PRAGUE – ALAC Executive Committee
Friday, June 29, 2012 – 09:00 to 11:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay well good morning everybody and welcome to this ALAC ExCom, Executive Committee, I was going to say conference call, it feels like a conference call at the end of this week doesn't it – meeting. The time is 11 minutes past nine and today we have several people coming to see us, starting with David Olive, VP for Policy Development; Steve Antonoff, Director of Human Resources; Akram Atallah a little bit later, and Xavier Calvez finally towards the end of our meeting. Unfortunately Steve Crocker, who was originally listed, was not able to come. So I think we can just immediately start with David Olive whom I saw outside.
	We could do a roll call sure. When in doubt, when you have nothing to do, actually that's exactly what I did when I took my function wasn't it. I didn't know what to do and I had to reboot the computer and so I said "maybe Gisella could we start with a roll call" – but Gisella left the room as well. So let's start with a quick, maybe Matt, could you do a roll call please?
Matt Ashtiani:	Sure this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. We have Alan Greenberg, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Carlton Samuels, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Evan Leibovitch, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, Julie Hammer, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sebastien

Bachollet, Sandra Hoferichter and Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro; and myself, Matt Ashtiani and Oksana.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Matt. And I believe we also have, is that Maureen Hilliard on the remote?

Matt Ashtiani: Yes we also have Maureen Hilliard on the remote participation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I've just heard that it might be 3:00 a.m. Maureen's time, so that's well done is the thing. Okay, so we'll start with David Olive, Vice President for Policy Development. Welcome David, and the floor is yours.

David Olive: Thank yo,u Olivier and members of the Executive Committee. I'm pleased to be here. We always save the best till last, and so I'm glad to have the chance to do this. I'm sorry, during the week I had scheduled to talk to you, but the schedule got out of hand for me and I'm sorry I missed that, but I'm glad to be here today on Friday, a working day for all of us. I wanted to just highlight a few things. as you know, I lead the policy team that supports the policy development process within the supporting organizations; that's the GNSO, the ccNSO and the ASO as well as the advisory groups, the distinguished advisory groups who also advise the Board on policy and other matters, including ALAC.

PRAGUE

That keep us all very busy, but of course, my main focus is the police development process. And to that extent, the need to have those interactions and ideas and comments put into those processes of the supporting organizations. And to that extent, I want to compliment and thank you for your active role in that endeavor. In 2011 40 policy statements, and we're only somewhat into 2012 and you're up to 20. It is for that very purpose that I thank you and I'm here. I know members of the policy team did brief you; talk to you about the RAA negotiations.

Margie Milam and Brian Peck also talked to you about IOC and Red Cross. We're happy to do that at any ICANN meeting, however if you should want that type of specialized briefing or general overview briefing we're happy to do that on a webinar or at your pleasure. And as you know, before every ICANN meeting we do have our policy webinar where we try to preview the policy topics that are likely to be discussed or debated or even approved at the ICANN meeting, and I wanted to include Heidi in that only to show, among other things, the policy inputs and statements of the ALAC and the At-Large community into those processes with the SOs.

And so that was a very nice addition and I wanted to highlight those 40 and now 20, the efforts of all your hard work. So I want to thank you for that. Also congratulations on your ten-year ALAC and five-year RALO Anniversaries an the growing structures – 144 ALSes around the world.

So in addition to the policy development process, the other important element is the public comment process in particular and I thank you for your comments on this: the need to have sufficient time and more time. This is being discussed and reviewed by the Public Participation

Committee of the Board, the Chair is sitting right here and he knows this very well; but the point of which is the new process that started in January was of course new and different from what we've done before, if you will. We tried to improve a lot of things but the primary purpose is to encourage inputs; not to discourage inputs. And to that extent we're happy to hear how that's working and you've provided that feedback for us.

And then finally as you heard in the Public Forum I have been focusing on workload issues: in particular how to address the growing number of topics, policy development processes, both from a staff and my particular point of view, a staff point of view – how do I make sure they're covered if you will with appropriate staff; but also from a community point of view of burnout or ability to get the right inputs. And so to that extent it's a good topic. I was happy that they raised it at the Public Forum and I'd like to hear your views as well.

And then I think one other issue I would like to talk about as we've been discussing here at ICANN in Prague, the implications of the New gTLD Program on the various SOs and ACs; and I'd like to hear your view about what might be the impact on the At-Large Community's and ALAC's workload and the like as we look at what we would have to do to either have new inclusions, new constituencies in the GNSO or new membership generally. Will we need a hotel that accommodates 4000 people instead of 1000 or so? These are issues of other people's concerns; I'm really worried about the linkage to the policy development process in our SOs and ACs.

So those are really my opening comments. I didn't think you wanted another presentation and I didn't want to give one though I'm happy to do that as well at any time. Olivier, I turn back to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, David, and certainly in this session presentations are somehow outlawed I guess and dialog is really what we're looking for. So the floor is open for questions and discussions, and I already see Alan with his hand up. So Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Two topics: first of all, burnout. I'm burnt out. There are other people who are burnt out. One of the reasons is there are so few people actively involved in the policy development processes. If you take the sum total of all the people on the mailing lists there's a lot of people. If you take the sum total of all the people who actually show up on a regular basis there's an awful lot of overlap between policy processes. And I don't know what the number is but I suspect it is not a particularly large one; it's one you have access to because all of the groups keep attendance. It may be interesting to actually tabulate it.

The perception of burnout among a small number of people, the perception of burnout is due to the large number of things that are going on, not necessarily because people are so involved in them. Councils may be burnt out and ACs may be burnt out by the volume of things they're asked to respond to and that's true. Part of that is the issue that was raised or the issue we moved on to once Stefan raised it at the Public Forum of volume of documents. Well, I hate to say it but

PRAGUE

it's your staff that often are driving the size of the documents by saying "These are mandated parts we can't omit." Now, they're not doing it on whim; they're doing it because we've built rules saying this has to be true.

The alternative to putting things in documents these days is you put it on the Wiki and have a pointer to it. The sad part of that is four years from now when we move to a new Wiki all of that will be lost. None of that will be findable because even if we move all the pages we will not change the references and the PDFs. So just as any old document right now is virtually unusable if it has pointers in it it's a real problem. I'm not proposing what the solution is but the substance of the issue raised that we need shorter documents that people can actually digest is true in spades. And we need to get more people involved actively – certainly At-Large does. The number of At-Large people who are participating in non-ALAC committees and working groups is miniscule, and somehow we have to fix it.

And I think staff has a role to play in that in continuing to remind other groups that the outreach component is important. And it's got to be active outreach; it can't be just passive. You put out yet another email to people who are inundated with emails, it ain't gonna work. In terms of the new gTLDs and the impact on the organization, I think it's going to have a large impact. I'm not prescient enough to know what it is. My gut feel tells me that the GNSO is going to be immobilized because of the different players that want to play and the pace in the organization they play. I think the structure and voting thresholds are going to end up making it more and more difficult to create policy. Again, it's going to take more than me talking to fix that but I'm predicting it will happen.

The GNSO has said in public that "No, we think we have it all under control." I think they're dreaming. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan, and since this is an Executive Committee meeting I'll give preference to ExCom members and then if we have time we'll have more people. So next is Carlton, Evan, Dev and Sala – that's the current list. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Olivier – Carlton Samuels for the record. I'm listening to Alan and I'm thinking if you look at all of the symptoms that he identified, the only way that you're going to get over them is with more effort and more work from a group that is already overworked and stretched to the limit. So now, how do you sensibly attack the problem? I mean any management consultant would tell you that what you need to do is to shear, shear, shear, right – cut, cut, cut? Or without actively cutting you will [undoubtedly] get to stasis, which Alan is suggesting is going to happen.

So maybe you can do something actively now or you can wait until it gets to stasis. I would not suggest you wait until it gets to stasis. I think what you need to do is that you have to recognize that the pipe is only so big and you can only get so much through the pipe. And people have been talking all this week about rate limiting, have you noticed? It's come up in three or four different conversations that I've had or listened to – rate limiting, "We need rate limiting." And seriously, you have to start thinking about how you translate that concept of rate

limiting to the various streams that we are involved in now. Because I know, Tijani, you can't split yourself more. It's going to have to happen so it's best to take informed decisions rather than wait until it gets to stasis. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there, and thanks for coming, Dave. I'm going to address a couple of the things that you asked about, one of which I'll do first on the issue of gTLDs. And at least one of the things I've observed at least from the point of view of At-Large, I don't think there's a lot of interest in the fight between different applicants of who gets what with a couple of exceptions. I mean as you know we've been involved with applicant support; we've been involved in the attempt to globalize this, so it's been very unfortunate that there's been so little globalization.

Now there's a difference in viewpoint. I don't think it's totally been a matter of communications; I also think that it's a matter of not quite as much demand as people thought. But moving on from that, when it comes to the issues of the gTLDs I think the overarching concern that I've seen is a general sense of things that diminish public trust in ICANN. And I don't particularly care whether it's digital archery, whether it's digital ultimate Frisbee or it's something else to do with how things are prioritized. I don't care and I don't think too many other people care about how that's done. But the fact that digital archery was put up and then got knocked down, and that you had the problems with the TAS

system – which tool was chosen and which was used or whatever is less relevant than the fact that ICANN took a trust hit in the way that these things were rolled out and in some cases rolled back in.

And so when I'm thinking of what's our stance on how things happen with the New gTLD rollout, a couple things: number one, IDNs, community things, applicant support things – that to us, from what I can see, should be at the top of the queue regardless of whatever other things are threshed out. Fights between speculators are not of particular interest to me. From the end user point of view there's those things that are of higher priority but more than that ICANN has to consider the concept of public trust when it decides to do what it does. And sometimes things are over-engineered, and I tossed the idea out of prioritizing things by putting a jellybean jar counting contest. It sounds stupid but in some eyes it's no more or less sensible than what's been put out so far.

The issue of public trust is simply paramount when it comes to this, and it's not a matter of what purpose you choose but just be sensible about it. Do something that's doable, that's sensible and that builds public trust as opposed to diminishes it.

And on the general level of the burnout and the outreach, Alan said outreach is important. I'd go further; I'd say it's critical in the sense that at least within the At-Large Community… As you know, we're the one bunch in ICANN that does not have a self interest in being here. Most of us have day jobs that have nothing to do with internet governance let alone making money off of this industry. So we're here because we want to be, because we're passionate about it; but the problem is

finding more people like us to share the load. That to me has to be a critical challenge and has to be addressed.

So it's been frustrating, for instance, when we put forward outreach proposals to the ICANN budget process and they keep getting rejected. And the idea is not to have more of the usual suspects come in but to try and have some innovative ideas that go out to areas where you don't find the policy wonks, where you don't find the usual people. That is a huge challenge that we have to get involved. And I was a little disappointed when I heard, I think there was at least three people going up from India and they said "Well, why aren't there more constituencies representing end users?" And I wanted to almost jump up and say "Hello! Here we are!"

Okay, but nobody from the podium answered that. Sorry, I don't mean to raise my voice but I was getting really upset about this because-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Nobody ever answers that. It's always a case of "Oh yeah, you're right – we don't have end users."

Evan Leibovitch: Yeah, and you've got the entire Board that's up on the podium and these people are saying "Well, who's representing the end user in India? We need another constituency." No, the answer is not we need another constituency. It's "Here's those people in At-Large, go talk to them and go become part of the process that's already in place. That answer has to be institutionalized. Sorry, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sebastien, you were on the podium.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, and I didn't answer but you have to, I would like you to understand two things. We were not supposed to talk too much. We were in listening mode. And the second point: I really think don't wait for us. Don't expect anything from us. Do your job. It's much more relevant that somebody from ALAC came to the microphone to say "Hey, we are here and you have your place with us." If somebody says "Hey guys, go to see the other guy in the community" it will be less relevant. It's not to say that the Board can't help but for this purpose I suggest that you go and you struggle with them, because there were a lot of different issues yesterday about… I wanted to talk but as you see, we were short enough on time and we were shut up.

But when the young people came, I was quite upset that they said "We want a constituency within the GNSO." Is it the right place for children to be or for young people to be? I don't think so. But for the people to answer "It's not me as the Board; it's maybe me as an end user or one of yours, but it's not me as the Board – but I think you need to also come in to see [maybe there are other ways."

I was just dreaming yesterday that maybe we can create a Children's, young Advisory Committee? It may be an ALAC young something or whatever, just we need to think out of the box and especially out of the box of the GNSO in this case. And there are a lot of different things that happened yesterday. I urge you to take your voice, put your voice and it

PRAGUE

will be better than to expect a Board member to do it. If you ask me I will do it but I don't think it's strong enough.

Evan Leibovitch:

Sebastien, it's not a matter of one or the other. We're capable of speaking for ourselves. My only point to you and to David is that these answers need to be institutionalized within ICANN, not just at the Public Forum but anytime they come up. Personally I thought the .kids thing was a bit of an act of manipulation but that's a different story, but the immediate answer is when wondering about how to create new things and think out of the box let's see if the existing things can accommodate.

The idea of having a kids' ALS makes an awful lot of sense and could easily be done without having to change a lot of things. Until we've even tried that, asking to create something absolutely new out of the blue seems to not make sense because we're not even using existing mechanisms. At-Large has taken a long time to mature; it's taken a long time to perfect. We've now gone through a round of structural improvements and so on. Let's get the best that we can out of this before automatically trying to invent new things is my point.

But the original message is a matter of corporate philosophy and corporate attitude, that when a question like this comes up not just in the Public Forum but anytime that anyone in staff, Board comes across this, the answer is "We've got something to accommodate this. It was put in place to be able to scale very, very high. Let's make use of it before we start thinking of reinventing wheels. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, everyone. Unfortunately we have a queue that is longer than the amount of time we have for David. We've already spent twenty minutes with you. But I'll just have Dev and Sala because you've been waiting for a long time, first starting with Dev. Sandra, you came five minutes after the…

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: One-minute comments for each so we have three minutes total, thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you; Dev Anand Teelucksingh. David, regarding that we have in place a process, procedure for ALAC to file possible objections to new gTLD applications; however now that the list has now been revealed we have 1900 applications possibly for At-Large to review and so forth, and make comments on the Wiki and so on. I think it now becomes apparent that we now need a little I would say Secretariat support in the sense of being able to coordinate, do the [body] maintenance to upload comments and so forth. I'm thinking… Well, it's hard to predict because right now we've now only started the process. We don't really know how many comments will come in but we have to be able to respond to it in a timely fashion. So I'm thinking someone who could

work on it or let's say have a turnaround of within 24 hours, so when somebody wants to make a comment it appears on the Wiki.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev. The matter was also raised with Kurt because the question is whether it's policy or operational staff that will deal with it. But that has been recorded, I gather. Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcripts. In relation to the policy briefs, David, that you give to the community, to the global ICANN community – it's been very useful. I think the ball is now in our court as ALAC in relation to the working groups that we have in relation to this area, particularly to reference what Alan is saying – the need to create succession and sustainability and that sort of thing.

One of the things I would suggest as an action point would be, and we've done this for the IDN already, is to create a chronology of all the things, of all documents related in that area as far as ALAC is concerned – the working groups – and sort of identify. We've done one for the IDNs and I'm happy to send the template, and I think to the staff, and that can be shared across and feel free to tweak. But the point is we need to have some sort of historical overview account of the development of this policy and it's just about working smart. And David and his team are readily available at any time.

The second matter I'd like to address in relation to the same thing is I found that there's too much discussion… There was very little discussion on substantive policymaking in all the ICANN meetings I've

been to so far, which is very little compared to a lot of you; and I think for people who flew more than 40 hours frankly I consider it a waste of my time. And frankly I would like to see more substantive policy discussion especially with experts and liaisons because there are certain things that just can't happen over email. So we just need to come up with a way to prioritize certain things.

The third thing is, Mr. Chair, respectfully I'd like to remind the ALAC that you are bound by the Rules of Procedure and there's no mention of the Executive Committee in the Rules of Procedure. Therefore, every ALAC member has an equal voice and that's said very respectfully. And that's all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sala. It is for the Chair to also make the choice of the order of speakers, so if the Chair wishes to choose ExCom members first for courtesy of our ExCom I think the Chair can do that. Thank you. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Sandra Hoferichter for the record. I also want to have a brief comment on feeling overworked and overloaded but Alan started and Sala just continued. And it goes pretty much in the same direction as Sala, but I think we have to look on our own schedule, on the ALAC schedule. We are spending too much time with procedural discussions instead of having a substantive discussion. It turned out yesterday that the wrap-up was only one and a half hours, and there was such a great need to discuss the papers and there was no time anymore.

PRAGUE

And honestly, three times a year, one week away from my family, away from my work – I have to use this time more effectively. I'm really fed up with having a discussion about language issues every time three times. There is an open forum which can be attended by all the ALAC members, and it's really better to go to such an open forum to have a discussion with the other community members instead of having it on our agenda again and again and again and again; and serving only the need of some people, but that's another case.

And I really would ask the Chair and the ExCom to rethink our agenda. Please make it more substantial. There was a time when procedural working was needed for the consolidation process of At-Large or of ALAC – I absolutely understand and appreciate that but that time is over. We need to go more into substantial things and need to participate, and this goes pretty much in the direction of what Sebastien said: go out, participate in other community meetings, participate in other open sessions. Raise your voice so that all the others can also here what At-Large is about and have more time to discuss about the joint view, to find a consensus with At-Large which can then be spread out into the ICANN community. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sandra. Points noted. There are two constraints. The first one is the availability of staff, so unfortunately we have some days where it's a policy discussion and unfortunately on that day Policy staff is not available and instead we then have to deal with other issues, such as translation, such as things like that. We've heard of this.

The other thing is I'm not sure whether we've actually made the exact calculation of how much time we spend on policy and how much on process, but I would believe we spend a lot more on policy today than we ever spent before. The process is something which we still need to have but the majority is actually policy. And you might disagree but I think that's looking at it through a prism, a kaleidoscope. There certainly was a lot of policy discussion taking place, mostly taking place in working groups now rather than taking place on an ALAC level. Rinalia to respond?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: I actually agree with her but I think the point about agenda, I think we have a specific template for our meetings because it looks exactly the same from the past two meetings that I have been to; and I think we should re-look at the schedule. And I do understand availability of ICANN staff to help facilitate our discussion is a limiting factor, but I think it's crucial that we are able to find some time. So can we please make an action item to just re-look at the agenda?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, we need last words from David because we have now a full list of people and we cannot go over time in this meeting unfortunately. So as good as the conversation is I'd love to continue, but so David?

David Olive: Thank you very much. My takeaways are I have to spend a little more time with you, one. Two, in terms of the policy topics and policy development process, if indeed we can do some webinar in between or

PRAGUE

if you're going to want to have a particular topic or two that you want to discuss face-to-face we can have a webinar before that, before the ICANN meeting, and then we can bring in the people – it's just a matter of planning, frankly, to get the right staff to talk to you. I got very positive feedback from Margie and Brian on the briefings they had. They enjoyed the interactions and we can do more of that, maybe prefaced with a webinar that may be more time effective.

But I thank you for your comments, and in terms of staffing we understand about the objection process that is now primarily our focus for my staff. We understand that and we're talking to services and others to assist you in that because that's an important function for the New gTLD Program. I think finally what we're doing and I'm trying to now figure out how best to advertise the various groups, and we're trying to get together documents that talk about in short form documents that talk about the various SOs and ACs and their policymaking dimensions; and it brings to mind the various documents you have so pioneered in At-Large – the *Beginner's Guides* and various things like that. And that would be very helpful to spread that around because I too wanted to get up at that Public Forum and say "There's At-Large, there's ALSes, they're local people you should be involved with." And so I'll try behind the scenes as well.

So thank you for taking the time to spend with me and as limited as it was it was very profitable and I enjoyed it. I'll come back if you invite me back. Thank you.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, David. And next-

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Olivier, excuse me. I just wanted to suggest that you add an any other business at the end of all the visitors we have. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, I've got the pointing to the watch. So joining us is Steve Antonoff from the… Oh, Tijani. Sorry, I didn't see you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: This is just to say that I expect in the future we will only talk about issues that concern the people who have come here to talk about specific issues, not about personnel issues, not about ALAC issues or At-Large issues. I had asked the floor from Olivier to discuss a certain point and he actually gave the floor to someone else. So this is just what I want to say – I want to express myself whenever I wanted.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So Steve Antonoff is here, the Director of Human Resources. And Steve, the floor is yours.

Steve Antonoff: Thank you, Olivier. I have a 270-slide PowerPoint presentation, it should not take more than three or four hours and then we'll open up for questions. [laughter]

Evan Leibovitch: Is there music?

Steve Antonoff: Of course, Evan, there's music. So I have obviously no presentation.
                               We did have an open meeting Tuesday evening, and I see a number of
                               familiar faces that joined me Tuesday evening. We do have a travel
                               guideline currently posted, a draft posted open for public comment and
                               there's a number of comments coming from the At-Large community
                               that will be responded to as well when public comments close in mid-
                               July; but in addition to that I more than welcome any further input that
                               any or all of you have and any discussion we might have about
                               improvements in the process going forward.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You're ready for questions?

Steve Antonoff: I am.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alright, thank you very much, Steve. So first is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you, Olivier.   There are quite a few cases I've seen in top
                               leadership at ICANN where the new recruits are presented as citizens of
                               this or that country, Egypt for instance, and if you dig a bit further then

you realize that they're US citizens. Now, I understand that from the point of view of communication that may be an advantage, but I think that we all owe you all – the community – a more truthful portrait of what's happening. So this is just a piece of advice from an old man that I think it would be good to put things out as they are whether it's for Board members, for top leadership, for staff – say things as they are. Don't give false impressions.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Any other questions or comments? There is one which I wanted to take up and that was to do with the visas and travel effectively and visas. One of the problem was several of our members had trouble with their visa applications, always from the same parts of the world; and one thing that I have heard is that the reimbursement for travel to go to an Embassy or go to an organization or location where an Embassy is is not refunded anymore. And I just wanted to have a clarification on this because I didn't quite understand the background to this.

Steve Antonoff: Thank you, Olivier; Steve Antonoff for the record. The challenge that we are attempting to address has to do with the timeliness of receiving responses. What we have learned through the past few meetings is that while there are individuals coming from certain nations or passport holders that have more difficulty in obtaining a visa from certain countries due to the limitations of where our Consulates or Embassies are located, many countries have provisions for processing of visas that can be done via DHL or other methods as long as you start early enough

PRAGUE

in the process. And some of what we are finding is that we have individuals who are late in responding in this process leaving us no choice then but to have to pay for them to travel to another country, and in many instances the cost of them traveling to get their visa exceeds the cost of having them come to the ICANN meeting itself.

So from a budget standpoint we have to balance the difference between these two issues, so we are attempting to address this through some of what we are calling the timeliness of response, and that's in the draft guidelines. If you go back and look at that, in an effort to try and reduce these types of issues we still on an exception basis are paying for travel for certain individuals to go to another country to obtain their visa. But generally speaking, if there is an alternative besides traveling to another country to get their visa that will always be our primary focus. And if the reason the individual is unable to process their visa through another method besides travel is because they were not timely in responding in the first place it does not seem fair to the community that we're spending all of those additional funds just because they chose to not be timely in responding.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. Steve. I'm fortunate enough and blessed enough to come from a country that doesn't have a lot of these visa requirements, but I'm wondering if it is possible to make use of one of a number of services that exist to expedite visas on behalf of people. If you already

PRAGUE

have the passport information that people have sent in from their forms, so if you already have that data in is it not possible to contract with one of these visa services that can tell you and that have already done this work in saying "Okay, we have people from these countries going to this country. This is what is required, this is how far they have to work back, and this is how much can be done without them having to do that?"

I'm fairly aware that there's some third-party contract services, and much like you work with a travel agent for booking the flights – is it not possible to take that bit of a headache off the people and contract to a service that can own this problem and say "Okay, you need to send in a photo to us and do this to us – we will take care of the visa expediting because we already do this." I mean there are services that do this on behalf of other corporate clients. Could you possibly take this headache away from folks and perhaps contract with a service like that that can own this problem?

Steve Antonoff: Steve Antonoff for the record. Evan, that is a very good suggestion. We have actually explored this and when it has been feasible we have actually used such services. What we find is that many of these service providers specialize in travelers from certain destinations as opposed to going to certain destinations. So it would mean actually multiple service providers for the various passport holders that we have; that's not to say it doesn't work, it just is a little more problematic than we initially thought.

The other thing that we've done is we have taken a much more proactive approach through our Meetings Team. When a host city is announced we begin almost immediately working with our hosts and contacting the immigration authorities for the host country in identifying what do we need to do and what can they do to help us. So we had some better success for example, at least from a visa standpoint with Kenya, and some success with Senegal by utilizing this method. We have already started the process of reaching out to the Chinese government in terms of visa processing for Beijing since most travelers to that meeting will require visas.

So we're trying to take a proactive approach in how we address that. Even interestingly enough for Canada we have encountered a most unique situation which I believe I spoke about Tuesday evening, which is that some of the individuals who come to the ICANN meetings who perform services require work permits to come to Canada which is separate from a visa. And we currently are in process to get work permits for approximately 60 people to come to Canada. This includes our translation team, the audio/visual team, the technical people who provide all of the wonderful internet services and all of the other technical services we have here at the meeting.

The alternative would be to hire locally engaged folks who have not experienced an ICANN meeting before and we're reasonably confident that would be a great deal of difficulty for the entire community with the inability to keep up with all the demands of what happens at an ICANN meeting. So we are getting better at being proactive. That's not to say we can't continue to improve, and I think we would continue to look for international services such as you've mentioned – I'm familiar

with a number of them – who have some expertise and who can help guide us. We also usually reach out to the Consulates in Los Angeles: the Consulates for most every major country have a Consulate or an Embassy in Los Angeles and we typically go off and visit with them and ask them as well "Is there some alternative way other than the standard way to process visas?" This is a very important issue.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Just two more people in the queue: first Rinalia and then Oksana, and then I think we'll have to… Okay, and Alan as well.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you; Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcripts. Steve, you're Director of Human Resources. That means you're in charge of staffing, correct?

Steve Antonoff: That is correct.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: As you know, internationalization is very strategic to ICANN and I've been very interested in the diversity of ICANN's staff. And I know that there's been some improvement but can you give me your sense in terms of planning to enhance internationalization of staff and where you are right now?

Steve Antonoff: Another excellent question. As an organization internally we have had a tremendous amount of dialog about how we execute internationalization. One of our challenges for internationalization are those countries where we actually are registered to do business. And while we continue to explore additional registrations, having international staff that are physically sited internationally becomes challenging because in certain circumstances we cannot legally employ them; they must be brought in under some type of a contract role.

So we have recently for example more than tripled the size of our Brussels office, physical office in anticipation of hiring a significant increase in staff in Brussels. I do know that there is discussion about opening an office in Asia and we are trying to identify that city or country where it makes the most sense. And this is a coordinated effort amongst a number of departments. For example, our Legal Department needs to be involved because once we make a decision and go for registration ICANN as a somewhat unique not-for-profit entity sometimes finds that it has a difficult time explaining to a local government why we're a not-for-profit when we appear to have a revenue stream.

So we are absolutely committed to internationalization. In the budget process that we went through for FY13, while there are a significant number of additions to staff the vast majority of those, regardless of what discipline they're in – what I call the outward-facing which would be registry, registrar, compliance; all of those outward-facing activities, policy development – or even the support staff, we are looking to hire folks who are international in the sense of they're not in North America. They're distributed around the globe so that we're covering time zones,

language zones, and the like. And so a significant if not a preponderance of additions to staff contemplated in FY13 are in locations where we have either limited or no coverage currently.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Why must the staff be tied to physical office locations? In terms of ISOC for example, I believe they have officers who are not tied to offices – they can be located anywhere and they can function because it's a virtual organization.

Steve Antonoff: So and we're doing the same thing. There's always that balance between cooperatively working together across time zones and having groups of people who are at least situated with each other that allows communication to work better. So for example, I'll use the Brussels office as an example again. The Brussels office will consist of oftentimes just one individual from a given department.

So within the twenty or so folks working in that office they may represent fifteen different departments within ICANN, but it allows for a coordinated effort within that region of the world amongst them since there's typically a lot of synergy between the Registry Team, the Registrar Team, the Compliance Team, the Legal Department and the like. And by having representatives of those teams working together we find that it facilitates the communication internally.

We also do have a significant number of folks who work independently. When I say "independently" they work out of their home or a remote

PRAGUE

office that they establish, and I expect that that will continue to expand as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. The two last questions, one from Alan and one from Oksana. I'll put Alan first; make it very short. The amount of time we spend on this conversation we won't spend with Akram who has a hard stop. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, two very short statements. You said before on visas "travel to other country." I presume you mean city or country as necessary.

Steve Antonoff: That's correct.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I presumed that's what you meant, just to be clear. One thing which would be incredibly useful and incredibly difficult for you to do no doubt, one of the things that ICANN does not have that makes it very difficult to have your organization is something resembling an organizational chart or reporting relationships. You have developed the most obscure set of titles of directors and senior-type directors and advisers – it took me a while in the GNSO to figure out who was the boss and who reported to the other ones, and from the titles you would have guessed wrong.

It is useful to know, and I understand there's going to be dashed lines and people report to six different people – it would be useful to understand roughly what the structure is for someone who's coming in and trying to figure out how these people interrelate. Your titles are designed to obscure. Give us some other tool, thank you. You don't need to answer.

Steve Antonoff: But I would actually choose to respond to that. So I joined ICANN a little over five years ago and it took me three years myself to understand the titles. [laughter] One of the current activities that we've undertaken is actually codifying titles in a way which are meaningful both internally and externally to the organization, so titles such as Chief Registrar Liaison is now gone. Tim Cole is no longer the Chief Registrar Liaison which has meaning to some people but not most. Tim is now Director of Registrar Services which probably makes a lot more sense.

So he didn't get promoted; we just fixed his title. And we're doing that throughout the organization with the help of our compensation consulting firm Towers Watson who is helping us to identify the titles themselves that make sense in the public domain if you will, that make sense transferrably across other organizations but still reflect what folks do in ours.

The issue of publishing an organization chart has always been hotly debated. It's one that we continue to pursue. We clearly publish all of our staff on our staff page... .Actually we do. If you go to the "About" tab on our website and then click on "Staff," you will see a bio on each

and every person who works for us as a staff member and the photos of many of them.

Alan Greenberg: Forgive me: you will see their name, often not a lot more, sometimes an obscure title. We can talk offline.

Steve Antonoff: We can talk offline. But the answer is so we are in discussions about whether we should effectively post our organization chart.   Most organizations do not because it offers an entree to outsiders to recruit, which is actually a primary reason for not putting up your org chart. But as a transparent organization we have that balance between the needs of the community and our transparency versus some of those other issues.

Alan Greenberg: I don't really care about the chart but some measure of understanding who reports to who would be useful.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. I think we have to go. The last one is Oksana. Every minute we spend talking about charts and so on we're not going to spend speaking with Akram. He is leaving in six minutes' time.

Oksana Prykhodko: Thank you, Chair; Oksana Prykhodko for the record. I would like to return again to the visa problem because I am from Ukraine and Ukraine

may be the most sovereign country from visa problems. It's my fifth ICANN meeting and three times I received my visa via the internet without the help of ICANN. For Singapore it was on ordinary basis for everybody, but for example for Costa Rica and for Senegal, it was made my exceptional basis. I would like to ask ICANN to initiate, to broaden their method of receiving e-visas for a lot of countries. And I would like to say about the Canadian Embassy in Ukraine that this Embassy is famous for not giving an answer in any reasonable terms. So I expect my own visa problems again. Thank you, sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. It's been noted and we don't have time anymore. So thank you very much for coming to see us, Steve.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And now with some day left we have Akram Atallah – welcome – Chief Operating Officer but soon to be CEO. Is that starting pretty soon? He'll be able to tell us all about this. And President, so welcome, Akram.

Akram Atallah: Good morning, everyone, and thank you for having me. It's always a pleasure to meet with the ALAC. So given that I have a meeting at 10:15 I want to just try to get the questions and address your concerns immediately. Thanks.

PRAGUE

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you and the floor is open, and first on the trigger is Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thanks.   Two questions: internationalization and the public interest. First point, internationalization: you're not starting from scratch as a CEO.   There has been a President's Strategy Report years ago, the recommendations of which are still out there – they've never been taken.   Many other things of that report, recommendations, have been taken in the AOC but not about internationalization.   Look at that please.   And then transmit that to Fadi.

Why were we so keen to have another legal entity elsewhere than in California or the United States?   We just had Mr. Antonoff speak to us about personnel problems.   If only that, recruiting really internationally would be much easier elsewhere, for instance Geneva.   I'm not saying this by chance; we studied it for several months and we pinpointed for all sorts of reasons, including fiscal, Geneva would be a sort of "please look at that."

My second point is the global public interest.   With the change of CEO, a change of mood, a change of budget dimension with new income I think it's your duty to look at this afresh.   You are running the risk right now of not only being, but worse being perceived, as becoming more and more an industry association.   This cannot be fixed just by little things in the GNSO and elsewhere.   This is a radical change which is called for.   So please look at this also: a rebalancing act in a very fundamental way, and we can help.   Thanks.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Jean-Jacques, and definitely we'll [reserve] things on the foremost of our mind and we've been very challenged with the globalization because it's very hard to satisfy everybody on a single formula of what it means to be global. But we are continuing to work right now with the Board Global Relations Committee on defining a strategy for globalization. I think that our original idea of putting the different people in different locations and breaking the problem into local problems instead of a global problem is going in the right direction to begin with and it seems that Africa now is taking on the challenge of defining what Africa needs.

So I think if that model works and we can see some progress between now and Toronto I think that might translate into a strategy for all the other regions; and hopefully that will provide a solution from the region to ICANN, and ICANN would just implement it. And I think that would be the right approach.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Rinalia?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the record. Akram, external relations pertaining to the ITU, could I hear some of your thoughts in terms of perhaps improving the relationship particularly with Fadi coming onboard in three months' time?

Akram Atallah: Sure. So I think that having good relationships with everybody is just a good thing to do to begin with. But these things are not always as easy as goodwill. So I hope that we have better relationships with the ITU and I think that Fadi plans to meet with [Hamadouin] as soon as he can and establish a relationship there. And I think in this short period for me to start doing these relationships to change them three months later is not really productive, so I will not actually seek to establish that. But if there is an opportunity I will definitely make sure that we try to move that forwards.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Akram, shall we speak Arabic?

Akram Atallah: Anyway you want.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You may speak in French but in Arabic…

Tijani Ben Jemaa: No, it's just to tell you that you said it's not only goodwill, but goodwill has to be there. And I think that in the pats period it wasn't really there, so please try to go on this way. Another question about the IANA contract…

PRAGUE

Akram Atallah: Hopefully we'll have something to announce soon but right now I can't talk about it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. I do find it interesting, the IANA contract. You pronounced "IANA contract," this acronym and word and nothing comes out, not even whether ICANN has actually submitted something. I would have thought the first thing to communicate to the community is to say "We've worked on it, we've answered the questions which were asked and that's it."

Akram Atallah: So these are, for one reason or another government contracts are weird in that way where you are not supposed to even say that you're bidding on something. And the reason I think for that is they don't want to, because of the defense rules when you're doing defense contracts they have to kind of protect people from being influenced. So they put a gag order on everybody, and so ours is not a defense contract but all the same rules apply the same way.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Which exactly makes the point of why ICANN should be internationalized, because that is just ridiculous, sorry – a personal comment of course, not as Chair.

PRAGUE

Akram Atallah: But even if we would have headquarters… Yeah, that's good. Even if we would have a headquarter in Switzerland the rules of the organism that issues the RFP apply, the contracting authority. So it wouldn't change anything, actually.

Male: What Olivier is saying is that we shouldn't have a contract.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: [laughter] Thank you. Okay, just a few more minutes. Any other questions? Any other questions from around the table? Just a question: are you going to initiate any new programs in the next three months until Fadi takes over or are you basically just steering the ship so that it doesn't hit an iceberg and just trying to steer it away from trouble?

Akram Atallah: So actually I'm trying to kill a few projects…

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Wow, and you wanted to get out of here?? [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Do you need us to supply any ammo?

Akram Atallah: I actually think that the irony yesterday was that everybody was talking about how "We have so much on our plate and we are overworked";

and then right after that "We should develop a project to go look at that." [laughter] So this is part of our problem, is that we tend to keep piling up things on our plate and we don't try to empty the plate or start with a new one, or finish the stuff that we started with. We're always kind of starting projects and they never finish – they just become part of our day-to-day routine and on top of that there are new projects. So this is the biggest challenge that I think we have at ICANN, that we need to kind of put our arms around so that we can close things and say "If we want to change or increase and want to change, it's a new project; not always that continuously projects continue to be alive," because if we do this we are going to get to a point where the community can't sustain itself and the staff has to double every year. It's just not sustainable.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And in the interim period until Fadi Chehadé takes the position, could you describe your working relationship with him?

Akram Atallah: So the good thing is that Fadi is within twenty minutes from the office, so I'm going to try to drag him to the office every day I can. And actually we've already set a few times that he's going to spend one day a week in the office getting ready. We're going to include him in our executive meeting that happens every week so that he's aware of the issues, and when he comes in he can hit the ground running. And if he can spend more time I'm sure we can put more on his plate immediately and get him involved as soon as possible. So the CEO transition is on the top of my priorities as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic, okay. One last question from Jean-Jacques?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: When are you closing the Palo Alto office?

Akram Atallah: Ooh, so right now we're not planning to close the Palo Alto office and we have a contract on the office. I mean we still have an Australia office so…

[background conversation]

Akram Atallah: Yes. So part of our internationalization should be… It's not about office locations but you'd be amazed at how efficient people are when there is an office. And when there is an office and there is IT support, and when there is an office and there is a place where people can go and sit down and talk to other people within the organization – things move a lot faster. Now, having said that we are very conscious about our costs so it's more important for me to make sure that we look at the costs and see when our leases expire if we stay in the same location or we move to a more affordable location – that would be more of my focus because we have a number of people that work out of the Palo Alto office.

And I think that there is a lot of talent in the Bay Area that we can tap if we can leverage this; and it's not a good message to send to the

PRAGUE

organization that we are growing yet we are shutting their office where they are sitting and helping the organization do its work. We should focus on where we need to be in the future and figure out how to use our funds in a most efficient way to get all of that done and not to just concentrate on shutting down here and opening there. There's a lot of costs involved in shutting down offices also that we need to be careful about.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So I gather that the new CEO will have to move to Palo Alto then. [laughter] Okay, just the image of that office effectively is very closely linked. One last from Tijani, and by the way I have to warn you: if you sit here the questions will keep on coming. So it's up to you.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Akram, as a part of the internationalization of ICANN I think that we have to review, to think about the location of the offices of ICANN. My thought is for the efficiency. If we need more than one headquarters we need to think where to put it, and it is not wise to put the majority of the offices in the same country or in the same region. It is an international organization so I think that we have to think about it. I know that it is costly to change, but if we have more than we need we have to close the offices we have that we don't need. But if we need more than that we have to think about the location of where we have to put them, and I think that for an international organization it is not wise to have three or four offices in the United States and in Africa none, and I don't know, none in Asia, etc.

PRAGUE

Akram Atallah: We are in 100% agreement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, and with this thank you very much, Akram, for passing by. And you may now go. Thank you, and certainly we're very pleased to hear of your good working relationship with the new CEO.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And already at the table is Xavier Calvez, Financial Officer with his roving mic. And I'm not going to ask you to sit beside me – you might wish to walk around if you want? You're very welcome to. Okay, you can see everyone, okay. So go ahead, Xavier, you have the floor.

Xavier Calvez: Well, I think that there were two questions just to start with that we had touched on last time, and I suspect that one of them that's very specific – it's one that Tijani had on a specific note on the budget, and Tijani and I did not get a chance to sit down together as we originally intended to look at that. So I would suggest, Tijani, that we do that maybe in the back of this room so that we nail the point; but it's an arithmetical answer that we're looking for.

And I think the other question was the question that Evan had formulated, and I'm going to reformulate it so that I make sure I

understood it correctly and then try to get into an answer. I think your question was about the notion of funds available for organizations rather than projects that are carried out by the staff with the community that are then funded. You may want to…

Evan Leibovitch: I was going more to the target audience rather than who – oh sorry, this is Evan Leibovitch for whatever. What I was getting at more is the target audience. ICANN is very good at reaching out to what I'd call the usual suspects – governance experts, the industry of course knows where to find us, and so on. The biggest challenge, and this is something that has been a concern of mine from the start is how ICANN reaches out to actually At-Large's core audience – supposedly the billions, most of which couldn't even spell DNS let alone knows what it means; people that go to internet cafes and go to sites and they have the trust issues and confidence issues of using the DNS.

We in At-Large badly need to be able to talk to them both as a matter of education and as a matter of a source of new blood. We were talking earlier about how the people within At-Large are being driven insane by the amount of work and there's so little ability to get new people involved to share the workload but also to give different perspectives. So what I was trying to get at before was getting ICANN out of its comfort level and actually trying to reach different audiences.

ICANN makes a great issue and at great expense taking its meetings all over the world, but is there an organized ICANN event to invite the Czech internet users to our meeting, to invite Costa Rican internet users to San Jose – not just as an At-Large event but also to invite ISPs, to

involve other people? So you've got this great travelling roadshow that ICANN does at great expense and there's part of me that feels that there's a great wasted opportunity in not being able to use this as an ability to outreach to people who don't know where to find ICANN or who don't even know what ICANN is.

I'll leave it at that but that's sort of the challenge I've been talking about. It's a difficult one but I think it's absolutely necessary.

Xavier Calvez:

So I have difficulties trying to answer your question because my role is to carry out the budget, and it's a fairly – let me put it this way – technical, process-driven role. So I have zero issue or concern with anything that you just said. I don't yet know how to answer from a budgeting standpoint the translation of what you just described.

Evan Leibovitch:

Then I can be specific. When it comes time into the budget process, I don't know how things are coming in from other parts of ICANN but at least from ALAC there's the budget process: we give in proposals for projects. And sometimes it's difficult to understand the rationale that's used for the prioritization of what is accepted and what is rejected. I simply mean I know of a couple of projects that have gone, shall we say, outside the box and targeting ICANN at unusual and unfamiliar audiences; and these proposals have tended to be rejected. That goes to that.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you, it's helpful to make that link. So we have effectively, and I think to just complete the description that you just did, you're referring to the fact that as part of the answers to some of the requests – this year I think we have said that some of the requests were not given priority in funding and therefore rejected on the basis of it's not the usual suspects that you were mentioning earlier.

So there's a technical answer to that and then there's a more substantial answer, and I think we need to look at both. The technical/practical answer is that with limited resources we need to prioritize, but I'll leave it at that. It's always the same thing – you have limited funds, not everything fits into it, fine. That's a process standpoint.

The question that you asked is one that, when we looked at the requests, though the principle saying we put at a higher priority for this specific process, for that specific list of requests, the funding of activities that can happen at ICANN meetings has a certain logic; but also has the inherent consequence of saying "Well, if we want to do outreach then that principle suggests that you have to do outreach at ICANN meetings," which is possible but also potentially counterintuitive.

So the only thing I would say is that I think we need to be able to expands our horizon, so I agree with the idea of we need to find ways to be able to do that. I think the budget is the downstream step of achieving that because I feel that there is still a formulation of the outreach exercise, and we had conversations on outreach before on where the outreach process is in terms of progress and status and so on – and I know there's a little bit of progress from that perspective in the

last two weeks and at this meeting. But I would as a technical answer to budgeting beside the process that we have talked about and that we've lived through of the SO and AC additional budget requests; so that one exists.

And as a channel I think that anything innovative or outside of what fits well into established priorities is something that we need to funnel through, in my view the process of outreach so that it becomes more of a priority – do you see what I'm saying; so that it raises to the level of when we have to make choices it makes it in rather that out. So what I'm trying to say by that is I have the impression we need to be able to establish a bit further, to mature and formulate a little bit further and more precisely a priority in a group of ideas that translate into actions; that then we can say "Okay, we have momentum, we have critical mass on that specific subject and we have a little bit of a plan." And then we can go with it.

So putting it into different words, maybe the idea that those requests we were formulating this year were a little bit too avant garde-ish for our old fashioned model of budget approval to yet make it… I have the impression we need to, you see what I'm saying? And hopefully I know I'm providing a little bit of a conceptual and a general description but I have the impression we need to mature those a little bit more to then have a chance to look at them differently.

I'm even thinking that if we think once we have an outreach bin that where those fit well, that are the translation of agreed-upon approaches to do outreach, then maybe outreach funding is something we should even take out of the SO and AC additional budget process to

PRAGUE

have its own focused [kind of thing]. I think that would be the natural in my view evolution to this, right? The SO and AC additional budget process is only I guess an exception process to allow to catch what has not already been caught. In my views, outreach is a major activity that we need to ensure happens. I don't know how it's going to be formulated when it matures but it would make sense to me that it has its own momentum and process and approach for funding.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Xavier, and you know, the small concern: we hear this and then comes a small request for a trip, €500, and the request is denied. "Oh, sorry." Now €500 is less than a dinner for three people in a restaurant that took place earlier this week. It's just ridiculous; it's peanuts. Our community gets that and says "Okay, I'm not going to beg for €500 or $500, I'm going to pay for it out of my pocket," but I don't think it's fair that they have to pay for it out of their pocket if it's business where they are actually bringing ICANN into forums out there.

And I know that it might be an allocation or something but perhaps there should be an allocation of a certain amount of cash, a discretionary fund that is there for these specific cases that are not related to specific projects but related to these things. I know several people around the room who have paid out of their own pocket. Rinalia?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the record. Two issues: the first one is about budget planning and the assumptions that are related to it; and the

PRAGUE

second one pertains to a lack of clarity at least at the working level about approvals. So going back to assumptions, in trying to develop a budget you need to have a set of working assumptions and it's very important, otherwise the budget that you plan for will go way off the mark or under the mark.

In the last process that we engaged in, which was my first experience, people didn't know where to gauge it. People either under-budgeted it and as a result there was a lot of surprise when the results came out that "Oh, we actually got funding for some of this." So what I would like is clarity for the next phase – should we aim for something similar or more? Can you give some guidance on that?

And the second issue that I want to raise is about this lack of clarity about approvals. I'll give you a concrete example: APRALO has submitted a request for budget, some of it has been approved. We have a meeting that we can organize somewhere and I think there is consensus that we will organize it at the IGF in Baku. So the question is what is this budget for and who gets to decide what we use it for? There is, I asked around – there is an opinion that this is a budget for an ICANN event at IGF and it is not for funding our RALO members to either participate or be ambassadors of ICANN at this meeting. And I think that's just wrong because Global Partnerships would have its own budget to finance official ICANN meetings or whatnot… Exactly. So those are my two issues.

Xavier Calvez: I think that trying to address your first comment first. We need to, I think we've made progress this year on the formulation of the process

of the budget requests and that comes and goes with having an understanding of what the process was last year which you didn't have and I didn't have either. So we've tried to make progress on making more clear the criteria and the process around that and the communication of the results; and I think that we need to improve further on two things: on providing probably more rationale to the conclusion of the decision process and transparency in the decision process, and also trying to work out the answers – and I'll clarify – to the next step.

So you're taking the example of the IGF Baku event. What we have seen in a number of the requests is a number of people, a number of organizations have requested to be able to go to the IGF and do a certain number of things at the IGF – not only the APRALO but a number of organizations. And ICANN already had funding for a number of activities at the IGF, a number of travelers and staff and I think there's a few more members if I'm not mistaken…anyway, already something.

So we said rather than looking at everything in a slice and ignoring whatever else is happening at the same event, why don't we try to gather these objectives, see which ones are common and try to enable those who want to go for their purposes with an additional budget so that there's more people who can go, they can do whatever they want; and at the same time there's a number of ICANN objectives that can be achieved by these organizations in addition to their outreach. So it kind of does two or three things at the same time and it's synergies.

This is about as much as has been formulated for now as part of the answer. So what I'm getting at is when we know, but who will – and it

needs to be worked out so we can achieve that. So the only thing we've tried to say with the answer to the requests is because there are several requests of the same nature, what we want to do is ensure that we try to bring together those requests at least for their common purposes so that we fund people to go there and try to achieve as much as possible those purposes; and make a synergies of the various pieces of [founts] there to try to do at least something.

So what has not yet been formulated is how we're going to do this in the practicals I guess, in terms of "Now we need to lay out a process to say okay, so who wants to do what and how many people does that require?" so we determine how many people want to go from each organization for work purposes, how many meeting rooms do we need, what's the process to define within each organization who comes and who doesn't, and so on and so forth. So the logistics I would say of putting in place this meeting – that we haven't done and it is not formulated as part of the answer, and I suspect that's why you have your question.

So it's a matter of sequence of formulating an answer, and I recognize it's not always intuitive but when you publish a budget like we have on the 27th of June, a lot of what's been put into this happened in May or in April, or before. And there's a sequence of events to finalize budgets, to review it with management, with the BFC, with the Board and some that bring those steps back in time. The only reason I'm saying that is just as a qualification of when you find yourself in April you don't know what's going to be approved/not approved. You formulate an idea but you don't necessarily go all the way down to the next steps of every single

PRAGUE

step of what is going to take to achieve this? So that's the part we haven't done.

I think next time we need to go one step further into the formulation of what the answer is, not necessarily for planning purposes but for clarity of what will be in it. So that's the two aspects that I think we need to improve upon next year. Thank you.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Just a quick follow-up: timing is very important. We have four months, yes three if you really count for preparation.

Xavier Calvez: So just on that we had a discussion, I can't remember if it's in Dakar or San Jose – I think it was in Dakar with Tijani in the same circumstances with the fact that the timing of the budget approval creates… Which by the way, it's not that bad that it's approved before the beginning of the year – I've seen worse – but it creates a lot of pressure on anything that's supposed to happen in the first few months of the year. So that's one of the issues that I'm expecting, I'm not trying to push back the responsibility but I expect that the few people who will look at the timeline of the budget as a result of the meeting that we had on Wednesday on budget improvements. There's a number of people who are going o work on the overall timeline, the scheduling of the budget process and Tijani is one of them. I suspect that this is an element that we should look at.

What I mean by that is you approve the budget on the 28th of June of the 26th of June, what about things that are supposed to happen in July?

So it's already too late to schedule anything in July. So I'm expecting that as part of this process we will try to address that specific subject. What if, and I'm not trying to preempt the ideas that will be formulated as part of this discussion, but what if we try to formulate an interim decision making process relative to specific actions, and that we approve from a budgeting/funding perspective earlier in the year but in a limitative manner?

So what if we say "Well, there's three or four meetings that happen in the first four months of the fiscal year, between July and October; and those meetings, there are potentially requests for them from the community or there are also staff planning in some – why don't we just look at those specific aspects and in a limitative manner we preapprove the budget or we just approve the budget?" We have regular meetings with the BFC; we can potentially…

[break in audio]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you for that.

[break in audio]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: …Toronto events asked for less money than they could have asked for, and the concern I possibly have is that the community is so hurt already

PRAGUE

by previous processes that today it is scared to ask for large sums of money and has actually toned down on its requests for fear of not getting anything at all. And I know that this is what's happened specifically in Toronto.

I don't think that's right. I think that if something serious is not done by the Board Finance Committee and working with you to put this right in FY14 there will not be any requests in FY15 because there won't be a community. We still have three more people in the queue – Tijani, Carlton, and Jean-Jacques. We're really running short of time so Tijani, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Olivier. First of all, Xavier, my question is answered in the adopted budget. By the way, ExCom members have in their Skype chat the link to the adopted budget. So the question is answered.

But the other question is not answered since you still speak about the non-ICANN events and yet you have approved an international meeting on January, 2013, out of the ICANN meetings. So it is a long discussion, we spoke a lot about it but I think especially for a RALO who asked for not a lot of money – it was nothing really – and your answer is no because it is a non-ICANN meeting. And this is frustrating for this RALO. Coming back to the question of Rinalia, if a RALO didn't ask for money, if a RALO asked for a specific activity and it was very well detailed in the request, so we know exactly what the money will be used for according to the request of APRALO. So there is not any confusion I think. So I will stop there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani. Next is Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair – Carlton Samuels for the record. I've heard this and it reminds me of what the fellow – [Elliot Ness] was he? – said the other night. It comes back to me. Did you hear Elliot Ness? No, Noss, Noss, Elliot Noss. He made a point of saying "You know, what we have here is an organization that seems to be turning over itself to be so, so perfect, and perfection is the enemy of the good."

We have a problem with uncertainty, and what I find is ICANN is becoming more like a public service, like a government budgeting thing that you have to get one year ahead; and if it's not one year ahead in the budget you can't do anything about it. ICANN has to make that middle ground between a private corporation and a government, and that means it has to step up to the plate to manage uncertainty. To me, it makes no sense if you say that we are in this enterprise to promote a specific outcome that you can't approve a €500 request for an outcome that we are all agreed. It doesn't make sense. To me that is a failure to manage uncertainty.

And if we hear this over and over again and it says… The only thing I'm going to ask is who decides? Where is the decision point in that process because you don't have a good process for going in. Once it gets in the bucket, that's when it becomes real fuzzy because you don't know how it moves through the funnel and you don't know where the decision point is. And that is where the uncertainty management comes in. And

to me, all of this talk I've heard for many years is that we're not doing a good job of managing uncertainty to make sure that the outcomes that we all agree are useful happen. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thanks.   One quick comment, one simple question.   The comment, Xavier: you're the first CFO in a long, long time who comes not with a defensive attitude. Thank you; congratulations.

My question: say that although it has not been programmed for a long, long time – it is a short-term request – there is a necessity felt in the ALAC that certain views should be defended at some international meetings at Baku, let's say about the concept of improving ICANN; a sort of ICANN new style. This isn't a great expense. My question is who actually decides? Is it you as CFO, or at what level is it? In other words, who must we convince for small sums without them being in the program a long time ahead?

Xavier Calvez: So first of all I've heard three times the notion of small expense – it should be easy enough. So part of the decision making, elements of making a decision, the amount is one of them but the amount is not the only element that should determine whether an expense should happen or not. So I've heard the notion of $500 or €500, and I do not know what we're talking about and I will not try to comment on an expense

PRAGUE

that I don't know any circumstances about. I am only making the point that the magnitude of the expense is only one of the elements that enters into the decision of making the expense or not.

If we would be in a private corporation, the decision making process of a small amount is easier than the process of a big amount; and even a big amount is potentially easier than….No, in a private corporation than the same amount in a multi-stakeholder model.   And that's part of the issue, is that we need to ensure…. But I think, I'm not disputing the fact that…

[background conversation]

Xavier Calvez: No, but I'm answering several questions at the same time is the issue, and I will not ignore your question and I will try to answer it. But three people differently have mentioned the notion of "It's €500 so why isn't it approved?" It's not approved potentially because the amount is not the only element that enters into the decision making process for an expense. And if I would throw $500 at my limo trip you would have a problem with it and you should. So it's not only a matter of amount.

So to try to answer more specifically the question from Jean-Jacques, thank God it's not me making the decision. And I do recognize two things. One, it appears as if I'm the one making the decision because we, Finance, spit out the outcome of the budget process. So one, there's an appearance of that. Two, whether I like it or not there is an influence that I – but Finance, generally speaking – bring into the

decision making process. If I enable the process and if I wanted to create a formalized process for the AC and SO budget requests this year it's so as to help in removing Finance from the decision making process. And I know I'm not yet answering Jean-Jacques questions but I will.

Last year, the SO and AC budget requests have been decided upon by Finance at midnight or 1:00 in the morning by lack of having been able to formulate a process to allow decision making in a structured manner, and that is something that I absolutely want to avoid happening again. So we have tried to formulate a process with criteria and so on so that we make that a little more substantial, a bit more structured and a bit more predictable and understandable. So where we need to be able to close the loop better is what I've said earlier about that the rendering, the formulation of the conclusion – what is it, effectively?

So coming back to who makes the decision: we have used the help of a number of people in the organization, in the ICANN staff, to help formulate the decisions. It's involved staff across departments, it involved the Global Relationship Department; it involved the Stakeholders Department, it involved the Policy Department who provided input into the assessment of the criteria and the formulation of possible answers and elements to make a decision on the requests.

At the end of the day, we've taken that input and when I say "we" it's we as the Finance staff – we've gathered that input. And unless the input was not coinciding together, meaning that the input we received was disparate which has been not often the case – most of the input has been concluding to the same thing – we have gone by that decision

process, right. So no, not me – it's just we have an input that says "This makes more sense."

Now, I recognize by formulating it better and formulating that decision for that request better we will also make more transparent the thought process about it. You've talked about flexibility before – I'd just like to remind everyone, and I'm not trying to dismiss the importance of what we're talking about and I think I have proven that I have given importance to it this year. But we're talking right now for those requests, about 600 or there is 666 this year or 700 that we're riding at this year, this is 1% of the budget process. So I want to make sure that we don't over-engineer either a process that, by distracting… I don't want to have to put an FTE behind supporting this process if you understand what I am saying.

So I don't want to over-engineer it either but I recognize that we need to formulate a little bit better the decision making process. To finalize a response to Jean-Jacques, I think that between the Policy Department, the Stakeholder Department, the Global Partnerships Department, the Kurts, the Davids, the Robs, the Heidis and the people you are in contact with, that you interact with at the meetings – those are the people who provide input into it. Sometimes I have my opinion and I'm not putting it into the balance. I shouldn't, right? Why should I as a holder or guardian of the process also be judging? You see what I'm saying? So I want to remove myself from that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Closing words from Evan. You just want to connect the dots?

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there.   As I'm listening to all the comments there's a number of very, very common themes and a number of common threads that go off in slightly different directions but have a very, very similar point that actually started, Olivier, when you made your comments at the beginning. And I'm going to suggest maybe possibly as a takeaway from this that you might want to consider something that may be totally inappropriate here but it's never stopped me before – and that is to make a suggestion that would ask for what I'd call an educated leap of faith. And by that I mean, given the fact that we now celebrate our tenth year in At-Large, we have our own Budget and Finance Committee; we've demonstrated to ICANN that we're capable of acting in a mature and professional manner-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Tenth year of ALAC, not At-Large.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, sorry. That we've achieved a certain level of maturity – we've gone through our own improvements process, we've demonstrated to ICANN that we're capable of doing things intelligently. Is it possible, almost as an experiment to suggest the idea of a discretionary fund that could be used within certain specific parameters: it must be outreach, it must be this, it must follow certain accounting procedures that are transparent and accountable to the community but are within the discretionary range of ALAC itself?

And that's what I mean by the educated leap of faith: something that allocates perhaps to start with a small amount of money so we're not arguing about €500 here and about this little outreach thing here, and we're taking some of that as you've said yourself out of budget and out of these midnight meetings and putting it into the hands of the people that would most benefit and would be most responsible for doing it? I'm suggesting that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Xavier doesn't need to answer right now. It's something that we should take as a takeaway, perhaps send it to you in writing.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, I was going to suggest that we try to formulate that further. I don't think that's the first time it's been formulated, and not only here either. So I think it's important that we can try to nail down that idea. There are technical aspects to the answer but I'm sure what we do with this idea should not only be the result of technical answers. The reason I am saying technical answers, I will go very quickly, is that the ICANN fund management operates under a corporation and there are fiduciary aspects to managing the finances of that corporation. And I know very well of it because I can go to jail, and not only me but me first I would say. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Sebastien over there but for other reasons, maybe.

PRAGUE

Xavier Calvez: Yes, but Sebastien, I don't care if Sebastien goes to jail and I care if I do. [laughter] But again, that's only a portion of the answer, and I think we need to formulate that better and also bring in more ideas, because mine are certainly the premise of the discussion. So I think there's more to say about that and more than just with you guys, right? I mean this is a tool that you're talking about and there is a philosophy behind it. So I think this is something that maybe warrant more discussion across several organizations.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm sorry to cut you off but we are about to lose interpretation. Sebastien wanted to say three words: you have thirty seconds, Sebastien, and then we have to go quickly through the action items which will take us one minute. Sebastien?

Sebastien Bachollet: Yeah, just I understand that you are pushing for the [black side] of the situation but at the same time I would like you to take the bright side of what is Finance. And if I read well the budget there are two meetings next year, and these two meetings have the possibility for each of the RALOs to have a General Assembly, and organize it, do it.   And the question for the next year is what you want to do, and I'm saying what we want to do. But we discussed about a second Summit and it's now that you want to start to think about that, because if it's not the case the first meeting of the next year, by the schedule it's in July in Africa if I am not wrong. Then take the positive part of the process, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sebastien, and thank you very much Xavier for joining us and we will be of course following up with you after this. Have a good, safe trip home.

Xavier Calvez: Thank you. Thank you for the invitation and thank you for allowing me to get your feedback.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well done. A few action items that we have to go over, and we're going to have to do this rather fast because we're about to lose interpretation. Or maybe we have lost interpretation… I hear "stop" in my ear.

So ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session I, we have a formal vote of thanks to At-Large staff for their work on the ALAC Improvements Project is to occur during the wrap-up session – and we didn't have that vote. That's an interesting one, so we'll have to have an online vote that will follow up. It's a formal vote of thanks so I think we should have an online vote. Of course that's a bit unfair isn't it to our staff, making them have to do an enormous amount of work. So by consensus, should we say "acclimation" rather than "vote" here?

[Applause]

PRAGUE

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I wanted to see Matt's face when I asked for the online vote – priceless. [laughter] Okay, so I have to thank the interpreters. I think we all have to thank the interpreters for having spent this much time with us.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You've done a great job all week and really I don't know how you do it, but well done. Tijani is telling me I have to thank also – no, no, you guys have to stay for a few more minutes, please. Wait for your thanks, yeah. [laughter]

So next the Technology Taskforce is to look at the development of a Wiki page with its links to new Wiki pages, and so don't look at me – I'm just the person who reads these. But Dev is here so that's pretty good, so Dev, maybe you will have to be able to help us on this one. The Technology Taskforce is to look at the development of a Wiki page with links to new Wiki pages. I remember what it's about – let's jog your memory.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Okay, I think – thanks Olivier; Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Regarding that, the question was raised on the Technology Taskforce mailing list that it seems that to get access to information on the At-Large Wiki requires a lot of drilldown. And when you compare the GNSO Wiki space and the At-Large Wiki space I think it's not easy to find – you actually have to

PRAGUE

know where to start in order to drill down, and I think that's the disadvantage. So I think it was just an offer to help staff to try to figure out what is that optimal layout. That's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. So next, the ALAC Policy Discussion Part II: Silvia Vivanco is to follow up at the next Secretarial meeting and ensure that the necessary ASO information has been distributed.

Silvia Vivanco: Yeah, so basically what I would like to know is when if you are all the RALOs, when you will have the next Secretariat meeting. And one proposal was to have this Secretariat meeting monthly, to have a more frequent communication between the RALOs. So I think we are going to move forward with that if it's okay?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I think monthly would be too much because we have a lot of other calls. Sometimes we have three calls a week, so and… [laughter] Actually really it's seven calls a week, but we may do a call every two months.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Wolf?

Wolf Ludwig: Every two months.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich;   Heidi Ullrich for the record if I may – just because of the session, the way the meetings are set up if we could have it just every two months but particularly one month prior to the next meeting.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic, okay.   So next, the ALAC Executive Committee: At-Large meeting agendas at ICANN meetings should include more time for policy discussions.   If I can add an additional thing, maybe this can be one of our metrics: find out how many hours of our meetings are taken on policy discussions and how many in process discussions.   I absolutely hear what you say, Sandra, and I sometimes also feel like we are getting so bogged down in process; and a lot of people in many parts of ICANN also think that.   If we actually calculated the amount of time and found out if we are doing better or worse it would be a good thing.   Sandra?

PRAGUE

Sandra Hoferichter: May I just make a small addendum to what I said before: what I meant is the policy discussion within At-Large, not having presentations by others – this is important. But it could be less done sometimes, and I figured out during the wrap-up meeting that a discussion among us is so fruitful and it's so much better than doing it on a mailing list. And we need more time for that. And also I think working groups need more time onsite. Spoken for my project, the ICANN Academy, having only one hour was far too little. I would have needed actually two meetings or two hours or something like this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, just as a point: you know that you have the official meeting; you can also ask for small rooms and you have to ask staff. So for any of you who wish to conduct additional meetings, and some of you have, you can ask staff for small rooms for ad-hoc meetings to take place. I have Rinalia, Tijani, and then we have Cheryl. Rinalia?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia for the transcript record. I think that our meetings are over-agenda'd and there is not enough space to actually go into the substance of it. That's one thing. In terms of the requests for more time for working groups, it's not about getting the rooms or whatever it is but it's actually the conflict with other things that are happening. And it's really frustrating to start something and not be able to drill down.

And I think that one of the suggestions I had in one of the breakfast discussion is that when I look at our meeting agenda it is templated, it fits a particular format.   You have certain procedural things that

introduce ALAC and At-Large members to some aspects of ICANN work which we do not need to repeat at every ICANN meeting. And I think that you can do that perhaps once every year because you have new ALAC members coming in, and then for the second and third meeting you don't need to have that any more and leave that space for the policy discussion.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes. Yes, you're right – we need more discussion about policy. But the problem is that this format, one week of meetings at ICANN, will make us always in conflict between meetings of ALAC and other meetings which are very important also. And also we don't have time to go deep in the policy discussion. Usually you come here only to approve something; not to discuss. If we want to discuss a policy, a point about the policy we have to define a meeting for it and then we will discuss it completely. But in our sessions we cannot develop an advice about policy during our meetings.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Thank you, Tijani. Oh, you wanted another thing? Well, just as an answer the wrap-up we've already spoken about: we are thinking of extending it to two hours rather than 1.5 hours and also have each policy discussion instead of 90 minutes also extended to two hours. So that will effectively… Once people get into the discussion, the

PRAGUE

heat of it it's very hard to stop it. And I'd like to let discussions stand [and run]. Rinalia?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thank you, Cheryl, for letting me speak first. The liaisons, the Policy liaisons that we have, it is so important to have time discuss with them. And I think that if you bundle them together with the RALO Chair report it's not of the same level of significance where policy is concerned. And I would like a separation and dedicated attention to what the liaisons have to tell us in the discussions on that.

And I would really like to have the liaisons in the room because there is no point in saying "Okay, we have a liaison report and they are at ccNSO or IDN," so we shouldn't have it at that time. But I know that the problem is we have the Public Forum and you want to have inputs for that, so can we have some creative ideas in terms of how to deal with this?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, this time around we pushed the RALO reports away to get a bit more time. But yes, it was a struggle, a real struggle; and sitting from where I'm sitting it was a real struggle – you can see the sweat. It was Cheryl, she's been waiting for a while, and then also there was Wolf; and then after you, Tijani.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier – Cheryl here. A couple of things: one of the things that worries me deeply, and Sebastien, I hope you are accidentally

PRAGUE

listening to this very, very….ahem. One of the things that worries me, in fact terrifies me about the new format failures that I think it has had and will be explored of the four-day rather than the five-day meeting, is the fact that the world that is ICANN the structure still sees this at a meeting of the ICANN Board that some public participation and interaction is wrapped around. And I genuinely fear for when the finish happens Thursday that then we are constantly getting squeezed more and more.

It was Tuesday and I was hearing ccNSO people saying "We've lost a day, there's too much clash, blah, blah, blah." But let's assume for all the good reasons these changes were experimented in, with when more does what and how it interacts; and there's a lot of worth in that. What if it was really clear to Meetings, community, to all of us that Friday is still a working day? We could in fact be having several sessions which could be work group or policy or whatever.

I'm not going to throw the baby out with the bath water and say what I do or don't think should work based on one experience, but I'm very aware that we've tried shorter meetings before and we know that didn't work. This is a different format but I think it is de facto resulted in a shorter meeting. But we also need to control in future plans for meetings, perhaps specific subject material so what doesn't happen – and believe me, it happens to me in a shattering number of recurring events; I feel like *Groundhog Day* should be my life. I go from room to room and I hear the same conversations and the same discussions and the same debate in different fractions of space.

And gee, I don't know – all here, one time, large room available? Maybe that would work. So there's a lot of working smarter not harder that can be done. But I do believe that the opportunity for things like work-shopping things is incredibly important.

I just want to pick you up on the liaisons. You've got to remember that your liaison role is to be your voice in that space. So what you should be doing and I think that is what you asked for, is to have us report back to you at a point in time which gives sufficient time for us to engage and brief you. Maybe it should be earlier in the process; maybe we should have a month of Sundays to do it. And I think that would be great.

Might I just say, though, because of other reporting commitments because of the way these agendas get up, I basically have failed you other than in work group representation this meeting as a ccNSO liaison and I find that very, very difficult. I found that very, very hard. I missed two work days equivalent out of three days of what I should be doing. I did your work groups; I did as much as I could do but you actually had me in this room far, far, far more than I should have been. It had to be done, I'm not regretting it, but-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Understood, Cheryl. There's been a lot of work done by working groups as well, that's one other thing as it should be. Certainly the shortening of the ICANN week is also something which I've heard from others as not being such a good idea. We have more work, less time – easy to find the answer. So I still had Wolf I think, and then after Tijani, and then after that Alan and we can finish with Sebastien with closing words.

Wolf Ludwig: Yes, thanks Olivier – it's Wolf Ludwig for the transcript record. I just wanted to underline what has been mentioned by various other speakers, and we had by the way a lot of off-side discussions. It's my [50th meeting] now and…

[Applause]

Wolf Ludwig: And after such a tournament you necessarily due some reflections about economy, how to organize meetings in the best way. And when I stepped in I saw all the work done by At-Large staff and especially Cheryl to get the things smoothly working, to have a lot of space for rules and procedures and things like this; to have this settled.

This was a necessity at the time and it's in these briefings that some bad habits were introduced, like we have had – I looked back, almost at every ICANN meeting we had a briefing on translation services. What a boring thing. When I need a document translated I do this bilaterally, say "I need this" but I don't waste every ICANN meeting for 10 or 15 or 20 minutes for repetitive briefings with the same people. And we have heard for the fifth, the seventh or the tenth times the same stories. This is such a waste of time. It's getting so tiring. It's getting so boring.

[background conversation]

Wolf Ludwig: Please cut them down to the minimum or even zero. If we need a briefing we will ask you and give more space for policy discussions. That is so often made from Alan reporting back from the GNSO with political issues. I would like to have a discussion on this point. So concentrate on substance and reduce rules, procedures, and routine to the minimum.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you very much. Coming back to the liaison, you're right, Rinalia – we need to deepen perhaps some aspects of their reports. But their reports are on the Wiki and everyone has to read their reports, and then if I find that there is a point that I need to deepen first I go to the liaison by email, by Skype and ask him about it. And if I find that it is a concern for the At-Large, for the end users I ask to put it on the agenda for our meetings. This is the way we can work. We cannot, our meetings cannot be dedicated to deepen all the policy issues. We're only here, we're only adopted to discuss briefly the issue but if you want to deepen it we have to read it. All is on the Wiki.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. We still have a queue – next is Alan. Alan, would you cede your place to Rinalia for reaction to Tijani's question?

Alan Greenberg:	I'll cede the order but not my place. [laughter]
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Well, [speaking French] as we say in French, which is just extend your…
Rinalia Abdul Rahim:	Thank you, Alan, I'll be very short.
Evan Leibovitch:	He's tired.

[background conversation]

Rinalia Abdul Rahim:	This is Rinalia. Just on the point that Tijani raised, the issues are interrelated. So it's okay to say the report is there and you can read it and you can have bilateral interactions with the liaison itself; but you must have an opportunity to be able to discuss it and then you can take whatever you want from it. You can either close it, okay and we don't have to discuss it anymore. But I feel that opportunity is missing and so we're not connecting the dots. That's all.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you. Next is Alan.

Alan Greenberg:	Okay, a few things: I think we have the same problem with our face-to-face meetings as we have with our teleconferences. We try to put everything on the agenda, we try to be egalitarian and talk about everything and as a result we don't have enough time, we go over every time whether it's a face-to-face meeting or a teleconference. There are huge parts of our meeting that I feel we need to short circuit. I'm not going to spend time here talking about it; if anyone cares about my opinion I'll be glad to provide it.

If we need more time… And forgive me, but I presume you met with Language Services this time again, and there are a whole bunch of things that really we just reiterate what we did last time. And we need to get rid of those. In terms of real substantive discussions, if we're going to allow a discussion we have to allow it; we have to allocate a reasonable time. You don't have a substantive discussion with people giving opinions in a ten-minute slot. It doesn't happen. It isn't even enough for the preamble to describe what you're going to talk about.

If we need more time yes, I know we have freed up Fridays. I 'm fried. If Friday was an official day that we had planned for it would have been okay. If we want more time, and this is not a good idea for the GNSO because I have meetings on Saturday but if you want more time work ahead of time. Come in early and have a half day to talk about some policy issue or whatever. That's a much better idea. I don't know how I would ration my time between the GNSO and that if we did that, but I think for the overall group it's a far more likely way to succeed and end up with decent discussions when people aren't just tired.

But the bottom line it comes down to is managing our time and deciding what it is we need to discuss. I can think of several ways that we could not go over the policy calendar every time we meet in ExCom and in ALAC. They may not have all of the benefits of what we do right now but I think we'd get most of it without spending large amounts of time. In a typical ExCom call, which I'm not obliged to sit through but I'm a masochist and I join, we normally use almost the full allocated time before we come to any discussion of specific things that need discussing. The same is often true with ALAC calls and the same is true here.

So we've gotten better; we are much better than we were two years ago. Those of you who weren't here, you can't imagine. We have learned more but we still have to refine it because it's a real drain to… When I read on my calendar, and I still have a paper calendar, an ALAC call whether it's an ExCom or a regular ALAC call I assume it's going to go an hour to two hours over. That's not a good way to manage. Sorry for taking too much time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And you've gone over your time limit as well. [laughter]

Alan Greenberg: I thought that's a requirement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You've qualified! Next, Tijani, did you want to say… No, I think I can pass directly to Sebastien or do you…

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much. I will not discuss about At-Large, ALAC and the ExCom calls but about what Cheryl is saying. I just can sympathize. I struggle not to suppress the Friday, but if there is trouble without the Friday – it is organized to fix that or to change that or to organize something else; but not to have one half-day less. Because what's happened, and I was maybe one of the few to say that is that we need part of what is happening on Friday to happen in public. And we decided not to do the Board, okay, but I don't know if you were at the session of the ISO – a very short fifteen minutes just before one of the new gTLD sessions, and it was what usually you do in two minutes in the report on Friday. And I would like to urge you to ask for such a spot to give fifteen minutes' feedback on what you are doing, where you are in front of the community and please, try to find a very important session just after.

And to be a bit late like that, the room will be full and you will be able to reach out to a lot of people in this community because one of the problems with the Friday is yew, we were not reaching out because nobody was in the room. But you deserve to have this feedback. My take is that you are quite exemplary with the way the overall meeting is organized. I take the one about we need to have a session where everybody is in the room and not to repeat ten times the same thing? Ooh, I would love that. I will work with the other Board members who are in charge of trying to be involved in the setting up of the program because we were not. It was staff-only… Yes, but it was a staff-only responsibility. It was less.

PRAGUE

I would like very much that at least the Chairs of the SOs and ACs can be involved and give their voices, and particularly you can help in resourcing your colleagues to define a little bit in advance some subject that you think is relevant for the overall community. And it will help a lot everybody because it will not just be an input from the Board members but from people from all the community. We really need to work together. The lead in that for the good and the bad is Chis Disspain, but I am a member of this team too, and then please, I can be your voice in that committee and I will be happy to do so as soon as I meet my colleagues.

And thank you very much. The ten years' was a really good event. I regret that it was in competition with other events. That's the trouble of this type of meeting but it was good, well-organized. Thank you, Wolf and all the others who organized that, and it was well-received by the people from the Board who were there. And I am sure that you will do a very good job in the future. Keep doing it. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sebastien, and thank you for doing the job you're doing on the Board for us.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Just one small note with regards to coordinating better and bringing more inputs directly to your processes, especially in the preparing in

PRAGUE
No. 44 · 24 - 29 JUNE 2012

these meetings: there is some inefficiency in the way this is done from my point of view. We've been asked to provide input for conversations in a discussion with Rod, a discussion with the Chair, the Public Participation discussions – what subject do we want to discuss? The agenda that we want to have when we're with the Board, the agenda that we want to have when we see the CEO or the Chair in a room – all of these appear to be separate, one from each other, and I have to ask the community again and again and again and months in advance. And then suddenly we wait until three days before the meeting to say we have a complete change of agenda. There's something working not so well there and I'm sure something can be improved.

Sebastien Bachollet: Definitely. It's not working. I hope that it will work better in the future but don't be shy and say "I don't want to meet you" or "Meet us together."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We want to meet people but having to draw the agenda ourselves two months in advance and then another agenda. We're asked to put three points and then the Board comes up with five points in one hour – we can't deal with seven points or eight points in one hour. Alan and then I'm going to close this because we're about to lose our microphones now as well now and our chairs and everything else. And then we'll have any other business. It has happened last time where I closed the meeting, I remained behind and everyone left – it was just me and my laptop and one chair in the room, seriously. Oh, and I had the Wi-Fi port standing in front of me and I put my foot on it and said "Don't even

touch that thing. [laugher] Alan and then we'll close this and we'll have any other business.

Alan Greenberg: I sympathize with the difficulty of coming up with topics for these various bilateral meetings, but those bilateral meetings from my perspective especially this week are some of the most important and effective meetings we've had. The meetings we had this time with the Board among other things was the most effective meeting with the Board that we have ever had in my career. And the GNSO one, the GAC one was also – we didn't get through everything but I feel we're actually talking to each other, not at each other. It has a lot to do with people not making speeches on either side and everyone's being very controlled this time, especially I must add the Board members some of whom genetically were not unable to make speeches before. So I thank whatever happened to them, some surgical procedure before the meeting or something like that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. And finally, any other business? And we just have Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: I'm very grateful to you, Olivier, for giving me this opportunity under any other business. The subject I want to bring up you may find is untimely, and some of you may think that it has to come at the end of Toronto. I'll tell you why I think it's important to bring up ALAC itself and the future of the ALAC – it's because ALAC is ten years old; it's

because we're entering a new ICANN, actually, with a new CEO and all that. So it's a time of change for ICANN and perhaps this is the moment we should seize in order to put some questions to ourselves.

I have followed the ALAC only since three years ago, something like that when I was a member of the Board and the Review Team, so I tried to take a very hands-off look at this now to see what I am about to say. It's about the succession planning in ALAC, because I am in mortal fear of this group losing some of its best people because some have to actually earn their lives and etc. So you know what I mean.

So I think that succession planning should not be done between doors at the very last moment of the last meeting; six months ahead is about too much. That's what I learned in corporations such as ICANN when I was a Board member and elsewhere. So I take the liberty of telling you that this is not about individuals. What I'm about to say is about structure. It's about relevance and efficiency. And so building on the comments I heard especially today at this session in which I was a guest, I need to see more clearly lines of action – priorities, not in abstract terms but even in structural terms.

To be clear, I would suggest that in addition to the Chair who has an oversight of all the ALAC and a representation role which is huge – the work that was done by Cheryl, when I saw that and now by Olivier is just astounding in quality, not only in quantity. I don't care so much about quantity. It's the quality of the relationship I have noted with all the members of the community. That is at stake. We have to preserve that, and in order to preserve that my suggestion is that the next ALAC think

of having three Vice-Chairs not for the pleasure of having three rather than two, but Vice-Chairs with…

No, no ,no – well why not six or ten? No, that's not the point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We have five regions, so one for each region would be a better representation.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: But my approach is not representational; it is functional. I'll tell you why. Let's say there are three lines of duty within ALAC which are not properly addressed functionally.   One is policy, process, and legal comment or opinion; the second is community, outreach and communication; and the third would be finance, human resources, support, etc. You can tweak around with that; never mind. This is my first proposal; I hope you'll have time to discuss it some other day. But this would correspond to three Vice-Chairs, one in charge of policy, process, and legal; the other community, outreach, and communication; and one for finance, support.

So I think that this would also add clarity to the discourse of ALAC in the wider ICANN context. It would allow people to see more clearly what is at stake and perhaps to engage the right people in our communities rather than simply trying at numbers. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, Jean-Jacques, the Rules of Procedure Working Group is carving this up as we speak. Can we take those words of wisdom from you and

PRAGUE

steal it shamelessly into our processes? I think that would be a very good way forward.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Great. Well, thank you for the suggestion, Jean-Jacques, and thank you for agreeing to bring this into the Rules of Procedure. Thanks to all of you for having come here this week for an extensive amount of work. I certainly am extremely impressed by all the work that you've all put, both during the day and in the evenings and the long hours, etc. I'd like to thank our staff again. They cannot be thanked enough for all of what they're doing for us, so one more round of applause…

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And we can close the recordings as well. I guess the meeting is now closed. Thank you. And thank you to those people, Nick and the gentleman over there.

Heidi Ullrich: If I can just say a few more words… So again, I'd like to carry on the theme of thanking…

[End of Transcript]

PRAGUE