. There's a new public comment just opened. It's on the proposed renewal of dot net, and that will close the 30th of May.

ALAN GREENBERG: And, is anyone interested in looking at it? The last time we had a review of dot org contract, there were some interesting things in it. I would think somebody really needs to be looking at going over this one with a fine tooth comb, probably more than one somebody. Do I have any volunteers, or would you like to suggest someone who is not on the call, and volunteer them? Maureen says she will work with someone on it. Does anyone else have an interest in gTLD contracts? Bastiaan is typing, is he volunteering? He will give it a shot. We have two people. I will let Maureen and Bastiaan decide over who is officially the penholder, and Ariel if you can check with them and record that for us on the policy page.

ARIEL LIANG: Will do, thank you. That's all for public comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. That's a long one. Alright, next item is, if there are any reports. Now normally reports are filed on the Wikis. I'd like to presume people are actually reading them, but this is an opportunity for anyone of the groups...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, you are interested, I missed something?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry. You did, yes. The review of current ALS applications.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah. Then I will put anyone's reports on hold for a moment, and we'll go back to Item number 5, review of current ALS applications. Thank you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks very much, Alan and Heidi, I'll be brief. We have the same number of certified ALSs from last week, 222, and 100 countries, but we do have an update on applications currently being voted on. That is ALS number 263, the internet development initiative, and if accepted, it would be a member of APRALO. The vote is to close next Monday, the 1st of May. We're also waiting for formal regional advice on [inaudible] and the Armenian Internet Traffic Exchange Foundation in APRALO.

And we have a couple more applications that we're processing due diligence for. And that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. And does anyone – normally it is just liaisons who tend to want to speak, although anyone is able to at this point, are there anything that needs to be reported that needs our focus other than what is in the written reports? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, I will assume we have nothing, and we are way ahead of schedule. I'm sure someone will figure out a way to stop that. Next item on the agenda, oh good, next one is me. ALAC credibility.

It's clear from the At-Large review, even if we didn't know it before, but we did, that there are a good number of people who believe we are not doing a particularly good job, that is, we submit statements, but they're not backed up by anything, and in fact, we have said similar things, that we are not getting enough contributions. Now, part of the problem in my mind is that the expectations that people have are varied, and many of them are quite unreasonable. We certainly on a regular basis hear that we are expected to discuss and get input from people in the thousands. We are expected to create statements which are driven from the bottom up, with people in ALSs and individual members creating the first comments and then we just pull them together. And I think that's not particularly reasonable.

So the question is, what is reasonable? And can we put together a set of expectations that we think unlikely we can address and meet? And we'll essentially work to not justify why we're here, but to validate that

we are doing a reasonable job of doing things. So I put together some thoughts and I'm not quite sure where this is going, but I think it's a discussion that we need to have. I have had it initial with the ALT and they shot me down a few times, and perhaps this has more, makes more sense.

One of the things that struck me was that although we are very, very different groups, the SSAC is potentially in a similar position to what we are in, in that the effect of not generate reports based on every security expert in the world, they don't even use every security expert within their group, because they have work teams that go off and do a specific task. And their challenge is to make sure that they have enough people with enough different kinds of security experience, so that they can stand behind their work, so they feel they've covered all aspects, and by making sure they have a really diverse group of people contributing, they feel they're covering themselves. In general we believe they are.

And Olivier says, the SSAC mission is very different. Can someone please find out where that sound is coming from? Olivier, I wasn't claiming that our mission is the same, I was simply saying that we have a similar issue in that there is a very large community of security experts in the world, and they try to put together valid statements based on a small subset of those, and that's the similarity that is emphasized there. But the analogy with the SSAC is not a major part of this, so I don't really want to focus on that a lot of. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan, Tijani speaking. If I understood well, you are proposing that we reduce our grassroots more or less, to make our statement from a small group, not small, but smaller group than we have now, so that we are not speaking on behalf of the whole end users, but on behalf of a certain group and users who can contribute to the work, isn't it? I really don't understand well your point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, no, that's not what I'm suggesting. What I'm suggesting is the expectations of some people that we have thousands of people contributing to every statement, and that we should expect and get input from dozens or hundreds of ALSs as we create each statement, I think is an unrealistic expectation, and yet, that is the expectation that many people have. And what I'm trying to see if we can put together is something that is more realistic than that. Does that make any sense? Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. Alan, perhaps that is not that unreasonable, and we may be able to do that. I believe that we have people, we have the working groups have shown that we have trained people, but perhaps what we are lacking is to have a bottom down consultation. Because in the grassroots we have end users who do not participate at all, and they do not have the knowledge, the necessary knowledge, but they may have some opinions.

So I created a report with the activities that are not many activities, but we have some activities from our 52 ALSs and I've got a report of 14

ALSs with their activities, and I know that there are many ALSs reaching hundreds of end users so perhaps what we may do is to get to these ALSs and provide indications for them to provide that to the end users, or perhaps we may be able to spread the necessary information and have the necessary feedback from them. Because I know that they are reaching thousands of end users, and they are just receiving information, but they are not providing feedback to us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I would like to put a hold on the queue right now, and finish what I was going to say, and then we will open it up. This is not an exercise today to figure out how to fix the problem of getting people involved. We have a process that we're working on already, where we believe that by feeding information out to people that is usable to them, we will get more people who are knowledgeable on the issues, and will probably get more people who are contributing. This is not a discussion on how to do that. The question is how do we set expectations among the entire community and the Board to tell them what we will describe as success.

So I'd prefer not to be talking about the actual process of how to get people involved. That's a good discussion, we are making good progress on that, but I don't think that's today's discussion. So, what I think we're trying to do, and we know we're never going to get a huge number of people involved in working groups and PDPs. The time commitment and the level of knowledge is just too high. So we certainly need more than we have today, but we're never going to get dozens and dozens of people that are likely to be doing that.

But we do need a reasonable number of people, probably dozens, and I'm not saying how many, who are in a position to comment and feed input into our process as we're developing positions and to work on our working groups that meet periodically to discuss the issues. So I think we're really looking at three types of people. Those who are very, very active, those are knowledge and can understand what we're talking about, and participate in our working groups, and participate and provide input into our statements, and then the larger group of people who we are going to do our best to try to educate and get some of them to move up in the tiers into the second and perhaps even the first level.

And that's the message that I think we need to put out, to set the expectations of just how we believe we are representing the interest of all end users, even though the vast majority of the many billions are not actually working with you. Now I'll open the floor. Harold?

HAROLD ARCOS:

This is Harold Arcos for the record. Thank you very much, Alan. Well, I do believe that in order to create expectations, should be done through practice. With the At-Large Review report, we had the experience of involving many people who had no knowledge about the report, but due to the great impact that this had on end users and on our ecosystem, well, they read the report and we were able to create a bottom up level and this was very interesting for us, and it was also a very demanding process.

So I believe that this is the kind of experience that we need to show that practice is the way to create our expectations. We need to understand,

as you said before, that we have different layers of different types of people with different levels of knowledge, but I believe that we need to practice, to exercise this model. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan, Tijani speaking. So changing the expectation of the ICANN community, including the board, about our statements and our advice, by saying that all our statements and advice are not the fruit of input from the 222 active ALSs we have today, but it the fruit of input from only those 20 or 50 persons in the At-Large community, is this your point of view?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, my point of view is we want to get to a point where we have a much larger number of those people active. I don't think the number is probably much larger than that today. You heard how much trouble we have getting people to comment on any of our statements, but I think what we want is a number that is probably greater than 100 and less than 300. I don't know the right number. It's a good question, what the right number is, how much can we manage and handle, and how much is enough to give us credibility.

And that's the question I'm asking. I'm not trying to tell you what the answers are, I'm trying to initiate the discussion, and I'd like thoughts from other people, if what I'm proposing is not a reasonable thing, what

is reasonable? Anyone any further thoughts? Or we'll put this one to bed and go to the next agenda time. Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah, this is Yrjo Lansiuero speaking. I think I would like to support Alan's idea of doing it, you know, virtually one ALS at a time, or basically to expand the group that is actively participating, but it's, we should not think of this in terms of either thousands of people or almost none, let's start, small, and let's try to expand, and what is important is that the process is going on and we are expanding this, and here, actually, this has a lot to do with the question, how. And has Alan said, processes are underway to create a mechanism, how we can entice AOs, ACs and individual members to be more active. So I think this is a realistic approach. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Yrjo. We'll go to Alberto. And as I said, what I'm looking for is not to get everyone to say yes, you're right, but to come up with something that we can eventually craft and sell to the community that is something that we believe is achievable in a reasonable amount of time, and then we can then have metrics to gauge how far along are we and how successful are we. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Alberto Soto speaking. I think that perhaps I was not clear in my words. But what I wanted to say is that we have ALSs that are really very, very active, but we are unaware of that. I myself, I'm unaware of the work

that they are doing. One of the benefits from this review is that at least in LACRALO we learned about hyperactivity in several ALSs and we were not aware of that. They are not active within the RALO, but they are active at ALSs and to the end users. They are doing the job with the contents they have, but we need to expand the contents a bit so as to have active ALSs within our RALOs. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have very active ALSs, many of them. The question is how are they active within the ICANN context? Anyone else want to speak on this, or we'll go on to the next item. No, alright, At-Large review. Holly is not on the line, Cheryl, do you want to take it? Or do you want me to do a very brief review of where we are and what the next steps are?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alright, yeah, I'll take it. Most of you know, I trust many of you have read, I have received what is known as the draft for discussion with the review working party document from the ICANN team. Those of who you have looked at the red line of that will see only a couple of changes, and not many of these seem to have any relevance to comments

recently put in, and we've certainly noted some very interesting discussions about analysis, how interpretation by ICANN of what the public comments mean may even vary from the Staff's interpretations, or Staff reporting what the public comments mean.

But that said, where we are up to is still not at a point of this going to the ICANN Board. We have a small window of time now where ICANN will interact with the working party using this document that was recently published as a base and upon that, our discussion should be related to it being picked up and ratified, we hope. And then it goes off to the ICANN Board, in combination with our own ALAC and working party implementation recommendations.

So we're nowhere near the end game yet, is what I'm trying to say. We're at an important stage, absolutely, reading this very carefully and respond thoughtfully and accurately and respectfully, yes indeed. Is it the end game, though? Not yet. There's still much work to do. And of course, within, we want to the organizational effectiveness committee, they will be looking at if there is variation between what ALAC and the working party is saying, is implementable, versus what the review team's final report may say, and it will be very much up to the organizational effectiveness committee to come back to implementation planning or otherwise to ALAC. So that's probably a longer report than you wanted, Alan, but is the current status. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, that was exactly what I was looking for. There are a number of other items attached to the agenda in addition to the items report. I

attached the response that the GNSOs sent to the organizational effectiveness committee, they sent that almost exactly a year ago on the 27th of April. They have just recently received a letter back from MSSSI, from Theresa Swinehart, telling them the response.

Now of course, their response, the GNSO response went to the – I don't know what's being displayed now, but it is not the right thing – just hold on, leave the pod empty for the moment. The GNSO sent their response to the organizational effectiveness committee a year ago, I'm not quite sure why it has taken this long, but the organizational effectiveness committee reviewed the report, along with the recommendations from the GNSO and they then sent that to the Board and the Board supported what the organizational effectiveness committee said, and it's now a done deal and it's up to the GNSO to do the implementation.

Now, the GNSO rated the recommendations on four different categories. And if we could put up the document that is listed as summary, attached to the agenda, it's a very short table. If we could put it into the center pod, display it. Okay, thank you.

The GNSO rated the recommendations in four different ways. One, they agree with the recommendation, they colored those green. They colored some orange, which said they are agreeing and work is underway. Yellow is we agree in part, or the intent, but we don't believe what was recommended was correct. And some we do not agree with at all and do not recommend being implemented at all. You can see the breakdown. There were 36 recommendations, and you can see the number in each category. The important message, I think, so

people aren't feeling put down, is the results from the Board were we accept what the GNSO is saying, period. So there were not ifs, buts, and ands.

The GNSO put a lot of effort into evaluating the recommendations both in to what extent were they good recommendations, and what the cost would be of implementing them, and made their recommendation and the Board has taken that recommendation to heart and is implementing it as suggested by the GNSO. I would like to think that if we do a similarly competent job, we will have a similar result. So I don't really think we need to worry a lot about the specifics of the recommendations, but we do have work to do, to make sure that we can justify what it is we're going to eventually say to the Board, and I think the statements that we have already created to the last version of the report, go a long way to creating the contents to justify what we're saying. So, before we break that off, any further comments? I see a tick mark from Cheryl. Nothing? Then we'll go on to the next item, which actually is something driven by the At-Large review.

The next item is the ALAC Chair and ALT responsibilities. One of the changes in the review from this version from the previous one is they are now having a formal recommendation that the ALT be abolished. And their rationale is the ALT is making substantive decisions on behalf of the ALAC and they believe these decisions should be made by the ALAC itself. I see Renalia is on the call. Renalia, do you want to make any comments on the previous item before we go ahead?

RENALIA: Hi, can you hear me, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

RENALIA: Great, so my comment on the At-Large review evaluation process by the OEC and the Board is that the GNSO template is a very good one. There was an occasion when the review working party had a position on one of the recommendations and the GNSO disagreed with it, but then the review working party reevaluated it's position and agreed with the GNSO position, and then it went to the Board and it was cleared, and there was consensus. So that's not a problem, and it was easy to just adopt their recommendations as it is. I just wanted to say that the highest weight in the EOC and Board evaluation is to review working parties' assessments. So that is the most important one. And I just wanted to convey that message. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, given that you're on the call, may I ask you one question? Is there any simple answer you can give to why it's taken a year, and should we expect similar timing on ours?

RENALIA: Um, actually the correspondence from the GNSO and the review working party in particular was that it was sent to me at the OEC and I communicated with them directly by email, and at the moment, the

ICANN organization is trying to tidy up its process where anything that is sent up gets a formal response, and they're just tidying up all these gaps.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, so when did in fact the results from the Board go, when were things finalized on your side?

RENALIA:

It came almost immediately after the OEC had its meeting to decide on the matter, and in terms of process, I went back immediately to the review working party and the GNSO Chair to say that okay, this is our process, and we're going to go to the Board, and we expect it is going to be done at this particular time. And once the Board had made its decision, then it was communicated to them. So that happened, there was no period of black box, it's just not been formal correspondence, it was all done through email.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. If I had actually read the document I posted, I wouldn't have had to ask that question, because the letter from Theresa actually says the OEC made its decision within about three weeks, and the Board made its decision about six weeks later. So, thank you, I'm sorry I didn't read the document before asking the question.

RENALIA: No, no problem, we actually changed the process in my committee to be able to respond to work as a community level faster. And that actually helps speed things up. So anyway, please proceed with your meeting. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Okay. Back on the Chair's responsibility and ALT responsibility, I found that recommendation quite intriguing, because as far as I understand, the only decisions the ALT ever makes, I mean, occasionally the ALT will recommend something to the ALAC and ask the ALAC what to do, but occasionally the ALT, because the ALT meets between ALAC meeting, the ALT on occasion will look at a public comment and say there's probably no need to do anything on it, and we don't actually ask the ALAC. We do tell the ALAC at the next ALAC meeting, and I don't think anyone has ever said no, but that is as far as I know the only decision, actually, that the ALT ever makes.

So I'm quite intrigued by the substantive decisions that the reviewers believed ALT makes. The reason I add it to the agenda today is there are little things like the decisions on public comments and stuff that are made on a routine basis, and one of the questions I have is to what extent should we be documenting that these are decisions that should be made? And if we could bring up – there's a document attached to the agenda that is the ALAC rules of procedure, and if we could pull that up and go to Item 5.11... and if you can scroll to Section 5.11.

Alright, apparently we're all supposed to scroll ourselves, if everyone can scroll to 5.11. Alright, the issue is 5.11 reads, "The ALAC Chair may

make substantive decisions on behalf of the ALAC if the matter is of such urgency that the ALAC cannot practically be consulted to the extent possible this must be done in consultation with the ALT. Any such decision must be reported to the ALAC without undue delay, and be ratified by the ALAC as soon as practical." We have done that over the years, once or twice.

But the question I'm asking this group now is it says the ALAC Chair may make substantive decisions, what that implies to me is the ALAC Chair is given permission to make nonsubstantive decisions on a more regular basis. You know, things perhaps like should there be a public comment or not, is the comment ready to go, and there is a host of things that come and go along with way. And the question is do we need a rule that makes that clear, or is that simply implied, because there is a comment about the process or substantive decisions, but there is no process that needs to be associated with less substantive decisions. And that's the question I'm asking. Tijani, you had your hand up for a long time, so I'm not sure if this was the issue, but I did want to ask the question before turning the queue over to anyone who wants to speak. So, Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. It is about two things. First you asked, I don't know from where they see that ALT is making substantive decisions. I think this is something that we have to ask them during the call we have with them. I don't see any utility of this call other than asking the questions. They are sticking to their mind and they are giving

the same recommendations as the final report. So the only thing that is useful is to ask them about these kinds of things.

Second, even in the rule of procedure, we say that ALT, the Chair and the ALT may make some decisions, but they have to inform the ALAC and the decisions should be ratified by ALAC. So ALT is not making any decision.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, no, Tijani, to be clear, I wasn't claiming they were, I'm agreeing with you completely, and yes, I certainly intend to ask them the question of what makes them think that. The question I'm asking right now is the rules and procedures do talk about the process ratifying, or under what conditions a substantive decision can be made without consultation the ALT. And I'm asking do we need another provision in the rules which talk about the less substantive decisions, and give the Chair or the ALT The permission to do them, or is that just assumed, because they're not mentioned like this. And that's the question I'm asking.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, I think that for this we have to remove "substantive" from the text. Any decision that ALT will make, and then ratified by ALAC, they have to do that. So I don't know why we have to two categories of decisions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, I guess because there are decisions that get made on a very regular basis that are not particularly important, but someone has to

make a decision. And those are the things that tend to fall into that other category. Anyone else have any comments? No one else seems to think it's particularly important, so I won't worry about it. Leon, did you want to say something? I know you have a comment in the chat. Okay, Leon is basically agreeing that since least substantive things aren't mentioned, they are presumed, that they will be handled in reasonable ways, reasonable being defined.

Actually, there are words there that already say that somewhere, we need to find them. Okay, Cheryl has agreed with Leon, Leon has thanked Cheryl, I think we can go on to the next item now. And that is the CCWG on Internet Governance. You will recall that there was a challenge of should the CCWG exist, because it doesn't follow the normal CCWG patterns of give a report and then close itself down. This CCWG has a different life cycle than the norm and part of the response to that is the CCWG is in the process of being rechartered, as one of the chartering organizations, we are going to be asked whether we support the new charter or not and I will turn the floor over to Olivier to quickly walk us through the differences from before.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Can you all hear me well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, very well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. So, thanks for this introduction, Alan. It's indeed some work that the CCWG, so cross community working group on internal governance has been doing in the past few months. At the annual general meeting last year, the GNSO council made recommendations that there should be some changes made to the charter, that there should also be an annual report of activities of the cross community working group and to explore whether the current cross community working group structure was the best structure to continue the work, the useful work that is undertaken in this working group, or whether another type of structure would be better suited for the aims of the working group.

So the working group had a contactor help them out on the one side to draft longish, longish reports about the activities of the working group in the past years, and I'm saying years, because it was not only for last year, but also the previous year's activities, as well. That was drafted and sent to all of the chartering organizations. Just to remind you, there are three chartering organizations for this cross community working group, so including the ALAC, the country code name supporting organization is a cochartering organization, and the generic name supporting organization is one, as well.

So the second piece of work that the working group did was to look at the charter of its charter that it then had, and look at where the discrepancies between that and the new guidelines for cross community working groups, which actually came into effect after the cross community working group had been put together. You should have on your screen now a table which shows the differences between the two, so it's a comparison table that was drawn to look at both, and for some

reason it doesn't really show very well on this screen here, that's strange, maybe one has to reduce the size. Here we go, comparison chart of the cross community working group charter with the CCWG charter template. That was not the one I was looking for, but okay.

Well, we can certainly work on that. Two documents were sent to the supporting organizations and advisory committees, so it's to the co-chartering organizations. One was a comparison chart between the cross community working group charter and the charter template that was designed by the GNSO and its guidelines on cross community working groups.

The second one is a comparison table of the cross community working group charter with the revised charter, showing the differences between the two, bearing in mind that the revised charter now followed the advice of the cross community working group chartering process, or template, should we call it? If I haven't lost you by now, let's start going through a handful of the changes. When you look at the whole thing, there weren't that many changes to be made. But because of completion reasons, in other words, sort of incomplete parts of the charter were completed with more things that were added.

So for example, the objective, and the scope of activities was replaced with a problem statement, goal and objectives, and scope problem statement. So that was expanded more than what was there before, and it actually provided more focused goals on what that working group would be doing. The scope of activities itself was reordered, and so one, so it was all expanded in a certain way. The deliverables and timeframes, which to start with were not present, were then provided

in further details in the guise of position papers, statements, workshops and reports of workshops, annual reports and progress papers.

The work plan didn't change too much, it was just rewritten slightly, to just say the working group should establish and adopt an annual work plan and associated schedules, while the previous one said pretty much the same thing. The report on progress is something which the working group has focused a bit more, because it was quite clear that the lack of regular reporting to its chartering organizations made it sound like the working group was doing nothing, whilst in fact it was very, very active, indeed. The position papers and statements was expanded in a different paragraph.

The process for the development of a position paper was fleshed out in further detail, especially in looking at the different types of position papers or consultations or work that could be produced, such as the review of a cross community working group public consultation, the drafting of a position paper, or a statement, or any kind of supplemental output that could be done, such as responding to an outside request outside of ICANN, et cetera.

And then there was a discussion, of course, or some details on what the submission of a board report would be like. Finally, the membership staffing and organization was expanded, as well, because prior to this, the history of the working group was a bit different than the usual planned way to put together a cross community working group and so we ended up with a group of people that was heavily influenced mostly by the noncommercial part of the generic name supporting organization.

And so the whole appointment of each chartering organization will have to be looked at in a sort of clearer way, but the working group itself follows the line of having participants, members and observers all with pretty much the same ability to participate very much in the same way as the cross community working group on ICANN accountability has pursued.

I think that's pretty much it for the changes. The rest of it is just an expansion of what was there before, or maybe clarification, or what full consensus is, what consensus is, and sort of amendments for rules of engagement regarding decision making methodologies, and the modifications of the charter.

So what we're looking for effectively is to get each one of the cochartering organizations to respond, provide some feedback to this at present, provide also some feedback to our annual report to see is there is anything that we should do better, and then beyond that, an indication as to whether the chartering organization would be ready to, it's not really re-charter, but to effectively agree to the amendments of the charter, so that we can proceed forward with operating under the new charter. That's it, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Questions? No one is going to ask anything? Is that because no one understood it, or he did it perfectly and we all understand it? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. My line is better. It's a bit crackling. I want to know, and forgive me if I'm not particularly articulate, I'm in another call, as well, so there's other language going on in my other ear. What is the down side in changing the type of entity that this important work is held in and done in? In other words, what I'm hearing out of GNSO council still includes why does it need to be a formal cross community working group, recognizing that those beast themselves, cross community working groups, have changed significantly over the couple of years that this has actually been operating, as well.

I just wanted to ask if Olivier could help me understand, so I may be able to input into GNSO as necessary, what the downside would be for being in perhaps a community committee or some such, still doing the same work, still with the same importance, but not with the specific value laden aspects that CCWGs are having now and developing. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, before Olivier answers, I was going to suggest, and I have suggested actually several times, but it's been patently ignored, that we simply say it's not a CCWG, it's a cross community working party or a cross community task force, or a cross community blah-de-blah, and by not using the magic words CCWG, it no longer falls under the auspices of things we have rules for, and no one can say it doesn't follow the rules. But for some reason, people seem determined to try to fit it into the CCWG model. I'm not quite sure why, but that seems to be where we're going. Olivier, any thoughts on either Cheryl's comment or mine?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Alan and Cheryl. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So we have been discussing this and I think that one of the concerns which actually is in line with my concerns, is the lack of formal status for any other type of structure, such as a cross community working party or a cross community committee. What I mean by the lack of a formal structure is that if this working group was asked to provide advice to the Board to its chartering organizations, or to draft a statement and ask for this to be supported by its co-chartering organizations, there would not be any formal channel established for something like this.

The working group itself is working closely with the Board working group on internet governance, which was created recently. It is working closely with ICANN Staff, who are interacting with areas outside ICANN, and it is providing advice to ICANN staff, and I gather that in time, when the Board working group on internet governance will be fully in operation, it might be able to provide advice to the Board working group on internet governance, although such a thing has not happened yet, due to the nature of the Board working group on internet governance being pretty much in its infancy at the moment.

But when it comes down to providing formal advice and having a clear process of decision making process in ICANN, a cross community working group channel has been, a vehicle, has been defined. Other vehicles have not been defined yet. Now it might well be that another vehicle is more suited for this, but the concerns are that if another vehicle is to be used, the ability for this working group to take action, to

provide formal advice, and to request formal responses from supporting organizations and advisory committees that make up its chartering component, it is something that is currently missing in the other vehicles. Does that help?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I just hate to see us spending huge amounts of time to satisfy a bureaucratic need when there are other ways that might be available to get around it. Any further questions for Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I could actually answer something?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure go ahead, I didn't think I asked a question, but go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm reading the chat and I'm noticing the question on coming against the core activities of ICANN's point of view. And this again, that's a question that Cheryl is asking, and of course I'm well aware of this question because I was GNSO last year and saw exactly this question being asked. And this is where there really is an almost religious debate going on in ICANN, well in ICANN's GNSO, and I gather perhaps even in the ccNSO as well, as to what ICANN's core activities should be, and whether ICANN should be involved in any way in internet governance.

There are those on the one side that believe that ICANN should not get involved with anything to do with internet governance, it should just restrict its mandate and its work to names, numbers, and to its core mandate, without getting involved with this worthless stuff, like IGF and government engagement in Geneva, ICU, and all of these other things. There are others who completely oppose this and who believe that there is an absolute need to be involved in this, simply because that is ICANN's immediate environment and the environment that ICANN involves in has great ability to influence or even affect ICANN and ICANN's very mission and very legitimacy.

So that's the debate that's going on, obvious if the first party wins the discussion and so on, then of course that cross community working group on internet governance is absolutely obsolete and should be abolished. If the second party wins the debate, then that cross community working group is absolutely key to the community being able to influence ICANN's own work, and when I mean ICANN's own work, that's the work of the Board and the work of ICANN Staff in these outside forums.

My personal preference, being one of the co-chairs of this working group is, I think, quite clear, is that I think that if ICANN does not get involved with any of these forums like the internet governance forum, like the work going on at ITU, the CSTD, et cetera, the danger today in ICANN's environment is so great, that ICANN might be history a few years from now. And by being involved, by the way, I mean not only as staff, board, but also community needing to be involved in those external processes to influence those who have the ability to strike

ICANN off from the face of the earth and influence them in a way that would be beneficial to ICANN. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier, you actually covered what I was going to say in your last few words. We are living in a world where not everyone thinks we're the greatest thing on earth, and I don't think we can ignore that, and when I say we, I do not believe we the community should leave that exclusively up to the board and staff. If there is a need for ICANN to be involved in these forums because there are threats coming from them, or because it is important that they understand what we do, then that 'we' has to be not only the board and staff, it must be the community, and that's why I think this kind of work is absolutely essential. Thank you. Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVETI:

Yeah, I'd like to chip in what you guys are talking about. I saw this discussion, this debate on how much ICANN should get involved in activities, and I saw it in our RALO request for our school of internet governance in Puerto Rico before the San Juan meeting. So we were asking for money, for the budget, for this North American school of internet governance, we were asking ICANN for money, and one of the responses from ICANN was well, we have to make sure that the core activities are in there and so we felt some push back on why are we getting on the school of internet governance, well, in the end, it seems the request was approved, the budget request was approved, so I guess the debate was one, at least on the side of keeping ICANN engaged in

this type of important true cross community, true ecosystemic conversation on internet governance. So, you know, I perceive that debate, but I think when you keep on pushing, you're going to win, because ICANN really can't divorce itself from internet governance. So that's it, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Cheryl in the chat said she doesn't think that the form that this activity takes is all that important, and I think I strongly agreed with that. I haven't heard any negative comments to that effect. So we may de facto be in the process of making that decision, that we're willing to recharter the CCWG but if it takes some other form and that lessens the administrative workload, I would strongly support that. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just in closing of the argument that could be presented to those opposing ICANN deviating, or supposedly deviating from its core mission, one significant point that is often overlooked by people with the argument of reducing ICANN's funding for non-core activities, is one which is engrained in the bylaws of ICANN, which is that the corporation is a not for profit public benefit corporation. It is not organized for the private gain of any person.

It is organized under the California nonprofit public benefit corporation law for charitable and public purposes, and it has to satisfy a set of requirements to be under the internal revenue code, that is the US internal revenue code, a 501-C3 organization, and that chapter, that

part of the revenue code mentions that a significant part of ICANN's revenue needs to be used for activities that are not core activities of ICANN, and that's one of the reasons why ICANN keeps on funding IGF and funding through its global stakeholder holder engagement, through its core budget, funds all sorts of activities that are outside of ICANN. If it doesn't do that, it loses its 501-C status, and therefore ends up having to pay tax, which would actually be a larger amount of money to be paid off, considering the profits that it has made, than if it uses this money for these purposes. That's it, thanks. I think that somehow closes the debate regarding the use of money. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier, I've never heard that argument before, actually. Can forward to the list the actual reference if you know where it is?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, its Olivier speaking. I shall forward you the relevant bylaw and I shall forward you the actual, I'll try and forward something. I've not read it anywhere, this is something, some analysis that I have performed and when I have discussed this with some board members...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, it's the reference to 501-C3 rules that I'm not familiar with.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, no worries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anything further on this issue? We still have a hand up from Javier, but I think its an old one, and Olivier is an old one. So I will assume they will come down, eventually. And we'll go on to the next time. That is the At-Large at ICANN59. It is still a while away, but not all that long, just about two months from now. Is Gisella with us?

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes, Gisella is here, for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good, good morning, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning to everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was only about four hours ago I said good night to Gisella. So we thank you for being with us.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, if I may, I've put the ICANN59 block schedule up and this is not the final version that is due to come through hopefully within the next 24 hours. Sorry, I'm just checking that everyone is able to scroll through the document and also make it bigger if need be. The only change that may happen with the revised document is on Wednesday the 28th of

June. The second cross community session which is in session, as you can see, all the cross community sessions on this schedule are in yellow, and the GAC requested that the second one, who sets ICANN's priorities, is switched with another one.

Now, we don't know which the switch will be, but as it stands now, we already have an overview of the cross community sessions for ICANN59. So, if I may, Alan, one of the main things will be to decide which sessions are able to be conflicting for the ALAC and which are not, and then from there, the ICANN59 planning committee, which is a small group of us, will be working on the At-Large draft schedule over the next week and post it for everyone to see, as we will need to finalize it over the next 10 days to two weeks. Alan, any comments?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a few from me. As you see, if you look at this diagram, there are a lot of cross community groups, I think 11 sessions, if we count the double ones, if I remember the number correctly. It is unknown at this point which of them are going to be classed as ones we are not allowed to bill anything against. I made an impassioned plea that is something is truly cross community and they're announced soon, no one will want to schedule against them, but I don't believe that there should be something with which we are told we are not allowed to, in case we really, any one group has no interest. And that was not very effective, apparently.

So we will have sessions we're told we cannot schedule against. In fact, most of the cross community ones are of some interest to us. The total

number of sessions that are being scheduled both as cross community and things like GNSO PDPs, is very large. There is a session being requested that isn't in this list, but I was told it was going to be requested, of gTLDs, where there would be I think a half a day working on the PDP and a half a day on cross community work. It may be the RDS one that I'm thinking of.

So we're looking at a four day meeting where significant parts of that, perhaps as much as half of it, is being blocked out, where we will not have a lot of freedom on how we're scheduling those meetings. So I'm afraid it's going to be yet another meeting where the schedule is not going to be a lot of fun. That's about all I have to say. We are about to start looking at detailed schedules. If people have strong feelings about what they want to see us doing, what kind of sessions they want, or what kind of sessions they don't want [MUSIC INTERRUPTION], or what kind of music they would like.

And please speak up, the group doing scheduling, in add to staff, is myself, Leon, and Boran has asked to has asked to join that group and she will be joining it, let us know, either directly with one of us, or through staff, what sessions you want, what sessions you don't want, what sessions you think are a waste of time, and we will do our best to try to act on all of them. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. First of all, the cross community sessions are 8 and not 11. Second, I noticed that some of them are programmed after 9:00 in the morning, which is different from

Helsinki. I think that will be a problem for us, because our work mainly starts at 9:00 in the morning, so I don't know how to do it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Tijani. I didn't say there were 11 sessions, I said there were 11 slots that were covered. Because some of these cross community groups span multiple slots. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and as you will have noticed from what's on the screen, it looks like a very busy schedule, indeed. I think during our recent discussion on the RALO, I can't remember where the discussion took place, I suggested that we might wish to make a proposal that the RALOs do not have a face to face meeting in an ICANN, except the RALO whose region the ICANN meeting is visiting. So that would allow for a few more slots.

And there are several reasons or several advantages of not needing for a RALO to meet at an ICANN meeting and to just pursue its normal conference calls, one of them being that often the RALO is in a completely different time zone and ends up having to have its meeting at 7:00 in the morning or very late in the evening, and sometimes the slot not being very good for the region, and ending up with fewer people than if it was just conducting its normal rotation of calls. So that's a proposal I'll be sending over to the RALO list imminently.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Last time I saw this presented, there was a fair amount of pushback, so I look forward to seeing what the results are. Anyone else like to get in? Certainly for those of us who are involved in GNSO PEPs or any activities in other parts of ICANN, it's going to be a real difficult meeting, I certainly know that part. Okay, last call for comments. Please, if you're going to complain after the meeting that it wasn't done right, you really owe it to everyone to have a say early on and get your input in. Okay, then we will go on to the next item.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Alan, it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking again, and I've got my hand up just for one question, and I know there has been a discussion on this, and I wondered whether there was any thought on the ALAC on that, that the cross community sessions would be unconflicted and that everyone would have to go to these sessions, has there been any, I mean, in your view, and I know you've pushed back against this, but there has been some support of these cross community sessions to be unconflicted, I just wondered whether it might worth finding out what the view in this community was about it, probably as that should be, but who knows.

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is the current status is some of them will be required to be unconflicted, others will not. I don't know which are which, but yes, I would, we have time today, if anyone has any thoughts, speak up. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. I told David Olive the team who is doing the scheduling of the meeting, that those sessions cannot be in conflict with all the other meetings, because some of them are not of interest of some kind of community of ICANN. For example, if a session is not interesting for At-Large, At-Large can program a meeting in parallel with it. So, David Olive didn't say no, he noted that. So I think that in the upcoming meeting we'll have more clarity on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The last I heard is about half of them will be unconflicted. The people who said it is important to have them unconflicted seem to be listened to more than the rest of us. And if there was some exasperation and frustration in my voice, then you read it properly. Any further comments? No further comments on this item.

Next item if Fiscal Year 18 Budget Requests. Heidi will go over the requests. We did pretty well this year, again, and Heidi will quickly review them, and then we'll spend a bit of time talking about the comment that we plan to submit on the fiscal year budget, the operation plan and budget. Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you have a document with this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I put that into the chat, it's actually up already a little bit. If you scroll up, let me just put it in there again.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's still on my screen.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, Evin are you able to put that up? I know it's just on the workspace right now. So while she is going that, just a little bit of an introduction. As Alan said, I think we did very well, actually 19 out of 24 of the At-Large requests were approved, 11 brought into core, and 8 more funded through the fiscal year 18 additional budget requests, so really, well done everyone on that. I don't know if I'm going to run through all of them, I'll just highlight a few. For the ALAC, they did very well. ALAC leadership team...

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, let's wait for the document, before we start talking about specifics. I will say that not only did we do pretty well, but the ones that

weren't funded, we were expecting not to be funded. And most of the answers were what we expected, even though in some cases the answer was no. Some requests were put in that we thought were somewhat unrealistic, but they were forwarded by the regions and we put them through, and in a few other cases, we knew they were going to be rejected, but we have alternative work that is going on to try to cover that. If you can unlock the document, please, so make it large enough to actually see.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So, Alan, just on that point again, this is Heidi, even those that were not approved officially, a few of them actually have text in the approval text that basically gives a window, even though the door is still locked or shut, for the time being, there is a window of a possibility. The text will actually advise, the person or the requestor, to work with either GSC staff or communication staff, et cetera, and then submit again possibly next year, or even this year, possibly implementing a part of the original request that was not approved. So just a comment there for those that were not officially approved.

But those that have been, in terms of for the ALAC, the ALT strategy session, that's the session that takes place the final day, actually it's the day after the final day of the ICANN meeting, that was approved. The captioning project, that one actually went into core, so it went through two years of a pilot effort and now brought into core, so really well done, and there will likely be further expansion as well on that. The GSC funding for RALO activities, that's that \$10,000 that was given to the GSC staff for the RALOs to be able to request materials or space,

catering, et cetera, for regional events. That one actually continues into core, and of note is that I'm going to be the staff lead working with Sylvia on that, likely to use the same template that we used this past or this current fiscal year.

IGF funding, we heard a little bit about that earlier, so again, both the ALAC request, as well as the three RALOs, that would be AFRALO, APRALO, and EURALO who submitted requests for the 2017 IGF, they were approved, not fully, not in the number of travel slots that they had initial requested, but still a significant number. And again, as we mentioned on the call earlier today, the key point right now for those people is to make sure that they develop the workshop proposal for the IGF and submit it next week on the 3rd to the MAG for consideration.

That is a key requirement for the fiscal year request. Then there was a request for tracking ALAC's advice to the Board, that one was brought into core, and Laura Benford is going to working on leading that project with At-Large. Then APRALO, of course, the General Assembly, this is actually the last General Assembly in the five year cycle, so after the AFRALO at ICANN59, followed by the APRALO at ICANN60, then At-Large will go into a one year planning phase for the next summit, that will take place in March 2019. Then the public media initiative.

Now, that was the one that Evin submitted, even though it is a no, I put approving text in with the highlight of where whoever wishes to work with the appropriate staff and communications, then the next gen staff is to see if we can get that developed in some small way, and then submit again next year, and I have raised that point with Evin. And then there is also ALAC discretion to use allocated ICANN meeting travel

slots, and that is a yes, and Joseph is going to be leading that time. Alan, am I doing okay for time? Should I go through the RALO ones now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Pick the interesting ones, if you can. We're not very tight on time, but we will run out if we're not careful.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so I'm going to skip, again, as I mentioned, IGF, AFRALO, APRALO, and EURALO, AFRALO was also given funding for an African IGF, then I'm just going to skip a few of them. Some of them were given, GSC was going to be contributing some funds, so they are going ahead, and that includes even the India SIG proposal, the Armenian IGF, they're all getting a little bit of funding money from the GSC LACRALO has a couple of really interesting ones.

One is a request for creating LACRALO leaders, and that is basically where using ICANN Learn and basically training trainers to then teach the leadership skills to other potential leaders, that's been approved, and the people leading it are Rodrigo and Ergis. I think that is a very interesting one that may possibly be linked to another session, which is the challenges for the At-Large community in Latin America and the Caribbean. That's is a face to face meeting likely to take place prior to ICANN60, which might be a bit of a followup to the LACRALO assembly that was held in Los Angeles.

And then EURALO, they received approval to hold the first North American internet governance during the ICANN61 meeting in Puerto Rico, and they've actually already had several discussions with Christopher Mondini, the GSC Vice President for North America on that session. And then also Loris Taylor's request for the global indigenous persons mentorship program in support of the fellowship, that was approved, as well, I'm happy to say that.

So they're going to expand on the current, the one program that they held in Hyderabad with just North American indigenous people, and they're going to expand that to other global indigenous, so I've informed Loris of that, and they will move forward. I'm hoping that we'll move this forward into ICANN60. And that is it. And we're having a meeting of the ALAC finance and budget subcommittee later this week to do into the details and to talk a little bit, hopefully start looking at who is going to be the lead from the community side, so we can start moving these forward as soon as possible, and once fiscal year 18 begins the 1st of July. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have a queue. Tijani is first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. Tijani speaking. Heidi, perhaps you had better mention the requests that weren't accepted, this is perhaps more important to mention and to see if it is important for us to insist on them, or if they weren't a reasonable request, to take them off. You

said that AFRALO was given funding for regional IGF, it was accepted to be from the CROPP.

And you know that we have limited slots of the CROPP, and you know that we have a clinic meeting twice a year that is very, very important for AFRALO, and we are making a very good job there, and all our slots are there. So this is, when they say you go to the CROPP, that means that they say no, that's all. So I am really concerned about that. It was very good opportunity for us to be active in the regional IGS, because we have always participated, but by other means. And now stopped doing that because it is so expensive for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Tijani, just on the point that your point is more important to look at the ones that were not accepted, I don't really fully agree with that. I think that you've done great overall and I think now the point is to start looking at the implementation of those. In terms of the point that you've made, I think that's probably something that you may wish to ask Rob Holgarth, who is going to be on the call of the finance and budget subcommittee later this week. He also works on the CROPP as well, so he works on these additional budget requests, as well as the CROPP, so he's probably a good person to ask.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Maureen, go ahead. I put myself at the end of the list.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, thank you. Speaking to what Tijani said, I was actually served a note that for example, for APRALO, there are two applications that have been accepted, but they involve CROPP. Now we usually have CROPP slots, so do these come out of the five CROPP slots, and is that you want to lead us at in the next meeting, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, Maureen. So I believe the answer is yes, our hopes, encouraged to come out of the five CROPPs. And I do realize, also, that CROPP has not gone into core for me, so I don't know whether that means that there is also going to be an expansion of the CROPP, I don't know, that is probably a Rob question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I've got a comment on that when my turn comes. Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVETI: Javier Rua-Joveti. Hi, Heidi. Question, is there a second [inaudible] that to come out that expresses the amounts of money that were approved, and when does that come out?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, actually it is already out. It is posted on the finance Wiki for this. If you would like, I can add it, add the numbers to this implementation page. Again, the reason I did not add them is it's not the aim that all the funds, that we spend every last penny. As Rob will likely say, the aim is basically to complete the projects, to complete the requests, rather than spend every last cent. And it might be that if something costs a little bit more, then that is also something to take into consideration to complete the project. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of things that came up along way. Number one, if you look at one of the requests we didn't talk about because its not ours, the GAC made a request for a high level minister's meeting and the response was yes, approved. And you might want to think about putting this into multi-year funding. The unspoken part is like the ALAC has done with their GA's and summits. So not only did we get that accepted, but it's now becoming an example for ICANN should do things. I thought that was rather pleasing to see.

One of the things that I will be raising with Rob, is that there is a rule saying that you cannot in these AC/SO budget requests, ask for funding to ICANN meetings. And on occasion, when someone asks, they are told, submit in the public comment area, occasionally. Other occasions

they're told yes, certainly, you can have the funding, and there seems to be on consistency between which ones are funded and which ones are told no, we're not allowed to fund them through this process.

And I think we really need some clarity on that. I was rather surprised about the ease at which the schools of internet governance were funded, although they're not being funded by huge amounts, presumably, and they are being done through GSC, but given the worry about keeping ICANN within its mission, I was pleasantly surprised that most of those requests, or maybe all of those requests, did get funded.

And my last comment is, as Heidi noted, CROPP now only has one P in it. It's no longer a pilot program, it's an official program, which means it is eligible to request, to say please increase the number of trips we get, or increase the size of the trip of the trips, or whatever the appropriate request is. I think if we're going to do that, we are going to have to provide evidence that we are using the existing trips well, and that's not just compiling the trip reports, I think we're going to have to make the case for why we are using the funding well, and as Tijani and Maureen pointed out, there are other things that we could be going to.

We are doing good work within the regions, especially in cooperating with other parts of the internet governance world, and other parts of the ICANN world, for that matter, if you look at RARs. But I think we're going to have to make the case, and the better case we make, the harder it's going to be for them to refuse it, and I think that's something that we're going to have to start doing soon, in preparation for the next budget year, and not wait until the request has to be submitted to start compiling that kind of thing.

I think I've finished my list now. I don't see any additional hands in the queue. Tijani, you did have a hand up that you put down after mine. If there are no more issues on the budget requests, then we will go on to a brief discussion on the operational plan and budget that is currently out for public comment and the comments that we will be making on it. Tijani, do you want me to list the items that I suggested first? Or do you want to take it from scratch yourself?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have them, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then the floor is yours.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, thank you Alan. So , first of all, I would like to say that I spent a huge amount of time reading and analyzing the budget. It is the most hard part of my work. Now I just finished the slide. I will start drafting. So first I have a clarification. I think that we are here commenting on the document, and I don't think that we have to bring something which is not in the document, or which was in the document and has been removed. We cannot bring it in our comments.

Such as, for example, the funding for the liaison. It wasn't in the budget, it is not in the budget, so I don't think that it is a good thing to put it in our comments. We may do something separate for it, but the commenting on the report should be about what is in the report or what was in the report and had been removed.

So, having said that, I would like to tell you that I have a few things. I read the report, it was very good, I read the budget, it was good, I want to remind you that at the beginning we had several points on the budget and this last, we had very few. That means that Xavier and his team are listening and they are improving. And I can tell you that they are improving because I am in the finance group and things are improved, really.

So now I have some comments, I would like to share them with you so that you give me your opinion on that. The first point is the root zone agreement. You know that the root zone was a zero dollar contract when it was between VeriSign and ICANN and NTIA. Now that the transition has happened, this contract has now been signed between ICANN and VeriSign, and to my surprise, it was a paid contract. They explained me that it is because it is now different, before it was a government of the US and VeriSign is part of this government, so they don't ask money, but now it is different and we have to pay it.

Okay, no problem. Why I am raising this point? It is because this agreement, the price on this agreement has increased this year by 33.33%. If there is an increase of a third of the amount each year, I think there is a problem here. We have to understand what it is, is it inside the contract that we have to increase the amount every year by 33.33%, or is it accidental, or is it only this year? What is that? I find it not logic.

Another point that I will make, it is the separation between the allotments of the website of At-Large and the website of ICANN. Because when people see \$300,000, they will say, oh, At-Large is taking

a lot of money from ICANN, but it is not ours, we have a part, and perhaps a small part of it. So I will ask to separate it on the budget.

There are other small things, such as when you make the calculation you don't find the right figures, and I think it is a problem of rounding, when you calculate, so I will perhaps make the remark but it's not very important, and it is in several spaces. I have another very important thing, the document development by this program to be expanded. This is not the request of At-Large only, this is the requests of other constituencies of ICANN, and I think it is a very important point to ask for. And also, as you asked me to do, we will ask to expand it to include training on development of policy advice statement.

We will also acknowledge that capturing ALAC and RALO development session has now been moved to the core budget, and the same thing for the CROPP. I think that we have to support the CCWG accountability for the expansion of the budget in Workstream II. So those are the few points I have. As I told you, I have here the GAC liaison travel funding and the request for a few more additional travel support for active travelers, but as I told you, I think that it is not logical that we speak about things that are not in the budget, or that weren't in the budget and have been removed. Thank you, I have finished, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and we are out of time, but we will make this relatively quick. We do have another few minutes of translation, but I do know it's been a long meeting for many people. Two things, number one, in terms of using this opportunity to request new travel slots to

ICANN, we have been told explicitly that this is the right place to ask that. Now, if you wish, we can do it from the ALAC in a separate document, but it is the correct place to ask for additional travel slots, that has been made very, very clear, both in person, and if you read the responses to the travel, to the AC/SO budget request, they point out that the appropriate place, at least for some people, is to put it into the public comment. So that is very much the appropriate place for that.

The second thing is, and I'd like to put an action item for Heidi, I've personally asked the question of the \$300,000, or 400, whatever it is, that was identified as At-Large and ICANN hardware and software for the website. We asked the question when we met with the finance and budget people the other day, and the answer was the person was not prepared to answer it. She didn't have the answer at her fingertips, so Heidi, I would like, I'm told it's posted somewhere, but if you could find out exactly where it's posted, what it said, so we can know whether we need to follow up or if the question was properly answered or not, I would appreciate that.

That's all I have, and if there are any other issues, people can raise them. Tijani will be working on this draft statement, and please feel free to comment on it, and we need to get that out moderately quickly. We do have a little bit of time left, but not a lot. Siranush, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Perhaps tomorrow we will have it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Tijani, great work. Siranush? Siranush, we cannot hear you. Alright, we'll go on to any other business, and then go back to Siranush, if she gets back on, but we are down to about four minutes of translation time left, so we can't wait too long. Does anyone have any other business they would like to add on to the agenda?

EVIN: Hi, Alan, this is Evin, if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

EVIN: Thanks so much, I'll be brief. I just wanted to add an addition regarding ALSs and individuals. We are organizing a reboot of our ALS onboarding program and I just want to let everyone know we're currently updating a draft PowerPoint agenda for welcoming new ALS members and individuals to At-Large, and we're going to try and schedule the first one for AFRALO sometime in May, so more details will be coming.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent, good to hear, thank you. Any other business issues? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I would like to ask about the onboarding program. I know that it is finished at the next meeting. So is it

reconnected again, and under which rules, how will it be done? Because last time it was done in the shadow, in the dark, nobody knows about it, something hidden. We want it to be clear for the community in the future.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, Tijani, this is Heidi. These are two different programs. What Evin is mentioning is the At-Large onboarding, and that's basically a staff developed program where we hold a couple of calls with new At-Large structures and then we bring in the RALO leaders, we bring in Alan, et cetera. The other one that you're mentioning is one that is run by DPRD, which is an onboarding across the board program, and I have spoken with Ergis about that and he is aware of the need to bring the other program more out into more transparency.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you both. Surnish, I gather you will not be able to speak, if you want to type something quickly, because we really do have to bring the call to an end. "Just wanted to share with ALAC, we are running a new regional newcomers fellowship pilot program." I'm not quite sure what that means, but we'll look forward – ah, "We have selected 15 newcomers from Africa, which I presume are going to Johannesburg." Thank you very much. If this is documented somewhere in an announcement, if you could point us to it. With that, I want to thank everybody. Heidi is that an old hand or a new hand?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, it is an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, then I want to thank everyone for being here at awkward hours for some of us, and again, thank the interpreters for marvelous work and for the extra 10 minutes, and I bid you all good night, good morning, or whatever is appropriate in your part of the world. Bye bye.

RECORDING: This call is adjourned. Thank you very much for your participation. Please do not forget to disconnect your line from the AC room when you are leaving. Thank you very much and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]