
MANAL ISMAIL: Welcome to the GAC-ALAC joint call, and thank you for setting the time for this call. I think we already have an agenda [for this] call and [inaudible] agenda item, our joint meeting. For the sake of time and since we have so many things to discuss with the agenda on [inaudible]

GÜLTEN TEPE: Manal, I'm sorry to interrupt you. We have received complaints that you sound so faint. So could you please speak up?

MANAL ISMAIL: Oh, thank you. Can you hear me better now?

GÜLTEN TEPE: Thank you, Manal. Yes, it's much better.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you, and apologies for this. So let's start with the first agenda item which is the [inaudible] in the subsequent new gTLD procedures. Basically, Work Track 5. And so as you all know, Work Track 5 has already started [inaudible] led by the co-chairs from the different SOs and ACs. The GAC has already shared some ambitions for participation. This is still an ongoing discussion within the GAC. So I think [we have] two points for discussion in terms of procedure and...

So, in terms of procedure [inaudible] the GAC [inaudible].

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.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Manal, you seem to have faded out. If you'd like, I'll take over.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. I'm sorry for that, Alan. So thank you, Alan. Please, can you take over?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I will. Perhaps we can dial out to you at the same time or something so we can hear you a little bit better. With regard to the geographic names in the GNSO PDP, the first thing I'd like to do is announce that the co-chair who has been acting on behalf of the ALAC, Christopher Wilkinson, has stepped down from that position and he will just be an active member in the group instead of a coleader. And we are in the process of selecting a new coleader, and hopefully that will be done by the end of the week. So a little bit of a change for us, but hopefully it will be a smooth transition. And Christopher has offered to support the new coleader as necessary.

The work in that work track is just barely starting. We spent a lot of time on the terms of reference, and we are now actually starting the work of trying to understand what a geographic name is. And ultimately, I hope we'll get to the point of trying to discuss how they are allocated and under what set of rules. I guess the first question I have is the GAC I know had been deliberating on whether they would pursue or follow up on the matter that the GAC had asked that CCWG rules be used, and the GNSO had responded that since this is a PDP, they don't have a lot of

choice but to follow the PDP rules. And I'm wondering, at this point are you accepting that, or is this still an issue within the GAC?

MANAL ISMAIL: I hope you can hear me. I'm still getting the numbers to [resolve] the [inaudible] the Adobe [inaudible]. Yes, as you mentioned, Alan, this has been under discussion within the GAC. We have submitted the conditions. Basically, as we mentioned they were almost around the CCWG rules and procedures. We have received a response to our submission, which again was not a clear acceptance or a clear refusal of the condition. But again, as we rightly mentioned, trouble describing the obligation that follow the [inaudible] that having this coleadership and this [invasive] setup that CCWG [inaudible]. But again, this is still under discussion now, haven't responded to the letter yet.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, Manal, [inaudible] my hand.

MANAL ISMAIL: Sorry, someone wants to talk?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, I'm not hearing you very well, Manal.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're still having trouble hearing you. Are you on Adobe Connect, or are you on a phone line?

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm on Adobe Connect. I'll stop here and try to get on the phone first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. If you give staff a phone number, they can dial out to you, I guess.

GÜLTEN TEPE: Manal, we are dialing you out momentarily. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. At this point, we also wanted CCWG rules, but we came to the conclusion that since for a GNSO PDP to be able to go to the board for implementation, for acceptance of its recommendations, the bylaws and the GNSO procedures require them to follow the specific rules that are currently documented. And although those could change, that would take up a very significant amount of time to do that. So that is why we relaxed those rules and didn't insist on the CCWG rules.

I guess I'm looking at it from a somewhat – ALAC is looking at it from a somewhat pragmatic point of view. That is if the GNSO doesn't expect, doesn't want the GAC and the ALAC to end up giving advice to the board counter to what they recommend, then they have some obligation to make sure that the work track is as inclusive as possible. And regardless

of the rules that apply in terms of appointed members or anyone can get on, that they're going to have to be very – acknowledge the participation of the other groups, or they're going to end up with recommendations that the board is going to have a great deal of difficulty accepting. So as I said, it's not written rules, but I think it's a pragmatic approach. Have we gotten Manal yet?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, much better.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Sorry for this. So thank you for sharing the ALAC views on this. As you rightly mentioned, it's still under discussion. It's good to know that you decided to accept this and relax your views. I have shared your response with the GAC, and we are still discussing this. But the discussions are not preventing us from participating as well to the work of Work Track 5.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent. I wish I knew how they were going to end up with a solution that will be acceptable to everyone, but I guess we're going to have to watch. Shall we go on to the next item on interim models of GDPR?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, please, unless anyone has any comments on the first agenda item.
If not, then let's move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no hands at this point, and no one is calling out.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want to take the lead, or do you want me to?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, I can start and hand over to you. So the GAC has discussed the different models that were posted by ICANN. Again, we didn't see them as, I mean, three concrete models, but rather elements for the different models where we agreed to some and disagreed with some rather than approaching them as a package, I mean as a model.

We have submitted our comments on this. So the GAC is more in favor of a long retention period, and as you may guess also, we were not happy with self-certification. So the GAC is more in favor of a third-party accreditation so that things are consistent and not left to the different registries and registrars. Also, regarding the data elements, we are much in favor of having as many public elements as possible. Of course, provided that we are still GDPR compliant.

So I think this is basically – so we submitted, we highlighted the points we agreed on each model and things we objected to in each model, and ultimately, we proposed a model that is basically merging different elements from the three different models. Having said that, I can still see some challenges, things like fields which sometimes may include personal data and may not, like the e-mail address for example. I cannot really see how this in terms of implementation would be implemented. Is it something that's going to be real-time? Is it something that's going to be mandated beforehand?

But yes, I'm sure this is going to be more clear as we get more into the implementation. Currently, we are sending a concept paper, if I may say, on the accreditation, because our understanding is that there is a proposal that the GAC may be involved in such accreditation. This has not been discussed within the GAC yet, so we're just waiting for something in writing, a concrete proposal that we can kick off the discussion and see how and whether the GAC would like to be involved.

I leave it here and hand over to you. I tried to look for an ALAC submission before the call. I found some submissions individually by yourself and others, but I think the ALAC did not submit a consensus proposal from the ALAC side. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. No, we did not, because if you look at the individual submissions, you'll see that they're quite different. And within the amount of time allowed, we just could not come to closure on a single consensus position.

There are significant numbers of people within At-Large who are looking at this very much from the privacy point of view and not looking as much at how information could be made available to others, to law enforcement or to other cyberpeople. And there are others – and I'm among them – whose position is much closer to the GAC position, and that is that we must need some level of accreditation, and ultimately, we need to collect almost everything we're doing right now. And it may only be made available to law enforcement with a subpoena, but it should be available when it is needed.

So we didn't come to closure, and therefore a number of people did submit individual requests, individual comments. Certainly from my point of view, personally, I think that no matter what we do, there's going to be a short period of time where things are going to be hard to get a hold of, because as you point out, the self-accreditation is certainly problematic, and coming up with an accreditation program is not going to happen instantaneously.

I really wish we had started that six or eight months ago, because we knew that any long-term solution is going to need one. But we didn't, so we are where we are. The concern that some of us have is that there's going to be at least a short period of time where things are going to perhaps be very blacked out. And I was glad to see the European Commission letter of a few weeks ago where they pointed out that law enforcement and non-law enforcement access really does have to be maintained one way or another.

I guess, is there anyone else either on ALAC or the GAC who would like to comment on where we are? Clearly, we're in a difficult situation right

now, and it's going to be interesting to see how it unfolds. Anyone else like to speak? Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Alan. Just a quick comment to express my personal disappointment that this issue is now coming up, the issue of GDPR is coming up so late in the game. I've read actually the European Commission's website today. It's 101 days until this enforcement starts. Enforcement is now listed as being the 25th of May 2018, and that's the time at which organizations in noncompliance may face heavy fines. But the approval of the GDPR – would you believe it – by the EU parliament was on the 14th of April 2016.

So really, we have lived the past two years in a time of indulgence, I guess, and it's just unfortunate that we've gotten that far down the road and now it's just very last-minute and everybody is a little worried. I really do not know how we can make ICANN more proactive. As advisory committees, both the GAC and the ALAC, make ICANN more proactive on these things that are over the horizon and what is currently happening. That's what I wanted to comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Certainly, this has been a wakeup call. There are many of us in ICANN that have known for a long time this was coming, and ICANN had chosen to not worry about it. I have no idea whether the next one will be done this way or not. Anybody else?

MANAL ISMAIL: So let's hope not, and I agree with you both that the most challenging aspects of this right now is the time, that very tight timeframe that we have, because I think the discussions are constructive, but it only needs time which is the biggest challenge right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course, we have no idea how quickly data commissioners will actually take action regarding WHOIS things. But we won't find out until they actually do, so there's no magic way to get around that.

If there are no further comments, then the next item is cooperation and capacity building in underserved regions. And that's an issue that I think Maureen raised, or with Seun having some comment. So Maureen, can I turn it over to you?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. And welcome, Manal, and your team. I guess I often raise this just to sort of like – because I think it's sort of like great that the GAC is actually taking some responsibility for the underserved regions and raising awareness about ICANN and building capacity. But I guess it's sort of like, for example, I know that our government, our little island government, not very many of them [inaudible] to the Pacific – there was a good group there, but it didn't represent all of the countries in the Pacific. And I'm not quite sure if there's another session going to be at the APRICOT meeting which, interestingly, [inaudible] has been told that the route that she chose to go to Katmandu was over the budget [inaudible] I don't know. But she's actually thinking of pulling out.

But I'm not quite sure what the attendance is going to be, and because in the APRALO region it's such a large region and so many of our countries don't have an ALS for example, but we are looking at how we might be able to I guess support each other. And I understand too that in the AFRALO – Seun, you might want to talk about that – I thought that was a great idea that AFRALO had some input into the capacity building that they did in Africa. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. [inaudible] This is Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you very much. Thank you, Manal, for also all the [strategy] talk so far. Yes, I think the session we had in Nairobi was a very good one, and the efforts to involve AFRALO, some AFRALO members [and] leadership was a good idea, because we kind of had the opportunity to meet with some government officials and then there were quite a number of sessions that some of us within AFRALO were member of the [inaudible] and in some cases [inaudible]

That was largely coordinated by the GSE and [GAC] was involved, and also – what's her name – Alice played a very significant role in organizing it. So I don't know what others. I think it was an initiative that David mentioned and [Dan] that we're going to go to other regions. So I don't know whether GAC is [planning] to outreach like that in other

regions. I understand that Africa may be not be – even though it's large in population – as large compared to Maureen's region. So there is a little bit of constraint there. But overall the good thing that [inaudible] other region as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun and Maureen. Anyone else have any comments? Yes, Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Alan, I just wanted to ask if the GAC had actually sort of made any consideration about the FY19 team suggestion that capacity building funding would be cut. And I did mention that the GAC did sort of make frequent requests. So, is that going to affect your long-term goals with regards to working with the underserved regions, Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. So just to take it piece by piece here, we're taking capacity building very seriously. We have a working group for underserved regions that's mainly taking the lead on those capacity building workshops. As Seun mentioned, we had a very successful one in Nairobi.

We had also other capacity building in other places. We have one that's going to take place in Nepal. Another, shorter one in San Juan, and another in Panama.

We prepared agenda bottom-up as well. We survey GAC members and members of the Underserved Regions Working Group, and we have evaluations done after each capacity building workshop. And I think the whole experience is going to be evaluated and assessed after Panama, if I understand correctly. I don't have the exact timeframes in front of me, but I think after Panama is a milestone for us.

For the one in San Juan, we're only having a half-day, the first half of the Saturday as a capacity building workshop which will be focusing on an approach for disaster recovery and how to – on DNS disaster recovery and how we can help in that respect.

I have noticed actually that the ccNSO and the ALAC will be discussing this issue as well in Puerto Rico, if I'm not mistaken on a Wednesday morning. So again, I think it would be good if we also cooperate on this aspect as well. Also speaking about capacity building, I have to mention – like I mentioned on other calls – that this last year, we had over 90 new GAC representatives. So it may not only be for underserved regions but also for new faces and newcomers, and new representatives. I think since Johannesburg, we had more than 60 new representatives.

And by representatives here I don't mean new members, but it's the same member country that has changed its representation. So we've been looking on such capacity building efforts continuously, even intersessionally. We're trying to arrange for a webinar with the GNSO so

that new colleagues can be more familiar and more acquainted with PDPs and so on.

On the budget and the fiscal year '18 budget, again, we are still seeking some clarifications. We have submitted a clarification request when the budget was posted for public comment. Again, this is of course a concern to the GAC and is still under discussion. We're even not sure about the exact number of travel support seats that we have for the GAC, so we are expecting a response to our clarification request. So I'm not sure I covered everything. I can see Maureen's hand up. Is this a new hand, or an old one?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Manal. It's a new hand. I was just wanting to say that I really do think it would add value to actually have some involvement of the regional At-Large organization within the GAC training, especially as we are both advisory committees, we both provide support for decisions that are made within ICANN. But it would be good for the ALAC contributors to sort of like hear more from the GAC point of view, but also or the GAC people to understand how the ALAC actually contributes to have the end users' viewpoint. But also the fact that we provide a lot of capacity building programs for the ALAC which would also be of value to the GAC, capacity building webinars and e-books, just resources that sort of help to build capacity that people can access in their own time. And we're sort of building quite a good resource [chest] of these sorts of resources that might be of value to you as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Maureen. Manal raised really interesting point that sometimes gets lost. And it's not just new underserved regions or new people coming, new organizations coming into ICANN, but it's also just replacement and renewal of the individual people that requires us to really do a back to zero introduction to what is ICANN and how does it work, because we can only expect these people to be effective if they very quickly start understanding what ICANN is, how it works and how they can participate in this process. So it's a really difficult thing, and it's somewhat disturbing if in fact capacity building is something that is viewed as expendable.

Anyone else on that topic of capacity building?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Alan. Just to thank Maureen. I think this is a very good idea, and we can start maybe if I may suggest by the ALAC liaison to the GAC, with the co-chairs of the GAC working group for underserved regions and try to align efforts and see how we can coordinate efforts and maximize benefit for both our communities. It only makes sense that we coordinate our efforts on such capacity building events or material or whatever aspects we can collaborate on. And I think this would take us smoothly to the following agenda item, but I can see Cheryl's hand up, so Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Manal. Very briefly from me, I think it's important – I'm delighted to hear the collaboration plans on the capacity building that obviously in tight fiscal times, it is one of those things that inevitably gets put to the bottom of the list if not bumped off altogether as a priority. But I don't believe that either the ALAC or the Government Advisory Committee has as yet leveraged our opportunities to provide material fit for purpose in our mutual views for ICANN Learn and asynchronous capacity building. And I would love to suggest that that might be something for a future conversation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Any further comments on capacity building? Then the next item is possible [follow-up] on the ALAC-GAC statement on enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation in ICANN, which indeed is somewhat linked to the previous one on capacity building. We just received our letter from Cherine acknowledging it and saying we should continue to talk on it.

I'm not sure if I should be pleased or upset that there was a reference in it to say we're doing such a good job we should continue leading and generating good material. I don't think we would have given the advice if we thought that we were able to do it all on our own without cooperation from other parts of ICANN. So I'm not sure I should be pleased that it was acknowledged that we do some work to try and make information accessible or that there was an implicit assumption that that may be good enough and they don't have to do a lot more. But regardless, I'm not sure what we're going to do on the very short term.

I will tell you that as part of the At-Large review, there is a very significant part of the review which implies we cannot get a lot of new people involved in the policy processes unless we can make the information much more accessible. So there is going to be a component of the At-Large review implementation when we finally get to that stage where we will be looking at how can we make information available to make sure that really, the people with no knowledge of ICANN and ICANN policy issues can start to get involved.

Obviously, not everyone will be interested, but we need to make information available so that the few people who are potentially interested can actually get up to speed quickly. So there will be a component of that that will be complementing what it is we were talking about in our joint statement. Open the floor to Manal or anyone else who would like to perhaps suggest how we move forward on this.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Alan. And yes, probably it was not clear enough to everyone from a first reading, because again, the first question we got from ICANN was, "So, what exactly is the type of documents you would like to receive apart from what we already have been compiling or sharing?" And again, clearly, it was not that we are missing new documentation, but rather, we're talking about the current documents, how they are written, the complexity of the language, the complexity of the topics, lack of a system for archiving whether it's the author name, material number, whatever documentation system that should be in place.

So we tried to make this clear. Obviously, there is an acceptance in principle on the importance of everything we mentioned in the joint statement in terms of the importance of lowering barriers to participation and so on. But yes, as you rightly mentioned, we need to put that in action. So we all now agree on the principle, but what's next?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. Thank you. My sense is that although some things could be done immediately, like making sure we have consistent numbering and format for cover pages. I suspect ICANN is going to defer that as part of their overall new database and search capability that they're looking at, and maybe that's a wise move, maybe it isn't, to do that. It certainly stops replicating, or reduces replication of work, but maybe it means the small wins will be deferred until the larger project is approaching implementation.

One thing I did note in the budget document is as an aid to keeping down or controlling translation costs, they are talking about doing a much better job at executive summaries. And the link of course is that instead of translating whole documents, they will just translate the executive summary. That implies there is an executive summary that is meaningful. And the existence of those documents may well help, or increasing of those documents may well help in the kind of things we were talking about. At least I'm optimistic. Of course, it's easier to say, "We will write good, meaningful executive summaries" than it is to actually do it. Anyone else like to weigh in on this from the GAC or the At-Large? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just to quickly mention that when this was brought up at the Los Angeles board workshop, the ITI initiative was also mentioned in the same context. The Information Transparency Initiative, if I recall the abbreviation correctly. Frankly speaking, I don't know the exact features of the initiative yet, but again, I hope this is going to be efforts that would support our joint statement as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you. Certainly the ITI initiative, we're talking about years. And sadly, if the budget gets more constrained, it's also an area which they may choose to elongate the process instead of doing it as quickly as originally viewed. So I'm reluctant to rely purely on that, although some parts of it I suspect we will have to depend on that.

And Cheryl has her hand up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. With the ITI, I just wanted to suggest that having read Cherine's response, Alan, to the ALAC where they highlight the session at ICANN61, I haven't yet looked at what that is going to clash with – and I'm quite sure it's going to clash with a number of things, that's by definition how meetings work – but I think it's really important that ALAC and GAC have a clear and very obvious presence. Now, whether that's just one or two of us sort of sitting right up the front in obvious front and center or something, but I just want to make sure that it's

very obvious that the advisory committees are taking a very close watching brief on this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and I'll ask Gisella and Heidi of our staff as we get closer to defining final agendas to keep that in mind.

Anyone else? We still have 15 minutes, and we're down to the last substantive item of potential agenda items of the San Juan meeting. I think we have the list of topics we discussed today I think are all good candidates for further discussion in San Juan. By then, we will have a much better idea hopefully of where the budget is going, and also in terms of GDPR, where we are aiming on the short term, the short term being the deadline of the end of May. So I suspect those are all going to be issues that we have progressed on, and it'll be an opportunity for the group as a whole to raise. Our meetings are somewhat constrained in time, so I think we're going to have to manage it carefully, but I think pretty much all of these issues will be on the agenda. At least that's the way I read it. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. I fully agree that the agenda we have today is a good potential agenda for the San Juan meeting. They are all topics of common interest, there is much going on in terms of GDPR, for example. So things are still developing between now and San Juan, and I'm sure we'll be having more updates and more things to discuss as we approach our joint meeting. So yes, I fully agree. And please let us know

if there is anything we can do to facilitate the role of the ALAC liaison to the GAC as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'll go on to that in a minute. I will say that perhaps by San Juan, Work Track 5 will have come to a conclusion and we'll all be happy with the answers. That's just said for Cheryl's amusement. But clearly in all of these topics, we are going to be in a different position by March two months from now – Or a month and a half from now, I guess – than we are right now. And it should be interesting to see how much we have progressed, but almost surely, things will have changed in most of these areas.

And I see we have Yrjö would like to speak. Go right ahead, please.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. With Mark, we did some joint work on the community-based locations, trying to develop some joint points. I'm not suggesting this as an agenda item because we already have so many as you both said for San Juan, but just if somebody in the GAC now is sort of continuing Mark's sort of interest in the community-based applications, that would be good to know, and perhaps we could meet in San Juan just to have a cup of coffee with and just develop some ideas on the community-based applications. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Yrjö. I think on community-based applications, one of the things we have to make sure is that for both of our groups, the GAC and

the ALAC, we have – to be blunt – more and better participation in the PDP working tracks that are discussing that, because as we’re going right now, there is relatively little participation. And although it’s fine to [have] submitted documents, I think we really need to make sure that when the draft report comes out in a few months, it really has captured a lot of what we have talked about and what we want to see in community applications. So I will encourage on both sides people to become a lot more active.

With regard to – Manal mentioned the liaison between the GAC and the ALAC, and we started that essentially as an experiment about a year and a half ago, I think. Do I have the right timing? I’m not sure. But I think at this point, it has been something that has worked very well, and I don’t think we would be in the stage where we’re having these meetings and these productive talks without Yrjö having taken the initiative in much of this. So I would like to thank him, and at this point I’m certainly delighted with how it’s working out, and I look forward to continuing. And I see we have some applause [in] the handshake.

At this point, I don’t think we have anything else left on the agenda unless anyone has Any Other Business, and I’ll turn it back over to Manal at this point. I think we’re having interesting conversations. We still have to work harder and develop more meaningful ways we can work together in addition to writing statements. I would like to actually see work products coming out of the joint efforts, but we’re doing well at this point compared to our relationship over the years, and I think I’d like to continue it.

And I'll turn it over to Manal to wrap up. We are a little bit early, so we do have time in case anyone else has any substantive items, but otherwise, we could give everyone a few minutes back. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Alan. And also, I would like to thank Yrjö as well. As you rightly mentioned, he has been pivotal in all our joint efforts so far. We are happy to facilitate his job in any way we can. And please feel free if there is something you would like to raise. Even with the GAC leadership, we can have you invited in our GAC leadership calls as necessary for certain agenda items.

We were looking into this with other liaisons as well, so we are very happy to accommodate. We can either invite you or you can request an intervention in one of our calls as you see appropriate. I'll surely put you in contact with Pua, our underserved regions co-chair so that we can coordinate efforts on the capacity building.

And yes, Alan, as you rightly mentioned, we have a lot in common and we look forward to truthful cooperation. The joint statement we had turned very well, and it was in a very short time. So when we want something to happen, I think we can. So let's keep the momentum, and looking forward to another fruitful discussion in San Juan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, any –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I was just going to point out I think Thomas has had strong incentives to get it done before he left.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, which is – it's all about the –

ALAN GREENBERG: So, that's always a good reason. I see Olivier's hand up, but I will note that although the budget document is very unclear in terms of travel funding because the published document – which I'm told has been revised, but we haven't seen a revised version yet – it starts off by saying there is a 10% cut in travel funding. It then goes on to show numbers which do not seem to have been cut by 10-15%. So I'm a little bit vague, but that document does list the ALAC as getting 29 slots, and among other things, that does allow us to keep funding travel for Yrjö. So from that point of view, it looks good. They did cut one of our other budget areas, but from my perspective, Yrjö's involvement takes priority. And we will make sure that is currently funded at this point. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Alan. And you must have been reading my mind, I was going to ask a question with regards to the budget process. And the fact that, yes, we are seeing at least a freeze in the ICANN budget

this year – or the budget growth – and I wondered whether the GAC was likely to – I think that the GAC has been impacted on some of these, certainly capacity building, and I wondered whether the GAC will actually be taking part in the budget process and will be issuing the statement. And whether there might be, in some of the cases, the opportunity to have joint statements on some of the parts. I really don't know at this point, just a wild question. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yes, thank you. As I mentioned, we are currently seeking clarifications because we understand there is an impact. We can't really quantify this impact. The document was a little bit unclear to us as well, so so far we're just seeking clarifications. And I think we will be formulating our questions after we get this response. Happy to issue any joint statements as things become more clear. We already have a placeholder for this topic on our agenda with the board on the joint GAC/board meeting in San Juan. Still, the question is not yet formulated because as I mentioned, it's going to be based on the response we get for our clarifications, but it's definitely a topic of interest. We plan to raise it with the board, and we're happy to coordinate on anything jointly with ALAC, of course.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Yes, as I said, we were told – we met with Xavier last week and we were told that a revised budget document clarifying some things including volunteer travel has been issued, but we have not been able to find it yet. So we are again asking. Any further comments before we adjourn, before we end the meeting?

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, then thank you very much to all of my colleagues in At-Large and all of our colleagues from the GAC, and I'll turn it over to Manal for any final words.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Thanks, Alan, and thanks to everyone on both sides, the ALAC and the GAC. It seems that I was on a very slow link, because I was impressed by how you saw hands up before even people raised their hands. But that seems to be my link. Thank you all, and looking forward. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Manal. Thank you all. Bye.

MANAL ISMAIL: Bye.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Bye-bye.

GÜLTEN TEPE:

Thank you, everyone. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]