GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Leadership Team monthly call on Monday, 16th of October at 19:00 UTC.
	On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, León Sanchez, Holly Raiche. As incoming ALT members, we have Seun Ojedeji who has just joined us. Apologies for that. Someone is just playing around with the Adobe Connect room. We also have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, and Maureen Hilyard on the call.
	No apologies noted today.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, Yeşim Nazlar, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Gisella Gruber.
	If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you very much, and over to you, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. I don't believe this is going to be a long meeting, although I'm usually wrong when I make that prediction but we'll see.
	The first substantive item on the agenda is the At-Large Policy Development Activities. I'll turn it over to Ariel to review what we have. Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Alan. We now have two public comments that are open. The first one is the Proposed Dates for ICANN Public Meetings. Oh, actually, I got that wrong. Sorry. I will correct that, but let's take a look at our second one. The second one is ICANN Reserve Fund – Public Comment on Rationale and Target Level. That will close 30th of November, and currently we don't have anybody volunteer to look at the public comment yet.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right, and what's in the agenda for the Public Meetings, which I thought closed already, is a little confusing. Can you clarify?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes, that's the one I said I was wrong. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, so it doesn't close on the 26th, Ricardo didn't volunteer, and we should ignore it all?

ARIEL LIANG:

Yes. That one has already been ratified. The correct one is the Draft PTI and IANA FY19 Operating Plans and Budgets. That will close on 26th of November, and Ricardo is interested in submitting a comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

On that one?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, let's have a quick discussion of the ALT. Do we believe this is something we want to be commenting on? Clearly, it is going to have a significant impact. The target level of the reserve that they're proposing is quite large, and we are very far from it. The implication is that certainly unless we get a significant chunk of auction money, that's going to have real implications on the ICANN budget, especially since revenue is down and things may be a little bit tighter than we had otherwise foreseen regardless. Do we think we're going to want to comment on it? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. It's funny. I have connection problems, and so the hand has gone up on your computer faster than it has on mine, although I did click it. Just a quick one here. I wonder, this whole thing about the reserve fund, is that to do with the PTI budget or is that to do with ICANN itself?

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN itself.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, then I don't know anything about it, so I'll have to spend some time reading it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else have any thoughts? I'm not sure what we want to say, if anything. But I certainly think it is within scope. But again with the intent of making comments that have impact, I think we're going to want to be a little bit careful what we say. But I certainly don't object to us at least soliciting input and seeing do we have something substantive to say. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't think that I would have anything to say. I have a question, and that is I would question why you need a very large reserve fund, what they have in mind and how they are balancing the need for reserves versus the need for continuing operations. I think that's a legitimate question to ask.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, certainly the size of the reserve. The norm for nonprofits tends to be somewhere in the order of a year, often somewhat more than a year. I think the report actually does go into that. The answer is relatively simple. We have certain operations, and PTI is among them, that we must continue funding, and if for one reason or another revenue goes down relatively quickly, we can't necessarily adjust the work we're doing to match that. That's essentially what it comes down to.

Then you add into it the potential for legal problems and things like that, which certainly is on ICANN's stage right now, and it's not unreasonable to have a reserve in the order of a year. That's very common for nonprofits, especially when you have relatively little control over what the revenue stream is.

Cheryl, go ahead. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Olivier, then Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Just a quick one here. You just mentioned the PTI budget, that being the operational part of ICANN needing this large budget. We do have to remember that as part of the work toward the IANA stewardship transition work, which I think you were in the room and Cheryl was in the room and she will no doubt be able to share her points on this, we did insist at the time for a large enough mattress if you want in case there was indeed less income and so on. So this is where the question goes. I'm just surprised that it has now turned into a big ICANN thing rather than having a mattress for the PTI budget specifically or PTI operations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think you're misremembering. ICANN has always – not always – has for many years had a reserve and the target was one year. That's over and above anything related specifically to the transition and IANA. So that is certainly not out of the ordinary.

We did during the transition talk about whether ICANN should actually be [seconding] money for a couple of years of IANA budget just in case ICANN goes belly up or is subject to bankruptcy due to lawsuits or something like that, that IANA could continue. That was felt to be difficult because of the size of the IANA budget and the fact that the ICANN reserve at that point, it would have been a very significant part of the ICANN budget.

So the two are linked, but the fact that there is an ICANN reserve and implicitly since there's no other reserve it includes preserving the budget of PTI, they are linked. But it's not purely a PTI issue.

Cheryl, go right ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, you both are in fact sort of remembering the same thing, and that's correct. We were very keen to ensure that there was some failover mechanism that we maintain the stability of the IANA. I'm not going to speak specifically to the whys and wherefores of this call for public comment.

What I wanted to say is whomever is going to draft a comment, and I think we should if we can draft one that is [inaudible] and has influence, but I did want to remind everybody that at the ending of 30th

November, whomever is going to be doing it or whoever is helping who is doing it needs to be in the room and actively involved in the not one but at least three budget workshops that will be running throughout ICANN60 because this is where a proper up-skilling for whoever is going to hold the pen on this will I think best happen.

I think that's very important because some of us, certainly Alan and Olivier and I and Tijani, have been entrenched in these sorts of things for a very long time. But the rest of the penholders need to make sure that they're speaking from the right foundation and with the right history. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. That's a really good point. And yes, although we have been entrenched in this for a very long time, these workshops always seem to be held at times that we can't get to the meetings. So that adds an extra level of complexity.

Can I ask for an action item from staff to put a comment on the wiki page for this policy discussion specifically identifying when and to the extent we now know where these budget workshops will be held during the Abu Dhabi meeting. And if there are any teleconferences, webinars also associated with the budget, can you please post that?

Olivier, new hand/old hand?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: An old hand, Alan. I can't put it down at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will ignore it. If you ever want to put it up again, you'll have to do it verbally.

May I also ask that in the future we augment this section of the agendas to include the predicted forthcoming comment periods? There is a section on the ICANN web that says "Upcoming Comments." It may not cover all of them and the dates may not end up being fully accurate but if we could include that in the future – and that includes for tomorrow's ALAC meeting. Sorry, tomorrow or next week? Tomorrow I think. That we have that going forward so we have an idea going forward what's coming up and can talk about those as well. If we could do going forward for the next month, which means we're covering between one ALAC meeting and the next at least to the extent that we can predict it, that would be useful. So I would like an action item for that. Ariel, please go ahead.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Alan. Just clarifying your request for the predicted upcoming public comment, you want the timeframe to be a month ahead?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct, one month.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that's just straight off of the ICANN website where they have forthcoming comments or upcoming comments, whatever it's called.

All right, any further issues on Item #3 on Policy Development issues? As usual, for the one we did submit on the proposed dates, it went right down to the wire. We really have to learn to get better at that than we're doing right now.

Next item is Updates from Liaisons. Does anyone have any input, anything they'd like to bring up? Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. On Sunday, we had an ALT meeting with GAC leadership. There was a long discussion on the quality of the information that is provided by ICANN to the communities. Of course, this is an old issue, but this time I think that both from the GAC and ALAC side there was interest in actually producing something and producing jointly something at Abu Dhabi or after, a statement where we would point out that the way of providing [information] for the basis of informed participation by the communities is just not on the [level].

I tried to summarize that quite long discussion in a one-page summary, and I sent that to all ALT members and to the staff. That's something that I would like to use as a basis for preparatory discussions with the GAC. The idea was that we would really prepare this item so that perhaps we could agree jointly on something in Abu Dhabi. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjö. Could I ask staff to resend that document to the ALT so that all of us don't have to dig through our e-mail to find it but actually take a look at it and perhaps make some comments because I don't believe I've seen any comments on it?

                         Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Just firstly, I wanted to mention that the links on the liaison updates on the agenda don't go anywhere. I was actually wanting to click through, but just to mention that.

                         Secondly, I wanted to ask if the applications for the ccNSO position had been received and considered by the selection committee yet. I haven't heard back on that.

                         Perhaps one mention that I might make from the report relates to the NomCom appointee to the ccNSO Council, which the Council had actually rejected because the NomCom appointed someone from CIRA and Byron is already on the Council and there would have been two people from the same organization, same country. I know that the Council did talk about this in depth because they recognized that this would be a valuable person, but it was in conflict with the criteria they had actually established with NomCom.

                         It's got [to a stage where] Steve Crocker has actually apologized to the appointee. She has withdrawn, but it has been a bit of an upsetting time for them I think and something that they're working through. But I sort of feel that NomCom hadn't addressed their criteria and the fact that

they have appointed somebody from an organization that's already represented on the Council [inaudible] misunderstanding somewhere. That's it from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I hadn't clicked on that. That's interesting. One could also question whether – how does one put this – whether we have the right to reject NomCom candidates and under what criteria. Thank you for that.

In terms of the liaisons, I'm afraid time has just gotten away from us and we haven't done anything on any of those positions but you will see action in the next couple of days for either the SSAC or the ccNSO one. There have just been too many things going on which have been super time critical, so I apologize for that, but you will see some action quickly.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: A couple of things. Our last meeting of the GNSO Council – and they've been packing them in this last few weeks with a number of time-critical things that had to happen before the Abu Dhabi meeting – we had a meeting on 12th of October. Most of it was discussion and administrivia. I think you will appreciate my reporting.

In the consent agenda on that meeting, the GNSO Council did see fit to confirm me which does not affect my role as liaison from the ALAC to the GNSO Council but to confirm me also as the new incoming co-Chair to the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLD new PDP Working Group.

So at the Council meeting that meant that Avri until she stepped up to Board in Abu Dhabi, Jeff, and myself, we're all going to be co-Chairs together. Then obviously after the AGM, it's going to be back to Jeff and I, which is not only a good gender balance but also the important balance of commercial and noncommercial interest in terms of overall leadership.

That said, and actually we were up to until just a very short while ago, Avri has now discovered that the Board in fact works an awful lot harder than she thought they did and she is in fact stepping down as a co-Chair effective immediately. So it will be as of the end of today. Unless the Council disagrees and somehow refuses to let her go, which I think they would, it will just be Jeff and I. So that's important for you to all know. I will update my SOI shortly to reflect that.

So that's it from the GNSO Council report from the last meeting. However, something that I know you will be interested in, day before yesterday I received from Constituency Travel support for travel information to attend the GNSO intersessional meeting to be held in Los Angeles at the end of January, running 29th of January through 1st of February. That was a matter that I know, Alan, you had raised with Council leadership in the past. There has been no update to the Council on the original plan to not include the liaisons. But the fact that I am now included in Constituency Travel outreach, I'm just going to go on and pretend that it's all going to happen and if it does, it does, and if it doesn't, well, we'll wonder about that later. But I thought you'd like to know that as well. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. I do appreciate that. And we have a marvelous echo. That's one of the clearest echoes I've heard in a while. Tijani, you're on next.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much, Alan. Do you hear me?
ALAN GREENBERG:	We hear you well.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	You hear me well? Okay, thank you very much. Alan, I raised my hand to speak about the liaison's selection for SSAC and GNSO. I beg your pardon, if you can send the candidates and the documents to the Selection Committee so that we have time at least to read and to understand. Sometimes we receive them very late, and we barely read them during the meeting. So it is better to have all that information before so that we may have time and read them. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. I don't believe that will be a substantive problem this time around but, yes, I understand. Thank you. Noted.
	Any further comments on liaison reports? Then we'll go on to the next subject of At-Large Review. Sorry, did someone say something?

[CHERYL LANGDON-ORR]:   I laughed. I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay. Understandable. I'll give a brief summary of where we are today, and I will then let Cheryl and Holly add anything they choose to add.

As you may be aware, and I'm not quite sure to what extent this was publicized, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee – and I apologize ahead of time if I ever call it Operational. Renalia has chastised me for doing so, but my mouth keeps on issuing those words. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee decided that it was rather problematic to forward the recommendations to the Board given that our study that we sent them essentially said that we were going to actively implement any of the recommendations as described. We did accept a number of them but had some "buts" associated with it or said we're already doing it. There was very little that we were going to do that was really in the recommendations that was substantive work addressing significant issues, and they found that rather problematic.

What they did is asked MSSI to create a mapping of the issues raised to what it is we were proposing to do. And essentially what they would then – assuming they agreed with what it said – would then recommend to the Board that essentially we be held accountable for implementing what we said we were going to implement or something related to that.

MSSI has been creating, to the extent I understand this, has been working on this mapping. It was supposed to have been delivered to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee a while ago to allow them to

make decision at the beginning of or prior to the ICANN60 meeting. Then the Board would presumably make a decision either at their Board meeting prior to the meeting or on their Board meeting on the last day of the meeting.

That whole process has slipped, and we are now talking about this document going to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee for their November 27 meeting, which implies that the OEC plus the Board that will be handling it will be a different OEC and Board than has been following this process all along. You will recall that we moved heaven and earth to make a time deadline so that this work could be done with the current committee. Clearly, that is not going to happen.

There is also a discussion ongoing at this point as to what extent we see this mapping prior to it going to the OEC. I will tell you I have made some very strong statements saying having this be a secret document that has attempted to read our document and figure out what we were saying but without us looking at it or verifying that it is correct or having an opportunity to comment on it is something I consider not acceptable.

That is not yet resolved, so I don't know exactly where this is going at this point. But I believe it is not acceptable for a Board committee to see a document about At-Large and recommending – even if it is only a preliminary draft – trying to rephrase our words without us having an opportunity to comment on it. I'm not saying we should write it, but we should at least be able to see [and] comment on it. That is not resolved yet, and it is an ongoing discussion.

I'll turn the floor over to Cheryl or Holly for any further comments.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl?

ALAN GREENBERG: I note in the chat, Holly, Maureen asks, "Where is the transparency?" Maureen, you could well ask: where is the transparency?

HOLLY RAICHE: The only thing I would like to add is that I thought I understood the timeframe, I thought I understood where we were up to in the process until I think it was yesterday or the day before we received the Theresa Swinehart e-mail that basically threw the timetable that we had been working with out the door based on the development of this map that we haven't seen. So I would only echo Alan's comments. The whole process has gone out of our hands and out of our sight. I would like to bring it back into our hands and back into our sight.

                        Alan, I wish you very good luck on that because I don't have anything further to add because I don't have any more knowledge than you have in terms of the e-mails we've got that completely changed our timeframe and tasks and everything else. So I'm very much in the dark, and I await clarification. Let's put it that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. Just for clarity, these e-mails have gone to the leadership of the working party essentially verifying that the document that was to be sent to the entire working party was sufficiently clear.

And suffice it to say it was not sufficiently clear and still is not. I didn't think there was any merit in distributing a document publicly that was undecipherable.

Although certainly we worked very hard to try to make this whole thing happen within the current ICANN year and with the same OEC and Board, I can understand that the process has taken longer. We've had things that took longer than we thought they would take also, so I am somewhat understanding of that. It's unfortunate, but at least some of the people on the committee are likely to be the same. I think there will be some continuity involved, so I'm not as worried about that.

To be clear, it would be completely unacceptable for us to write this mapping document and then go to the OEC and the Board for approval. That would be akin to what ITEMS claimed happened last time. That is, At-Large did not like the report so we wrote a new one. That isn't what happened, but that's what they thought happened. So it would be not acceptable for us to write the document that is then approved by the Board. But for us not to see it is a different issue altogether in my mind.

Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, look, a lot of what I wanted to say when I put my hand up, or tried to add my microphone earlier, it has, in fact, been picked up then.

But I do want to suggest that from my perspective, I have sufficient trust in what I understand will be. I also have sufficient trust in the ICANN

Board and they have a word for [inaudible] boards that escapes me right now, who, I'm going to use the word "sponsor" but I don't believe that's the correct terminology. They acted a [inaudible] for various discussions, and so, I'm quite confident that we will find that our review process is being sponsored – wrong word – through the ICANN Board discussions in a fair, frank, and fearless manner. But I do think we do need to dig our heels in on the transparency aspect of the mapping document.

I agree totally, Alan. Mapping documents need to be – they already should have been – promptly and effectively created by the [MSSI] Team and it is a sheer matter of courtesy as well as expected standards of transparency for our organization, that we would be given access to a copy of it, not necessarily to edit it, but to have the ability for a right to reply should one be required. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. I did say in one of my messages that if MSSI has done a great job, then our comment will suffice to be "Great job." But we should be given the courtesy of being allowed to say that or not and I think that is, well, okay. We're repeating our words right now. I think we're all vehemently agreeing with each other and we'll see how this plays out.

I have not gotten a response to my last comment, at least the last time I checked my e-mail, so we'll see where this goes. Either there will be further discussion between MSSI and us or a message will simply go to the working party saying whatever it says.

And Leon, you're on the call now. Would you like to take the floor to say whatever it is you just wrote in chat which is too long for me to read?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes, Alan. I have a little bit of background noise here. I am with the kids, having lunch. But my [ring] on the situation is that your [inaudible] needs these mappings because they realize that the recommendations made by the reviewer are so flawed and are pointing to a few in the At-Large community by [inaudible], so importantly, with the reviewer, that they need to understand how can the recommendations can possibly be implemented.

So I read these more in the situation of the OEC being the words that the reviewers even do and [inaudible] than to the [inaudible]. Its points of view [inaudible] for recommendation. So my feeling is that the output would be or should be desirable to the At-Large community. Of course, it's just my personal opinion. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, León. You may have missed the beginning of this discussion. There is absolutely no question that I personally, anyway, support strongly what the OEC did. I think the word I used in some private conversations, it was inspired in that they figured out a way, although a way that's never been used before, and that's one of the reasons ICANN staff and Board are proceeding with some caution is we've never essentially rejected a report, but said we're going to do something else in the current era of the reviews. Such things have

happened many times in the past, but essentially, in the previous regime.

So I believe what they have decided to do is quite inspired and I'm not objecting to you at all. It's a process that's been followed since that decision that we are questioning. And Cheryl agrees.

Anything else on this? I wish we could be a little bit clearer on how we're going forward. At this point, we can rest assured that there will not be any action during the Abu Dhabi meeting on this. We have yet to decide whether we choose to bring it up with the Board or not. It's tentatively on our agenda, and at this point, until we have a little bit more clarity, it is still tentatively on the agenda. If, for instance, we are told that, sorry, the document will go to the OEC and you will not have an opportunity to see it before that, you can rest assured, this will be on our agenda with the Board. But let's wait to see how this plays out and then we'll make a decision.

Anything further on the At-Large review before we proceed? We are a little bit behind schedule, but not a lot.

The next discussion, the next item is IGF Participation. You will recall that we had approval from the ICANN Finance and the Board to fund two people to go to ICANN – and the response was relatively explicit on this – one selected by or representing the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee of the ALAC and one from the ALAC.

We have talked about criteria informally. Heidi has put together a document. I don't know if Heidi is with us at the moment or not.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I am, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have that tentative document to display that you were working on? I asked Heidi to start drafting just what is the criteria. We're going to have to act relatively quickly, but I think we want clarity on what it is we're looking for in this person. But the intent is to ask the Outreach and Engagement to select one and the ALAC to select one. And I presume we will call for volunteers and then do a selection. It's not clear how we will do the selection given that there's a good chance at least some of the applicants are from the ALT and the Selection Committee. But I think we'll, hopefully based on the number of applicants, come up with a way of moving forward on that. We will have to move pretty quickly on, so Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Alan. So we don't have it in a Word document but I put it into the chat and these, again, so these are the ones that Alan and I discussed over the weekend, so for their IGF experience, with previous attendants at national, regional and global IGF meetings, for their significant knowledge of At-Large policy issues and how they could impact end users, and a third possible one is unlikely to attend if not funded through this program.

And at the same time, the subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement developed three criteria and I'll put those into the chat so it's up to you

and the ALAC if you want to add these as well. And that is more of a logistical set of criteria, and that is commit to management of the [booth] of the IGF, schedule/implement outreach and engagement activities, and lead on information of At-Large activities.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, I certainly have no reason to question what the Outreach and Engagement Committee has set for their selectee. The question is do we use those criteria as well for ALAC? And again, this is not a decision of the ALT, but we're going to have to make a recommendation for the meeting tomorrow.

And do people feel that the two or possibly three criteria we've added for the ALAC, and that we could impose or suggest to the Outreach and Engagement are reasonable? And I ask for any speakers on this.

I think we would like to make a decision on the ALAC meeting if we can tomorrow. We certainly could defer, but I think we'd like to start the selection process as soon as possible.

Holly says, "I think all of the criteria are helpful, so we should suggest the new ones to Outreach and Engagement." I'm not sure that I want to put on the ALAC person the commitment to support the booth and schedule the outreach and engagement, but I'd like input.

Anyone? Specifically people who have gone to IGFs would be useful. I'm looking at Cheryl, León, Tijani. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that the criteria you are working on are highly unreasonable in my point of view. The criteria of the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee are more meant to do things there. They're not criteria for selection. They are for more commitment and I think that people who go there should also commit, for example, to keep the [booth] for a moment, etc.

In my point of view, if we want it to be efficient, we need people who knows, first of all, everyone who goes there, they should know we have the schedule of the IGF so they should have their sessions selected. It means that they would not go there only to keep the [booth]. They have to contribute in the substance of the discussion in the IGF. It means that [if you go there] will, in my point of view, need to attend as much as possible workshops and the main session.

And also, perhaps the point of the commitment is that when they come back, they make a small report, which would be, in my point of view, useful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Quick question while your microphone is still enabled, are you suggesting that we, the ALAC, use the Outreach and Engagement criteria as well or commitments as well, or not? I just wasn't clear on what you were saying.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that we should ask people to commit to do things there, and one of the commitments are those of the Outreach and Engagement

Subcommittee. It is for our affair, if you want. And also, I am adding that anyone who is going, who is funded by the IGF should go there for substantial participation, to go to the sessions, to go to the workshops. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. That latter one I strongly support. If we are funding people to go to an IGF, we are funding people to attend the IGF. Yes, we will have a booth and yes, we want it manned but that is almost a peripheral part of the process. It may well be necessary to meet the Outreach and Engagement criteria that we are using to partially fund this, but the prime reason we are sending people, and the reason we have gotten an allocation outside of particular sessions is that if At-Large is to engage in IGF, it must engage in them, not just be there to wave a flag and man a booth. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry, I put it in the chat. I was very much agreeing with Tijani's point and the point you just made. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am a veteran of all levels – national, regional, and global – IGF, as of course, others are.

Regarding the criteria specifically for the ALAC-supported, Tijani's points in terms of reporting, etc., but I am Walt Whitman courage and [Sybil] for the attendee from ALAC-endorsed attendee to appear at the booth with you, Alan. I don't believe that is necessarily a need at all. The best use of an active participant, yeah, sure, look, the booths are important, but to be honest, it's also mostly [pill] before swine. You've got a whole bunch of local people who want to know if there's fund drives or pens to get, and very little more. The amount of actual return on investment in these booth activities is, I think, highly questionable.

But it is a mechanism for outreach and engagement, and I think quite appropriate in terms of flag waving and exposure of the brand for outreach and engagement-endorsed people to be doing. I think, however, the ALAC-endorsed person needs to be in the meetings, engaging with activities, talking in the corridors, creating networks, establishing where views of Internet governance, forum activities that have a nexus with At-Large and the ALAC may or may not be [inaudible] mutualism or actual identification of conflict and getting back to us. So that's my very biased view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just for your information, I am not a candidate for the ALAC position. I have managed to convince ICANN that if the ALAC and At-Large is a significant part of ICANN and an active participant within At-Large, the Chair should not be competing for other funding but should be funded by ICANN centrally along with the Board and ICANN staff, and they have agreed, so at least for this year, and hopefully for all years forthcoming.

That, by the way, I think is somewhat of a major coup because ICANN has not funded people from the component organizations like that before. But I made the case that unlike the Chairs of most of the other parts of ICANN which have independent access to funds, that was not the case for us.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well done.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we won one, at least, hopefully this year and if I don't embarrass everyone too much, hopefully in years to come when I'm no longer in this position.

Yes, Olivier. Go right ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much, Alan. I wanted to congratulate you on this one because it's been years, I think, that we've been trying to make the point. In past years, I was funded for the IGFs through ICANN but it was always a very last minute type thing, very informal, as if ICANN had no idea that the ALAC Chairs had no independent means to actually make it to an IGF meeting. So it's great that you managed to formalize this on this occasion.

I wanted to also add that I'm not either going to be asking for any funding from ICANN to go to IGF because I'm already independently

funded through the EuroDIG. So I think we're having a good discussion here.

My view on who should we send, I think that there is this thing about the whole outreach component part being important, and I think Cheryl did mention this quite well or explained it quite well with having not only just outreach at a booth but outreach in the actual corridors and doing things and talking to people.

So whoever is going to be sent there needs to be someone that is able to engage other people, that is quite outgoing and maybe even has a proven record on engaging with people out there and bringing those links that we need.

As Chair of EURALO, I would, obviously, love to benefit or love to hope that my region would benefit also from some engagement taking place there. And that's it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. I guess I differ with you just a little bit in that we are being funded to go to IGF and participate in IGF, as Tijani said. Participation in the active discussions, I believe, comes ahead of the proselytizing and trying to convert people or tell them how great we are. I think actually contributing to the meeting should be one of the prime motivations, certainly for the ALAC-selected person.

And just one more comment on the funding issue. I also was funded to go to one meeting. I asked for money from Global Stakeholder Engagement. It actually ended up coming from someone else. It was

literally at the last moment and I won't go into the interesting aspects of getting a Visa for Brazil in three days, but it was interesting.

Last year, I went to the meeting in Mexico and funded myself, and the campaigning to make this not have to happen like that again started, in fact, at Mexico so it took a fair amount of time.

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. In my point of view, the best way to make outreach is to speak in a workshop or in a session. When you speak in a session, you make yourself known, especially if you define yourself as an ICANN community member. This will make you more attractive to people to come to you, to speak with you. And this is the best outreach, in my point of view. You can stand in the corridor and say, "ICANN is the best," "APRALO is the best," "EURALO is the best," etc. I don't think you'll be very useful.

The best thing is to contribute in the substance. And this is the way people will come to you and will speak to you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Well said, Tijani. Thank you. Anyone else?

Then we'll go on to the next item. Thank you very much for that discussion. We have some details to present to the ALAC tomorrow, and we will do that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go right ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If you can look in the action item [pods], are those, the ALT agreed to criteria? So basically, Alan, the three that we had as well as the [required].

ALAN GREENBERG: We are going to suggest the three that we had to the Outreach and Engagement, and they will be the criteria for the ALAC member. We are going to note the Outreach and Engagement criteria, saying, for the ALAC member but not make them as an absolute requirement or commitment.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Got it. Okay. And then there's also a requirement to network and provide feedback. Well, yeah, just sorry. There's another for a report, required to make a report but then encouraging acts of participation and encouraging networking and providing feedback to the ALAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I would prefer to keep this less formal and not say you have to submit a report. I want feedback and involvement from people, not necessarily a piece of paper which they write on the plane and no one reads. So a requirement for feedback and involvement in the community after the meeting is the way I would put it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Alan, maybe we can take this offline because I heard pushback against. Okay, yeah. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, you head pushback?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I heard pushback from one of the three criteria from the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement and that is the management of the [booth]. So you don't want to include that one, it sounds like. But we can take this offline.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are not telling Outreach and Engagement what to do. We are telling them –

HEIDI ULLRICH: They have their criteria, correct.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. We will mention these to the ALAC member and not ask for commitments or say they are specific expectations.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I understand. But I'll follow-up.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll reflect and we'll talk to them also.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where are we on the agenda? Next item is SSR Review Team. As you are perhaps aware, because there's been a bit of discussion going on in various venues and published discussion, the Board has not accepted the terms of reference from the SSR Review.

The SSR Review, that's Security, Stability and Resiliency of the parts of the Internet that we're responsible for, part of the job these days of doing a review is to create a document called "Terms of Reference" which includes the scope that the group intends to cover, and this must go to the Board for their approval.

In this case, the Board did not accept the details and has told the Review Team that. In parallel with that, the SSAC, or the Chair of the SSAC has written a letter on behalf of the SSAC saying that he and they are concerned that we are seven months into the review, the scope has

not been settled, to a large extent, little work has been done, and they are very concerned that this group will fail and not produce a substantive user output and have a great amount of concern over that.

There will be a discussion that will happen among the Chairs and the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. I think it will be an open meeting that other people can observe, but I'm not sure about that, on the Friday prior to ICANN. There is certainly a lot of discussion going on between people and I think one of the things that became obvious is we have not followed through with our representatives on the group to report regularly to us on progress. And that is something that will be rectified very quickly.

I am also asking MSSI for information on participation and activity of people and will be pursuing that as well. The people we name to the SSR Review Team have superb credentials on paper, but we need to make sure that they're actually participating and active in the process.

There also seems to be some discussion and disagreement between ICANN staff and the Review Team as to what is allowed to be in scope and what is not, and I won't go into details right now, but that looks like it may be an interesting discussion going forward.

Anyone have any comments? I see a check mark from Cheryl. I see León has put some things in the chat. There's a concern that Review Team mission creeping as per the scope of the work. Well, they are defining their own scope, so the question is how does one define "mission creep" when the scope is not set out ahead of time? As I said, there also seems to be some disagreement on to what extent a Review Team can

review the ICANN organization and ICANN staff actions. And that looks like it's interesting. And I won't go into more details on what "interesting" means at this point, if you'll forgive me.

León, do you wish to say anything? León apparently does not. Okay, go ahead.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. So my impression is that there is the concern about how the current scope of work is written in the Terms of Reference in regards to how it relates to the ICANN Bylaws in terms of the mission of ICANN. So that is what I feel seems to be the concern from the Board and there is ongoing discussion on the issue, and as you say, I'm pretty sure that there will be more discussion on this moving forward. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else have any thoughts or comments on this? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we will go on to the next item, and that is At-Large at ICANN60. And I will turn it over to Gisella, I presume, to lead the discussion.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Alan. First of all, agenda point A review of At-Large leadership, ALAC, and ALT agendas. We're going to be showing the daily agendas from Saturday, on the day that we have ALAC and regional leaders working sessions, and I'll hand that over to Heidi for the agendas.

And as for the ALT agendas, I'll just briefly mention then when the ALT will be meeting and that is the current ALT as well as the incoming ALT, so Heidi, if I may, over to you for the agendas if you're able to.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you, and I'll make this brief. But please do take a look at what is being displayed on the AC room.

So on Saturday, we have a welcome to current and incoming leaders and special guests. And by "special guests" we mean the Global Indigenous Ambassadors. We also, obviously, include the APRALO ALSes who will be arriving there.

Then we move on to aims and objectives of the At-Large in ICANN60, and here importantly, is the discussion of the At-Large session with the ICANN Board. And there are several questions, Alan, but maybe we can do that, cover that later, the actual questions.

But also, in preparation for possible At-Large perspective in the cross-community sessions. [inaudible], I'm not looking at the AC room, so please let me know if there's anyone with their hand raised.

Second session is looking at new gTLDs. This is one of the ALAC hot topics, main topics, for ICANN60. This includes community applications, applicant support, string confusion, and closed [generics].

Then I'm going to skip the APRALO activities, if that's okay, just focusing on the ALAC meeting for this time being. Then in the afternoon, part three, we have, basically handing it over to Olivier for an At-Large evolution session. And that is, for the most part, similar to one of the

regular calls and we are covering all the Work Stream 2 issues and we will be sending them to patients, to all of the speakers there to make sure that they're able to.

Then in the afternoon, we have several people coming to speak with the ALAC and regional leaders, and that includes discussion on the SSRRT with Denise, Michelle, and Eric Osterweil. Then we have, on the CCTRT, Jonathan Zuck confirmed, SSRRT is also confirmed and then we also have consumer safeguard update with Bryan Schilling who is confirmed.

Then to close off Saturday, we have discussion on ATLAS III, organizational planning. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I can interrupt for a moment, just note that the sessions which do not involve guests are still subject to change. Heidi and I have not had our chance to do that final review, which I hope we'll do by tomorrow. But just a comment that if you see things with those that are particularly problematic because they conflict with other things you plan to be attending, then let us know on that. Thank you. But quickly. Thank you. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. So then ATLAS III, Gisella and I spoke about this and we're going to look at the current schedule that we have. Again, this is a block schedule. When plenaries are, when breakout sessions are, we have that already from Ted [Bartle] of Meeting staff.

We're also going to look at announce the deadline which I can announce to you is the 7th of December, 2018. We also need to look at who is going to be going? Is it the ALS reps? Are they going to be some individuals? What are the requirements for those? In the past, we've had surveys that they've had to complete in order to get their tickets.

Also, when is the cutoff date for ALSes? We are basically, right now, at the limit for the summit with 225 plus the 25 RALO leaders and ALAC liaisons, so that's something we'll need to discuss.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may interject, Heidi, this is a really important discussion when you look at it in the context of the At-Large Review. We are looking at a meeting which is almost two years out. We are also proposing to the OEC and the Board that we significantly increase our focus on individual members and increase our focus on members of ALSes, not just representatives.

That implies we are going to have to make sure by one way or another that this ATLAS meeting is relevant in that context and we're going to have to think about how to do that. Does that mean we don't give one slot to each ALS representative? Maybe we give a slot to each ALS?

We may want to look at how do we handle the cases of ALSes that are not participating, and we always have some. But I think going forward, we can't simply say that in the past, we have allowed for North America one person representing all of the individual members, and therefore, that's what we will do going forward forever because that just may not fit the model of the At-Large that we are aiming at having two years

from now, which is just about when we're ending the timeline of our implementation.

So it's something we're going to have to think about and make sure that we can defend how we're doing that in light of the changes that will be coming at At-Large as we do our implementation. I'm not trying to guide what the answers are today, but I'm simply saying we are going to have to make sure that we can rationalize the whole thing in light of that.

Tijani, yes, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that the amount of criteria if you want to select people, one of the most important criteria should be the participation. If we have people who are not participating, we cannot, in my point of view, honestly make ICANN spend money for them.

Also, we shouldn't give funding for people who attend meetings only because I know people who come to the meeting who register their name and then they put the telephone [working] and they go. If you ask them to speak, you will not find them. So it is not to attend calls. No, it is to participation and participation is very clear, in my point of view. Participation is participation [inaudible] in the discussions.

So in my point of view, I already spoke about that, Alan, and we had this more or less consensus that participation should be one very important element of this selection of [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I'm certainly not going to disagree with that. And yes, we do know people who, they may not have an automated thing calling into the meetings on their behalf, but they don't seem to be really there as people listening and responding at the time.

And, of course, we may want different criteria for a brand-new ALS. It may be very important to take a brand-new ALS that hasn't been with us very long and expose someone from that ALS to ICANN even if they're not active contributing, but that doesn't mean we take someone who joined in 2008 and treat them the same way. So I think we're going to have to have some good discussion and we do have some time to do this, but not an awful lot. So I'm looking forward to it. I think we'll have a much stronger meeting because of it.

Anything else? Sorry, I hijacked that meeting and I'll turn it back to Heidi. Sorry, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan. So one outcome that Gisella and I would like to have from that meeting is better understanding of who's going to be going, but definitely the timeline to ensure that we have all of the names by, again, 7th of December, 2018 and also, to ensure that we have a process on moving the Organizational Committee forward, including when we're going to do the call for members, what their timeline is.

Okay? Okay. Moving on to Sunday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani has his hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, sorry. Okay, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Heidi, can we make a proposal for people before or can we give ideas for people before the meeting so that they think about the issue? People at the meeting, they may be surprised or there are a lot of people who cannot think during the meeting. So it is better to send them something, some ideas, some proposals that we talk about now so that people will come. They already know what we are talking about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, just to be clear, you're talking about sending people who are attending Abu Dhabi suggestions for possible outcomes as to how do we select people and how do we set up the meeting. Is that what you're saying? How do we set up the ATLAS meeting?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Just wanted clarity. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Yeah, so Tijani, I did think about that. Do we want to make decisions like you've mentioned, or even ideas already, what the themes are? But then I thought, "Well, is that not the role of the Organizational Committee?" So if the ALAC says, "Well, we want to set these parameters that the Organizational Committee has to work in," that's fine.

We can certainly set up a wiki page, and with a deep breath, I say for the ATLAS III, we can do that. Here we go again. But is that what you'd like us to do, is basically set up a wiki page and then send some questions already?

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, may I try and answer?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please, and I'd like to add something later.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Heidi, Tijani is right. Both of you, I think, are right. We do not want to make all of the decisions in the ALAC and regional leaders as a whole, but I think we need some guidance that will set the parameters.

For instance, I think it is reasonable to say it is not going to be acceptable two years from now to simply say the formal ALS voting representative is, by default, the person who comes, and we want to

think about that consciously and try to make sure that it's going to fit the At-Large that we expect to have at that point.

So yes, we want decisions to be pushed down into the Organizational Committee, but I think we, the ALAC, have to provide some guidance.

Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Heidi, you spoke about the Organizing Committee. Do we already have an Organizing Committee for the [summit]?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We have, I believe, a number of people who I've reached out to as sort of a tentative Organizational Committee leading team, and I have to look back who they are. I know that you're one of them. So let me set that up and maybe send the initial questions to them, and then perhaps, they can organize a note to the wider At-Large leadership on that, if that's okay, Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Heidi, your wisdom notwithstanding, I think that it has to be a decision of the ALAC who it is who is going to be taking responsibility.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so we'll put that on the agenda for tomorrow. But in the meantime, the action item I have for this is staff to create an ATLAS III workspace. Okay? Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, and then ALAC meeting tomorrow to discuss. How's that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounds good to me.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, I think your hand is still up. No, it is not. Back to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, Heidi.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it's my mouth that isn't in gear.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for full disclosure, I've been in meetings from 8:30 or 8:00 in the morning or 9:00 in the morning, both Saturday and Sunday, so I'm not quite as rested as I should be.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, moving on to Sunday, and this is question I do need a response from is, okay, right now, given the situation we have with the At-Large Review, we still have the At-Large Review session. It's for an hour and 15 minutes. We're going to invite Renalia if you think that's okay.

From the staff side, we think that's okay to do and that we can invite the MSSI people, but I think Renalia, as the Chair of the OAC would be [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I do not think we're going to have an hour and 15 minutes worth of discussion at that point. We may well want to reallocate that time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: This area is still evolving.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, Alan. So that's great in a way because if we had even 20 minutes on that, then you have a whole bunch of time to add additional topics

without having to shift any other things right now because we are going to be sending things to the language services to translate these pretty soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that, but we'll move things around if necessary.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect. Okay. So Gisella, I think we can still go ahead and send that today. Just a note.

So then, okay, working, let's do part seven. Then we have confirmed. We have the ALAC [inaudible] with the SSAC representative. Julie is moderating that. And then another question here, we have the GSC update with Sally Costerton and regional vice presidents. Now this is simply the GSC. This is not the public responsibility support with Yrgö and Betsy.

So the question from Sally is what would you, the ALAC, like to discuss? Are there any particular regions, any particular programs that you would like to have an update from?

ALAN GREENBERG: Input here? This is only 45 minutes. If we're not careful, they will end up spending the whole time telling us what they're doing if we don't give them more direction. So do we want to raise any issues or make the focus? Cheryl, go right ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just figured it would be worthwhile seeing if we could get a focus at the APAC hub on engagement and activity rather than everything. I'm not saying ignore all the other regions, but do remember where that could be useful to have a primary focus on. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, I'm not raising my hand. I will raise it. If I may, I know that an internal senior management team, including policy and the GSC, are looking at closing the participation gap with volunteers. And that might be a program, again, it's at initial stages right now. It might be useful to bring that up in particular.

ALAN GREENBERG: What does that mean?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Basically, volunteers, how to encourage, in particular, once they are onboarded, how to encourage them to be more engaged. So the joint statement that the GAC and ALAC are planning on developing for ICANN developing more programs, etc., that might be useful to raise in passing and see if they have any comments on that. So we can do definitely a couple of regions and we can ask about that if you'd like.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? I'll give you my personal opinion on this whole issue of the stakeholder journey and onboarding and everything. I think it is totally ridiculous for staff to take over responsibility for figuring out what motivates volunteers. I think it's about time we involve volunteers in the discussion of what motivates volunteers and what we can do to encourage people to do something. Just a personal opinion.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, that might be, perhaps in a slightly toned down version, but basically, that would be useful. And I think that there is the planning to do that, but just to restate that would be useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, I have seen too many years of this happening in ICANN, so I'm optimistic that it will change, but to be honest, I want to see it. Yes, I will try to tone that down but you could send that note back to those people.

HEIDI ULLRICH: They know that. Believe me.

ALAN GREENBERG: They don't know that or they would act differently.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You were speaking to me during the meetings on this topic. You were totally in my mind and they knew that in a good way.

Okay, moving on to Part 8 in the afternoon. This is, again, one of the main items for ICANN60 for At-Large and this is on concession on public comments. And this includes discussions such as how should the ALAC select which public comments to respond to, also what should be the role of staff in the development of policy advice statements? And that's directly coming from the At-Large review findings.

And then there's also a discussion with public responsibility support. Now this is the former DPRD and this is with Yrgö and Betsy.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we have 45 minutes for both the internal discussions.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, no, the discussion for public comments is a separate item. Now I see. Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. So keep in mind that the discussion with Yrgö, he's going to introduce the topic of the community [inaudible] program. But then I thought that this might go into a discussion just among the ALAC as well while they're there on that find. And then Betsy is going to just talk a

little bit about a new platform for ICANN Learn and then that is going to be discussed much more deeply in the Capacity Building Working Group session later in the week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Then we have Part 9 and that is the At-Large Working Group review. Alan, do you want to talk a little bit about this?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll talk a little bit about it. As you all know, Evin has been working diligently to try to clean up the wiki and before anyone interjects, yes, there have been a couple of mistakes. Things were archived that shouldn't have been archived and let's not worry about that. Evin has been doing a large amount of work and it looks a lot more presentable than it is right now than it was before.

It was quite clear from the At-Large review where we were suggested to abandon all working groups that there was a clear misunderstanding about what our working groups do and how many we have and how much of our time is devoted to them, and how much staff time is devoted to them. And it became clear in discussions with the reviewers that at least part of the problem was if you went to our wiki and website, you got a very different impression on what is going on than the reality was. It was not uncommon to find a working group that has not met since 2010 listed as an active group soliciting members. There

were groups that were created for a very specific one-time purpose where that purpose ended years ago and were still listed as active groups. So a lot of clean-up has been done to fix some of those clear problems, but we also know that we have working groups that we believe are crucial and important, which are now essentially defunct, or at least, not active.

So I think what we have to do is make sure that we are presenting reality to people who are prospective users or prospective participants and that we have a mechanism for actually making sure these groups work. So I think we are going to be, once again, having a discussion at an ICANN meeting about working groups, but I think coming out of this one has to be some hard decisions on recognizing what groups are really active, what groups we need, and how do we make sure those are, in fact, doing their job and making sure that, going forward, that we have mechanisms to address the issues whether it's a working group or not, or whether it's simply identifying a subject matter expert who is the one we call on when we have a question or experts when we don't really need a working group, but we do need a name.

So we're going to be making some proposals. I talked to some of you already about it and we'll continue doing that over the next couple of weeks, and hopefully, coming out of this meeting, we'll have some cohesive decisions as to how to move forward and make sure that we are not only presenting reality to our community, but we can implement it properly. So it's a big bunch of wishes, but we really have to do this. We just can't afford to keep on pretending it's not a problem. Back to you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you very much. Seeing where we are on this. Okay, then we have just a few 25 minutes with Patrick Jones and Carlos Reyes from policy staff, sorry, ICANN staff. And this is on a project that they are working on across all communities, and that is the key resource consultation. And I believe that is to do with ICANN Travel Support. So they have a presentation and then there will be some initial discussions on that. Alan, any comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is they were talking about a revision of the Travel Support guidelines. Is it really more than that? Community Support Resource Consultation is a much larger topic, in my mind, than travel issues.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I would need to check on that. My understanding is that it was travel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then let's try to put a title on it that is a little bit closely-related or, if not the title, then at least some words under it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, I'm going to double-check with that. Before we do that, I'm going to double-check. But I will make it more clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given this is at 3:30 in the afternoon, or sorry, 4:30 in the afternoon, people are either going to be checking out the espresso bar or being at our meeting, and I think we're going to get more people at the meeting if we actually tell them it's about travel.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may be blunt.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: At the GNSO Council meeting, I had the privilege of having this presentation from both Patrick and Carlos. It's an excellent program, or project, I should say in its early days. It's certainly one that I am keen to make sure ALAC, [inaudible] regional At-Large organization are actively engaged in, in terms of survey feedback in this early stage.

"Community Resource Consultation," I see where that title does work, but if perhaps, we could put a byline and say "Resourcing of ICANN Community" might make it clearer and more attractive. Yes, it is about

travel and other things. But travel is clearly one of the big ticket items, however, that they are wanting to look at.

This is not a call to action to try and save the likelihood of continued Constituency Travel support. It's an effective and intelligent looking at how we can all work smarter, better, more effectively and in a predictable manner. So I'm very keen to see it happen. So perhaps a byline would work, making sure that it's seen as effective and efficient resourcing of community. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, does that mean that they might consider paying for Internet connectivity for those who can't afford it and can't participate well with what they can afford? I'm just trying to gauge how far out are we going?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, that's the type of comment that could very well lead to a next step. This is a staged implementation. It is a medium to long-term project and priorities are yet to be set, but one of the clear priorities is, of course, [travel] support.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Heidi, I'll leave it to you to how you change the wording. Clearly, from what Cheryl said, it is not exclusively travel but you may want to find some words that convey what it is about a little bit more than the title we have right now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'll do that. I'm looking at their document and Cheryl comments effective resources, I think, would be useful too.

Let's see. Okay, so that brings us… Okay, the final meeting of this day on Sunday with no agenda at the moment is the ALAC and CCNSO meeting. Gisella, do you have an update on that?

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Heidi. Unmuting. No update here from the ccNSO. We will hopefully hear back from them over the next 24 hours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I will point out we're over time on the meeting right now so I do think we need to speed up this review a little bit.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So just very quickly, on Wednesday, that's when we have our wrap-up. Well, we had the meeting with the Board. Are you going to talk about that now, Alan, as well? I guess we should do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm willing to talk about it. My screen has gone blank, so I'm not sure what we're uploading.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: We should upload the same document in another version. I'm confused. Hold on. I'll pull up. We can talk very briefly about the Board. Anyone can read it. I presume everyone on this call knows where the Abu Dhabi wiki page is and everything is pointed to there. But we can talk about it a little bit. Just let me pull up the right page.

Based on the comments received – and I essentially took most of the comments, or maybe all, I don't remember – and reworded them. We have a double-phased section on geographic regions and names. One of them is the question that was originally posed by Olivier as to what happened with the review of geographic regions given that the Bylaws mandated that it be finished in 2004, I believe.

It has now been finished for several years, or at least a while, and we are seeing no action. You can read the specifics in the document.

The second one is talking about the gTLD PDP on new procedures for gTLDs and the Work Stream 5 discussion that will be kicking off soon, and pointing out that it's not clear that we are going to get complete closure, and how does the Board view this given that they don't want to make decisions but they may well have to make decisions. And for instance, the ccNSO has said if everyone cannot agree on the outcome, then we must revert to the old rules, that clearly puts some onus on the Board for making decisions going forward.

And the second one is a question from the Board on post-transition ICANN since we now have a year since the new procedures were put in place from the Board and/or its members, provide feedback on how it sees the new ICANN unfolding, and what are both the high points of the

process and the low points and concerns. And lastly, we have a third item on the At-Large review if we need to discuss this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: On that third question, I will be preparing my briefing for the floor. I would like to know whether that question is going to be asked.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, if I knew that, I would tell you. Given that we are still waiting for answer from MSSI, we do not know what the status with that answer will be or what our position will be. We know the Board as a whole will not have seen any document at that point. The OAC is not likely to have seen any documents at that point.

So the only issue we can really discuss is process that has been followed and whether there will be a subset of issue to discuss or not, I cannot tell you. So you can try to summarize that in your briefing document. Okay, we only found out three days ago that this matter would not be discussed by the OAC and the Board at Abu Dhabi. And as you're well aware, we're still in the midst of discussion what will happen between now and then.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We may have a significant discussion as to quote Maureen earlier in this meeting, where is the transparency? That may be a moot point or it may still be an issue. If it is an issue, it will be brought up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. That's good. That's what I need for the most part.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Okay, thank you very much. So Alan, on the Board questions, did you want to discuss some in-depth tomorrow or during that first morning session that we have –

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we had a deadline for submitting them. They are submitted.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, the questions themselves are submitted. But on what else you'd like to talk about –

ALAN GREENBERG: We will have time face to face to allocate this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Perfect, thank you. Okay, so let's move to Wednesday. That is the two wrap-up sessions. So the first one, we have tentatively invited Goran and David Olive. However, again internal policy requires us to know what the topics you would like to discuss with Goran before we can confirm. So do you have one or two topics that you would like to discuss with him?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will ask everyone on this call to think about it and be prepared to speak about it tomorrow. And we'll make sure that we do allocate a few minutes tomorrow to talk about that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, perfect. Thank you. We'll also have a 30-minute debrief on ICANN60. Alan, I know that you find [inaudible] useful, so hopefully we can get to that. Then during the wrap-up, we have currently 20 minutes each for ALAC –

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we have noise from some line.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Silvia, is that you? I think, if you could mute please? We have ALAC liaison 20 minutes and 20 minutes for the RALO leaders. And then we have the Chairs. And that is 20 minutes. And Alan, you'll have the full list for that item.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Why don't we call it Staff Announcements if you're telling them I have a full list?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Because you're the Chair. You're the Chair, that's why.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Sorry, that was made as an attempt of humor.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yeah, well it is. You've succeeded. So then we have on Friday, we have the ALAC Development session. And Cheryl has set that through. Cheryl, did you wish to say anything at this point or – because we have not listed it on the agenda page.
ALAN GREENBERG:	We will be asking for a signed statement from everyone acknowledging that they have something to do on Friday though. Or Thurs… yeah, Friday.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And then for Saturday, we have the ALT. So again, we're not going to look at them, the open schedule, but we do need an agenda. And we need to know when you would like to invite Cherine and anybody else. And what would you like to talk with them?

ALAN GREENBERG: We will cover that. We are hearing Heidi over and over again. Gisella has her hand up. Gisella, please. And Cheryl has her hand up. Gisella and then Cheryl.

GISELLA GRUBER: ALT meeting on Saturday, can I just say two words about that one, if I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: You certainly may.

GISELLA GRUBER: So a reminder. There will be two ALT sessions in Abu Dhabi. The first one being for the current ALT, which will be a breakfast on [inaudible] 28th of October. It begins with current ALT and hopefully the incoming ALT. And then the incoming ALT will be meeting on the following Saturday, the 4th of November in a meeting from 8:30 to 12:00. Now unfortunately, both Cherine and Steve will have left by then. So we won't have the pleasure of having them in our meeting. However, moving forward, Alan –

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I guess we don't have to tell them what we want to talk about.

GISELLA GRUBER: However moving forward, Alan if I may, I've just said to [Theresa], you'll be able to discuss this with Cherine and maybe just introduce this to him even though he was at the last meeting. And I'll make sure that for all future meetings, this is put into the agenda well ahead of time so people can act accordingly.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, this was always going back an invitation if they are available.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I don't think we ever asked them to extend the trip because of it. These people put an awful lot of time with ICANN. And if there's another commitment or something they want to get back for, then I think that's understandable. So I think we have to be flexible. Cheryl, do you want to go for it now please? We cannot hear you yet. While we figure out how to get Cheryl on, Gisella do you have anything else?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes. Just to let you know that I will send you a – I have already put these and flagged these meetings to everyone. And I will send the updated room details, meeting room details as well as breakfast details for me to work on the logistics on the 28th of October just for where the Centro Capital Hotel is located. So please look out for an e-mail but you will have the final details in an e-mail from me for both these sessions to the relevant participants.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Gisella, may I ask you to ask for confirmation from each of the ALT members or liaisons that you believe will be attending for positive confirmation that they do understand the timing. We know Yrjö and [Bartlett] will not be attending. But I believe everyone else has confirmed. But let's make sure that we'd have no misunderstandings.

GISELLA GRUBER: Alan, yes. Thank you. Hence me saying we'll send another reminder.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yay. Complete with bird chorus. My apologies. I literally had to shift pieces of equipment to get back into the dial-up connectivity.

I just wanted to have a very quick word about what with this ALT but also hoping that we can raise it at the ALAC meeting tomorrow. Just sending a link out off to the list please about the agenda for our development session would be very important. Particularly because there is pre-work that needs to be done. People do need to come to that session – and I apologize for at least [inaudible] messages coming in now that I've opened up [inaudible] – that there is pre-work and preparations that people will need to come prepared for. And we will, closest to travel time, send some links out to the pre-reading should anyone be highly motivated.

But it is important that the prep work is done. And that you do not share your preparatory work because some of the exercises need to be fresh and a novelty. I do apologize for the mic. Do you have any issues? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Gisella, back to you for any final words or any other items we haven't covered yet. And we are almost 20 minutes into the post meeting time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan? Sorry, go ahead, Gisella.

ALAN GREENBERG: Whoever wants to speak, I don't need to call on you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Nothing further. I see we have now updated the Google Calendar so you'll be able to see the meetings in the Google Calendar. And apologies, you might see a lot of them. It's just for them then for you then to run through which meetings you'll be attending or not. And I'll send to you a list of social events which I'll also be showing during the ALAC call tomorrow if time permitting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And a reminder tomorrow, when you do this to remind everyone to fill in their travel details if they haven't.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, Alan, a couple of things. Back to the agenda. If you could just update me at least on where we are with Evin's suggestion of an ALAC strategy meeting. I know there was a long discussion of not having it be closed but I don't know whether it was agreed to have that open and what we're calling that, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is or will be on the agenda tomorrow. The meeting will be held. There was a general consensus that it not be a closed meeting. Evan with an A was also adamant that the physical structure of the meeting such that it

was not our normal table, I think we need to discuss that tomorrow too. But at this point, the meeting in essence will be going forward.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I don't know if we can change any meeting, the setup.

Gisella, I'm hearing you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't need to discuss that now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Let's see what else. Okay, really quickly Alan, you wanted this to be mentioned for the Fellowship. That's going to be on Monday that you're meeting with the Fellowship. It's Monday, the 30th of October from 12:30 to 13:00. You asked to put this on the agenda for today on who else should be going to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. In general, recently we have had past Fellows going to it and to a large extent, they have been the speakers, not me. I am quite happy to continue that but we do need a couple of volunteers. I don't need to see hands right now, we're late. But we will send out a message to the ALAC and we can mention it again tomorrow.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Alan, that is it, I think.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, is there anything else for Any Other Business? Then I thank you for your indulgement… indulgence, sorry. And we'll see you tomorrow on the ALAC Hall. Bye-bye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Bye-bye.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you everyone for joining today's call. The meeting has now been adjourned. The audio will be disconnected. Please do remember to disconnect your audio as well. Thank you very much for joining and wishing you all a good morning, good afternoon, and good evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]