
DUBLIN – ALAC Strategy and Working Session Part 2
Saturday, October 17, 2015 – 13:30 to 17:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

ALAN GREENBERG: Ignoring that, we will start anyway. And the first session is being chaired by Beran, or Beran jointly with Rafid. Jointly. And Beran will lead off.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. Ozan, are you ready? Good afternoon, everyone. That's for those in Dublin. And good morning and good evening for whoever's joining us on Adobe Connect. My name is Beran and I'll be chairing this session with Rafid. We'll be discussing the New Meeting Strategy Working Party, which we're co-chairs on. Leading up to Dublin, we've been discussing a lot with regards to the different meetings that we'll start having in [2016] the first of which is the Marrakech meeting.

ICANN Meeting Strategy Working Group came up with three different meeting structures to encourage regions that don't necessarily host ICANN meetings or are not actually able to host ICANN meetings because of legal issues, to be able to host these meetings. So in doing so, I'm taking that into consideration ICANN Meeting Strategy Working Group came up with three

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

different meeting strategies, which are Meeting A, Meeting B, and Meeting C.

Meeting A, which will be the first meeting of the year, to be held in March; Meeting B will be midyear; and Meeting C will be held at the end of the year, which will be the AGM meeting.

So the purpose of this working group is to actually come up with the structures of these meetings, the first of which is the Marrakech meeting, ICANN 55 in Morocco.

Now this session is going to be a bit elongated, I hope, because the purpose of it is to actually discuss and agree on a strategy and a structure for the different meetings, and to come up with something to present at the end of this meeting, which will be on Thursday morning, where we'll be meeting with other ACs and SOs to finalize a draft of each of the meetings, A, B, and C.

So without ado, we have a lot to get through, so I'm going to have to put bureaucracy aside and delve right into it. Ariel, Ozan, if we can have Meeting A on the screen. I would encourage everyone to really look critically at these schedules, give your feedback on where you think we can make use of more time.

The purpose of Meeting A is basically if you look at the structure, it's day meeting, which is sort of what we have currently for the [inaudible] in regards to ICANN meetings. We start on a Sunday

and we end on a Thursday. We have the only difference here – Sebastien doesn't like hearing this, but the critical difference with Meeting A with the current ICANN meeting is the two public forums.

So with this meeting, we're having a public forum on day three, which is the Monday, and then we'll have a second public forum at the end on a Thursday.

Now when we initially developed this schedule, we basically looked at all the sessions that we currently have in an ICANN meeting, and we basically uprooted them and pasted around this meeting schedule. But what we also did is we also created space for working groups interaction because the group – when we were dealing with the working party, a lot of ideas that came up where we don't really have that much one-on-one internally within ALAC to discuss critical issues. So we made some time for working groups.

Now I'm going to go through this day-by-day. I'm going to try and move as swiftly as possible, giving feedback along the way with regards to what was discussed four, five meetings ago, what was noted, and how we moved forward, whether we agree on it so that we can make it as quickly as possible.

I see Alan's card is already up. Alan, go ahead. You have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a couple of words, two different things. Number one, as Beran said, our target is to come out of this with a concrete plan. Theory is nice, but we're talking about the next meeting and we don't have a lot of slack time. We really need to make some decision as how we want to do this. That's part number one.

Part number two is almost exactly the opposite, however. You should not have any illusions that that we plan here is going to be implemented exactly. The process of scheduling meetings is complex, and as I said earlier today, sometimes the very last moment things happen that cause us to make major changes. But even on a more regular meeting, it's an iterative process where we have to try to fit all the pieces of the puzzle together.

So recognize that what we're planning here is what we would like to do and something that will be beneficial for At-Large and ALAC. But remember, going to end up getting moved and mangled and adjusted as we go into the real meeting venue. So just two thoughts. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. Just to buttress on what Alan said, what we also took into consideration when developing these schedules is

we're not really looking at time slots right now. We're just looking at what do we need to do rather than when do we need to do it. We can always move those blocks around as in when things change. But what's important and critical is let's get what we need to do there. And then when we do it, we can always figure that out with time.

Now without further ado, I'd like to look Meeting A, which is up on the screen right now. Day one, we're looking at ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting Part 1. That's on a Saturday morning, and that's a four-hour slot. And right after that, we have lunch. And then after lunch, we have meeting with the Board.

Now that's one of the things that was noted in the last meeting was we usually meet the Board on a Tuesday. So that needs to move to the Tuesday. Gisella, correct me if I'm wrong, we do meet the Board on Tuesdays. So that if that moves to Tuesday, we now have a huge slot from 1:00 to 6:00 for outreach. Now that was a suggestion. In the follow-up meetings to Dublin, this was a suggestion. We'll have an internal policy meeting, leadership meeting, or [strategy] session as it is called in the Dublin meeting schedule.

Or an ALAC [inaudible] and then we have lunch, and then in the afternoon, the whole afternoon would be dedicated to outreach.

If there are any suggestions on that or any feedback on that if anybody thinks that this can be changed? This was the suggestion in our last meeting.

I'd like to do it day-by-day, that way we move quickly and swiftly and agree and move forward rather than going and coming back. So I will take any suggestions on that day one of Meeting A. I see Holly's card is up. Holly, go ahead. You have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE:

There's always the question what's meant by outreach, because if outreach is something where in fact we're going out into the community, I don't know if that's enough time. If it's outreach that's inreach, that's a very different kind of time. And again, I don't know what the term means so I don't know if that's enough time.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Holly. Tijani, go ahead, you have the floor. Then I'll answer Holly's.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Beran. I don't think that half a day is not enough for outreach. It is not one shot with outreach. I imagine, in my mind, it might be a visit in a university, but it is a Saturday,

which is not good. But this kind of activity, of outreach activity, that we may have – and I think when I was part of the Meeting Strategy Working Group, and when we thought about outreach, it was in this way.

It was go outside and go to people who are there. It is not outreach among us. We don't need it. It is inreach and we do it in other times. But outreach should be with people of the country. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Tijani. And just to add on to that, this outreach is not going to be, as Tijani said, it's not going to be one-off, but is that going to prepare the ground before we actually get there. It's not going to be something we just get there and do. This is a continual process within that specific region. So we will contact our ALSes, we will do newspaper runs.

So it's really not structured. That's why we leave that block empty. It's not really something that needs to be defined right now. We just need to know that going out into the community and getting them involved in ICANN. How we do it is completely something that we need to decide on later on. And I think this meeting that's coming up on Thursday would really help us to do that.

Alan, you; then Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My recollection is that meeting staff said that for the first meeting, we would not be physically going out, that any “outreach” be at the meeting site. I thought I remember them saying that, but I may be wrong. Yeah. I thought it was in relation to the first meetings under the new schedule, not just the B. Okay. Then I’m wrong.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I just want to, in line with looking at outreach as actually going out, I’m wondering especially if we have considered that we – is it possible to actually swap it? Because we actually – I’m trying to be careful not to give suggestion because you said that we’re not going to be planning what we is going to happen now. So maybe what I’m about to say is actually going to be somewhat planning on all the outreach [inaudible].

But I think if we’re actually going to do outreach and actually invite people to that particular ICANN meeting, then it’d be good

to do it at the first early as possible so that actually they are part of the process, they have seen what you are doing. The meeting with ICANN Board, ALAC Regional [inaudible] meeting is something that [we] want to join.

So if we want to do outreach, with the mind of having some people convinced to actually want to attend what we're doing locally, maybe good to do it earlier than any other ALAC activity. That's what I thought.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Seun, for that contribution. I was going to ask Heidi to clarify this issue that Alan brought up with regards to the meeting not being able to engage outside of the venue for meeting A, but Heidi is not on seat now. So Heidi, would you like to just clarify at the point that Alan brought up so everyone hears the response to that?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

For Meeting B, the second meeting, the idea is that the first day of the outreach would now not go out to an outside venue or outside group for that. What I'm hearing is that there would be in the morning a plenary session that would include all of the ACs and SOs and any people, NextGen, fellows, meeting certain criteria, etc. And then in the afternoon, I believe it would be up

to the individual ACs and SOs to define what they would like to do in terms of outreach and engagement activities.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Heidi. But Alan’s question was for Meeting A. So we want to clarify is for Meeting A, if we do plan to go out, is it feasible?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alan, for the record, said, “Is there a budget for it?”

HEIDI ULLRICH: From what I’ve heard so far, no. But again, it might be something that At-Large wishes to raise sponsorship for. These are some questions that you may wish to raise for discussion with the entire ACs and SOs or the meeting staff. These are probably – and we should start taking these questions, Beran, and noting them to – yeah?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Heidi. They’re noted. I have Glenn in the queue and Maureen. I don’t know who came first. Was it Maureen or Glenn? Okay, Glenn. You go ahead, then Maureen, then Sebastien.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: On the outreach activities, I know it's too early to get into details, actual what activities. We just have a slot. I just want to remind you that we do have a working group, Outreach and Engagement. I'm assuming they will be deeply involved with this because there is a co-chair per region that's actually coming out with outreach strategies.

I just want to ask you a little bit about the think tank. Can you tell me who is in the think tank? How do you define what think tank is?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Glenn. That's actually very interesting because Maureen has a hand up and she's actually the leader of the think tank. So I'll let her come in there. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Beran. The think tank, very interesting. The whole idea of the think tank was that members from within the team could actually build up a list of ideas and activities in which we might engage. And we were focusing at that particular time on what we assumed the whole outreach program was. And we did discuss what we assumed outreach was and what the purpose outreach was on the ICANN perspective.

The reason why they asked us to do it. So we actually sort of like, I gathered a small team. Thank you, Vanda, for your contributions. Vanda and I and [inaudible] from Japan, I was probably a little bit disappointed we didn't get as many people contributing, but we did sort of like put together a lot of stuff that was we thought it was quite exciting to engage the community before the meeting was actually held within that particular community.

And we did sort of, I think that if we're going to do some outreach, really, the RALO itself could actually do quite a lot of work within that community before the meeting actually was held. And that if we were going to take a meeting to a particular city, whatever, that some preplanning of activities and engagement with ICANN was in place before the meeting took place. So that there was some understanding already through media, through discussions within the community, infomercials on TV. Sort of like really pushing the whole understanding about what ICANN was all about.

So we put this all together and we [inaudible] but we will use some of those ideas to incorporate and to – we were working on the Meeting B at the time, which we thought might be easier. But it turned out to be harder than anything.

And I think we were sort of like... Sebastien was really helpful in giving us some direction with regards to this. And then, of course, Nick came along to our meeting and told us exactly what ICANN wanted, and it was not to go out. And it was all budget-oriented, of course. They wanted outreach to be done within the meeting.

So it's sort of like the change, sort of like direction for, you know. Especially, for example... Again, I'm going back to Meeting B because that was the one I was actually concentrating on, where the first day was to be outreach and the second day and third day was to be focusing on interaction between internal systems, inter and intra, and then I can't remember the fourth one, though. What was it? Fourth day, we were going to do something.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Cross-community.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Cross-community. Yeah, that's right. But yeah, I guess it's sort of like, for me, and we're still sort of like, I think what happened was Vanda and Beran, Sebastien sort of like have created another little group where they actually sort of like made a

decision about how we can actually incorporate what it is that ICANN sort of like really wants.

But at the same time, I still think there are ways in which we can incorporate some of the other things that we were thinking about. And also because Nick said if we really felt that we had something that was important as part of our plan, that he would consider some sort of budget, budgetary contribution.

So really, it just depends on what ALAC decides is the way to go.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Glenn. I have Sebastien in the queue, then Tijani, and – I’m sorry? Panus. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. Since you all have your headsets and that since we have interpreters, might as well use them, use their skill. Thank you, Beran. First of all, I wanted to mention that the way that the meeting is organized, for example, the outreach session, contrary to the B Meeting. For A Meeting, that was not one of the main components of [proposal] that the New Meeting Strategy Working Group had established.

The other thing is that we need to consider which city we will [end in]. Are they city people? Are they people from the country,

people from the regional that we will outreach to? This is still a question.

For example, in Marrakech, is there a university where we can go? Is there a Chamber of Commerce where we can go and so forth? And when I say we, it is all of the constituencies within ICANN.

The other point that I wanted to make in order to add a little bit to the [defintion] of the difference between the current meetings and the future meetings. This meeting, for example, officially starts tomorrow.

Now what we did with all of the meetings is that we put all of the working days in one meeting and so you have meetings that start on Saturday and others on that end on Thursday. You have meetings that start on Monday, ending on Thursday for the B Meeting. You have meetings that start on Saturday and on Friday for the C Meeting. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Sebastien. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Beran. I will continue in French, as well. And I would like to confirm Sebastien is exactly right. Outreach for the B

meeting was something very specific to the New Meeting Strategy. So same as what we have done in the past, same as what we will do in the future, but what I think about outreach that it is absolutely crucial for ICANN and especially for At-Large. Because there are many people who say that we do not represent the final users, the end users. They say that we do our own thing, and the end users are – we are not the end users.

So we need to outreach, we need to go and meet them. What I would like to propose for Marrakech, as it was said by Maureen, actually, we need to have these outreach activities, we need to prepare them ahead of time. Even for Marrakech, we need to be prepared.

I was told earlier that there was an issue in terms of budget and outreach – outer outreach – and what it means that we don't know how to get people, ALAC people to where we want them to go. All we need is a bus to go somewhere for one day. It's really not that [problem]. It is much more simple than to gather something for people who come from the outside because the issue in terms of organization, it is new, and you can't really plan that.

However, if you go outside, this is something that is easy to plan. You can say, "Okay. Such and such a day, we will go this place that is just find a bus and get there." Very simple. But we need to

have prepared that with the university or the [ONG] that we go to. We need to [inaudible] in advance.

I think that this is something that we need to think about for Marrakech. If we want to outreach outside, we need to prepare it, we need to plan it. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Tijani. Just to add a little bit to that. This was what we actually had in mind when we included outreach in every single one of those schedules. We had it on A, we had it on B, and we had it on C, because we believe that At-Large needs to get out there for all these meetings in all of the regions.

Okay. I have Panus, Fatima, Tim, and Alan, and Aziz. It's Glenn. I'm sorry, Tim, it was in front of you. So that's Panus, Fatima, Glenn, Alan, and Aziz. Thank you.

PANUS NA NAKORN:

Hi. I understood that the outreach is trying to engage the new people to access on the At-Large and to bring them to be a part of At-Large as the end users of Internet, as well. But the point I'm following that [inaudible] has been discussions and things looked at in the activity, if you would like to reach more the people who that you would like to... I mean, to reach them.

Because I thought that people at university so might be different with people who is working at Internet at their house, so that why the way that you approach totally different and that activity need to be laid out carefully. The sub-population that need to be reached [inaudible], as well.

The second one that's thinking about how we can measure whether we achieve to approach that kind of people. How many people that we aim for. Let's say it's 100 at the Marrakech, whatever, it depends on [inaudible] , right? But I need to make sure that we agree upon that what kind of target population, subpopulation [inaudible] that we're going to using and how many people. So thereby we can share with other people that we reach on outreach activity is quite successful based on the number of people to be [inaudible] At-Large member, and this is [inaudible] of my thought. Thank you very much.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Panus. I think I'll just reserve my comments at the end. Glenn is next, and then I have Fatima, Alan, Aziz, and then Seun.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I have to agree entirely with my colleagues on the left that we need to narrowcast, we have to identify what areas we've not

served very well, especially journalism students and outreach to civil society. So we have to have a clear marketing strategy and I think we need to go back to the work that each of the RALOs have done in their CROPP outreach strategy.

We documented what we're going to do and we need to make sure it surfaces. This is a great opportunity.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Glenn. Just sort of clarify that. Vanda actually did a wonderful job with that, with the subcommittee we created for the Meeting B. She's actually trying to tie that into the LAC strategy, for outreach and engagement that is. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thanks, Beran. Some of the comments I wanted to make have already been made. I just wanted to go back to two items, especially a question about the outreach [inaudible]. In this kind of partnership we're seeking with the think tanks, I was wondering whether it would be important to go not only to university, also to the local ALSs. I think this not been mentioned yet.

This is the basis of our At-Large organizations, the local ALSs are the contact point with local communities, and in a way, and in a

great way, this would be a way of having local ALSs get involved in ICANN activities. Not all representatives can participate in all ICANN meetings. So if we cannot take representative to the meetings, maybe ICANN can get closer to the representatives so that they will be involved in these outreach activities.

And we should also see what is the interest of every region. Not all regions are the same from the point of view of the interests they have in the communities. So I think would be something to be considered, and if I can help you in any way, I volunteer to help you. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Fatima, for that. Just to sort of explain that we did discuss the involvement of ALSes and Vanda has actually also working on that and looking at ALSes within the region, especially for Panama. Let's see how we can get them to the meeting, as well. Probably one or two representatives for the meeting. Alan then Aziz. Aziz, you put your card down. Are you still in the queue?

You're still in the queue, so that's Alan, Aziz, Seun, and Tijani, and Heidi. Alan, can you just give me one second? Heidi just needs to clarify something quickly and then you can have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I've been Skyping with Nick Tomasso, who is VP of Meetings. So yes, he is able to save for Marrakech and Panama Meeting B. He will provide one day of shuttles to an outreach event that you would choose – a university, for example – and for fiscal year '17, he's going to be working on that, as well.

So we can provide one day of shuttle to an outreach event to a university of some sort.

BERAN GILLEN: Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just as we're making these plans, remember, we're bringing 27 people or so in the ALAC, regional leaders, all of whom should be a part of this process. It's not for people to do outreach and the others to do some sightseeing. And recall, as we're doing this, that in many cases, we're going to have a majority of the people not speaking the language of the country they're in.

So just as you're putting the plans together, keep that in mind. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Noted, Alan. Aziz, you have the floor.

AZIZ HILALI: Exactly what I wanted to start with. What was just said in terms of the language, Alan, is important. The language is important. So what we need to pay attention to is that depending on the region, you will have certain people who need to speak the language, whoever manages this. You have French and Arabic as far as Marrakech goes, but I think that as far as Morocco is concerned, French is the language because at the universities use French as their main language.

As far as universities we had already planned a meeting in Marrakech last year, as you know, and we had planned to have certain experts –certain ICANN experts – speak to inform you that the Sciences University in Marrakech is only 10 to 15 minutes away from the place where the meeting will take place.

I know the President of the university as well as the Dean, and we already broached the subject. We already talked about what we could do and have – for example, Olivier, who’s a great French [speaker] come to talk to them as well as Sebastien.

So we [talked about] this. Now what how do you want us to do it? What is the date? Translation, of course. That is the other point. But how would you like to do that? I think that the

university president, the dean will not say no. If you have people come for outreach to speak to the students about ICANN.

One more point. I invited Fadi last year. I invited him to come to [Habba], to my university, and ever since his [luncheon] many students came to me because they were interested in what ICANN does and was “How can we get in? What can we do?” It has a great impact on them. And so we need to do. We speak a lot on a theoretical level, but practically, how do you want this outreach to come to life?

Because Marrakech is only three months away, so let’s do it. Let’s post things. My proposal is that we should have two or three people come to an amphitheater, 400 students, 700 students. Let us now talk about what this topic of this interventions should be, and I would really be quite [inaudible] to organize this in Marrakech.

RAFID FATANI:

Thank you, Aziz. Just a question with regards to Marrakech specifically, and we’ll see how that affects the other meetings moving forward. When you’re referring to the university, that we could organize something with, how will the day affect that? It’s a Saturday [inaudible], then our engagement with them. Will this affect it much? Is that something that...?

AZIZ HILALI: It would not work. It should be Monday through Thursday. Saturday may not happen for students. It's a day of rest.

RAFID FATANI: Thank you, Aziz. Then we [inaudible].

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Rafid. Thank you, Aziz. We'll take note of that and we'll see, as I said at the beginning of the meeting, what's important is let's air out everything, all the suggestions, come out, and then we'll figure out a way of fitting this big jigsaw puzzle together. Important is let's know what we want on the schedule, and then how we fit it into the schedule is something we'll have to work with – with time, of course. We don't really have much of that.

I have Seun on the line. Alan, is that an old or a new? I have Seun in line, then I have Tijani, and I have Harold, and then Alberto.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was an old one, but I'll point out that we're only on day one, an hour into the meeting.

BERAN GILLEN: I was just going to say that. That’s exactly what I was going to say. I’m going to close the queue after that, and then we’ll move on. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Actually, I was thinking we’re not talking about how to utilize the day for the outreach. But since you’re actually talking about that now, I want to second what Fatima was saying the other time. However, I had to pull back my flag because what Beran said kind of did not actually bring out what Fatima was saying.

I think we need to take this outreach as an opportunity to activate and [code] the ALSs. It should actually be about the ALSs. Yes, we can get more ALSes to join, but the numbers we’ve had [inaudible] enough number. I mean, of course, I’m not saying we should close the doors to new ALSes, but we have enough numbers, but how much of this numbers are actually actively participating is a question that we’ll need to try to answer with this outreach.

So if there is [inaudible] need to engage ALSes locally, the more they actually get involved in the planning of this outreach would be very, very helpful. So I really suggest that the team working on this meeting plan, try as much as possible to work with the local ALS actually planning this meeting. Wherever we’re

choosing that as the location for the outreach, they should actually be making sure that they are present there because once they are part of the planning, [inaudible] will be there, as well.

So the idea of bringing in two ALSes to the meeting, I want to know what meeting are they referring to. Is it the outreach meeting or the ICANN meeting itself? If it is the ICANN meeting itself, then we need to see how we can actually encourage more ALSes to actually come to the ICANN meeting, which of course, is local to them. So the cost of coming will be reduced, so we need to ask if it's something that staff can pass the budget cost implication to staff – cost to staff to see where they can support more ALSes to actually attend those meetings because it's the only way we can get more participation and people to know what they're doing. One day is not enough to know about what ALAC or ICANN as a whole is doing. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Seun. The purpose of bringing in those ALSes is not necessarily only for the first day. It would be for the whole stretch of the meeting. But I do want to clarify something. By the end of this session, I will answer question with regard to the number of ALSes and budgetary issues. I believe it's Tijani have

next in line, then Harold, Alberto, and Panus, and then I'm afraid I'll have to cut the line off there so we can move on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Beran. I will start from where Seun ended, and your comment also, Beran. The ALSes will not be part of outreach. They are part of At-Large. And if we hold the meeting in a country, if the ALSes of this country don't come to ICANN, it will be a problem. They have to come, they have to come, they have to attend.

And if we have something to do with ALSes, we have to do it when we are not meeting in their country, because we are far from them. But if we are meeting in their country, they have to come to our meeting. So the outreach is for people who don't know about ICANN.

We need to make people who don't know about ICANN, we want them to hear about ICANN and to know what ICANN is doing. I think that for Marrakech, since we have the transportation – and, Alan, we are asking for a minibus, not for a car, so it is not two or three people. It is the 25 persons of ICANN that have to go there.

So I don't think that we have to limit our outreach effort to one university or one afternoon or something like this. We have to go

to the NGOs who are working on things related to Internet. We have to reach to, I don't know, other communities, other end users in the country.

So for me, outreach is something essential and it is not only university. University is the easiest thing because it is well-organized and we can reach out to them easily. But we have to think about people who are not easy to access. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Harold, you have the floor.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Beran. Well, many things have already been said about the importance of working with ALSes. I'd like to go back what we have already said. The interest and not to leverage effort. We're going to make lots of effort to get to a university, usually happens the first time you have contact with people where they're interested or not in learning about the ICANN [inaudible] the meeting.

We lose interest while the ALSes are already well organized and this ensures that the effort will not be lost after the meeting, after the event, so that it will not have a post-event syndrome so that all this planning and budget will be leveraged.

So we should reaffirm the importance of getting organized with the local ALSes. On the other hand, this is a perfect opportunity to think about something. We assume that if we go to university, there will be lots of interest there. That in the non-organized end users, there is also the need, and it is part of our job as ALSes to inform and especially to educate people in this respect. So we'll get higher value if we get through the ALSes, which already have a [structure] to access those people.

An important thing we have to think about is we talk about end users, universities, the academia, we should define very well the audience so that there will be no misunderstanding about the role that end users have, whether you are the academia, the technical community. In this way, we will be able to focus on people's participation.

This is part of ICANN's internal discussion, because otherwise we run the risk of the corporate foundations using their budget in the regions, take over a role that is should be taken by end users. They need to be informed, educated, and organized. These are the three items I think we should include in our outreach effort. Vanda, I'd like to volunteer to be part of team to get deeper into this subject now that Marrakech is coming up. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: I've just been told by staff that we have some additional time because it seems we have a lot of suggestions coming up and a lot of discussion, good discussion. So we have to 3:30. I have an hour, but still means we have to go through Meeting A, B, and C. So please keep your intervention short so we can go through to Meeting B, because I have a feeling we're going to spend 45 minutes on that alone. Thank you. Alberto, you have the floor. It's Alberto and Panus, and then that's the end of this discussion on day one.

ALBERTO SOTO: I'd rather be more pragmatic than practical. As soon as I learned that Panama was going to be our next meeting venue within our region, I contacted the only ALS we have there, which already has a model of presentation for our region, and we are organizing for several reasons. We could not make it before several meetings earlier than Panama that will be targeted to various audiences.

This ALS is completely open and willing to be contacted and do as necessary as we may suggest. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alberto. Panus, you have the floor.

PANUS NA NAKORN: Okay. Thank you. I'll just keep it short, but actually, try to emphasize again that the what is the benefits of the outreach activity, I think also people know that what is the benefits. How can we to convey the message that our people to understand why they need to pass off the [At-Large] communities. How can they raise their voice through the system to set up [inaudible]?

That's [kind of] the benefit that we need to convey the message for them, rather than just to outreach them and let them know this is an existing organization or even the constituent, that they can [inaudible] they're going to get from, as well. This is key point.

The second one [inaudible] is not only the university, but I thought our peoples in the NGO that – I'm just thinking about we need to take opportunity to strengthening the NGO that we can part of them and to strengthening them to be a part of the [At-Large], as well, and then we can continue working with them whatever in the other activities that is might be the good opportunity, if we were at that country, and to work with them on an NGO. That is the good points.

And another one that I like the way – that's rather than just outreach activities in the post-outreach activities, how can we measure? How can we measure the numbers of university that

we [miss] 300 and 400 whatever, but how many people that they still actively participate in [At-Large] after we outreach activity?

How can we set up the tones even to [inaudible] measurements activity to measure that is not lose too much thing about how to reach them, but how to keep them into the tracks. I think it's maybe a [good point], as well.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Panus. Just a little bit of housekeeping rule. We're going to start using the timer – two-minute timer – for all interventions so we can actually get through this and get everything on board.

But just to sum up day one, just to give you the feedback of basically what I've picked up from the discussion is we're going to move the ICANN meeting with the Board o Tuesday during the week and we'll also – there are concerns about Saturday, so the outreach should be during the week. And the end point I have there is the budget, and I think that's already been answered by Heidi that there will be buses and [inaudible] that would be available to the group.

The other suggestion that was brought in was to tie this in with [our] strategy, so that was from Glenn, and I think that's already been taken into consideration for the meeting B. But maybe

something that we would also need to work the Marrakech meeting to tie that into the AFRALO outreach and engagement strategy.

And the last but not least point that I have on here is for language and translation, which was also a concern. These are some of the things that I just have one question. Should we outreach for a whole day or half a day? This is on the floor. Tijani, you have the floor, and then Aziz. I'm sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I think that the outreach should be a function of what we prepared for it. So if we have sufficient area, where to go, where to make outreach, we may use one day. But I think that we have to start with half a day so that we learn, so that we have the feedback.

BERAN GILLEN:

Okay. We're still doing very well with the time. We have Aziz on the floor and then Evan. And then we're going to move on with the rest of the days, which I think are pretty simple.

AZIZ HILALI:

First of all, because of the question, I think that half a day, even though we're talking about a university, we're talking about

students who are in class all of the time, you need to make sure that this meeting is not just [inaudible] time for the students. I think that half a day is plenty [of that].

Tijani earlier was talking about the presence of ALS members in the meeting. That is an issue. Why? Well, because a meeting does not necessarily happen in the city where you have a maximum number of ALSes. So for example, as far as I'm concerned, many ALS members are asking me already how can we possibly attend? Because except for one or two of them, they are all outside of Marrakech, and so that is an issue. That is a constant issue.

The solution that I gave them is to ask if they can be a fellow and get a fellowship. So that is an issue that we need to think about. When the meeting occurs somewhere, you need to have a budget so that we [inaudible] avoid that there is an ALS board. Because you have a board in each ALS where you have four, five, or even ten members. These people need to be invited automatically.

For example, in Panama, you need to make sure and invite the members of the board that don't necessarily reside in the capital or in the place where the meeting takes place.

Now go back on the question of the university, I would like to propose that we set up a program and agenda with speakers, so

that we have a concrete presence there. Somebody else asked a question as far as the durability or the viability. That works is that the ALS of the region should be in charge of organizing that.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you for that intervention, Aziz. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I'll try and keep this short. My concern is not with the length of the meeting. I agree with Tijani and Aziz on having this at half a day. But in order for that to be worthwhile, there has to be some good preparation. And that means well in advance of having this meeting, there have to be a handful of good, simple, public interest questions that are raised to the local community that offers not only an incentive to answer but also a way to deal with ICANN in a way that doesn't get into the lingo, doesn't get into the knee-deep things that we have to do here.

In order for this outreach to work, it has to be reasonably simple, it has to be understood, and perhaps a webinar or two or something like that in advance helps make the most of this half day by making sure the people come in informed and aware, and having some small number of simple questions to be able to deal with I think will make the most of that time. Thanks.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. I'm sorry, Evan. Apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very similar. They are so similar.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Evan. So what I want to suggestion is the rest of the Meeting A, if you had a look at it already, which is already on the screen, most of it is almost the same as what we have in a typical ICANN meeting other than the public forums one and two. Now looking at it in bulk, I am not going by day because I'm learning now. It's not working. Looking at it, I want interventions across day two to day six. And I'm using my time now. So the floor is open. What we do have, I'm not going to read it out because I see you all have it on your screens. I'm sure you've accessed the working party wiki page. You've looked at it right here.

So I want feedback on the structure right now as it is, day two to six, taking into consideration that probably that block on the regional meetings will move to Saturday and that block for the outreach will probably move to Monday. So we would just do an even swap right then and there. That's my suggestion. Other than that, what else is lacking there or what else is unnecessary there, in your opinion, that needs to be moved with regards to meeting A?

Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Beran. And my question here is do we really need to start at 8:00 in the morning? Okay. Let me [try] again. Do we really need to start at 8:00 knowing that we usually skip lunch because it's just one hour and starts at 8:00 and finishes at 7:00 in the evening. It sounds like 11 hours. It's a long day.

BERAN GILLEN: Are you saying 8:00 is early or it's late? I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I'm saying 8:00 is early and 7:00 PM is late.

BERAN GILLEN: I have Sebastien had his hand up and then Alan can have the floor. Sebastien, you have the floor. Go ahead. And Fatima.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just one thing real quick. I think that if we want to be efficient during the meetings you say that yes, it is a long day. And if we don't really have a break, a good break, everybody's just unable to really be efficient. So if you start organizing meeting by saying, "Okay, let's use the lunch for a meeting." No, that cannot

happen. It does not work. I think that we need to coordinate together to make sure that we all have one hour for lunch so that we might breathe, go somewhere else, talk to people, but that we may not spend it discussing things at a table during a meeting.

So let's at least leave this open, and then, of course, in practice, it might be different. But let's start with that. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Sebastien. Alan and then Fatima.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sebastien said something at the very end, which I was going to say something similar, too. In practice, it's different. The reality is that we can write all the schedules we want today, and we don't know what exactly what we're going to be doing or when we're going to be starting or ending. So let's not get hung up on whether we're starting at 8:00 or 8:30. The reality of whatever we're dealing with at that point will help frame what the real schedule is.

Leon has been working with Gisella for the last couple of meetings scheduling. Don't work out the way you think it's going to at the beginning, not phrase in very proper English, I'm afraid. But let's not worry about the details too much here.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks. And I will speak in Spanish. I have a question on the B Meeting. What do you mean by regional meetings? What does it mean? What do you mean by regional meetings? This is a question. Is it the RALOs meetings? Each individual RALO meeting typically held in ICANN meetings? Or could it be the regional meetings of the RALOs held with other organizations such as the RIRs, the Regional Interest Registries or the regional IGFs? What is the idea behind it?

Is it going to be only within ALAC or are we going to be able to relate with other regional organizations outside? Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: This is for Meeting A, right? This is Meeting A. Are you looking at Meeting A? I just want to clarify whether your question is for Meeting A or for Meeting B. Fatima, we are not yet at Meeting B. Can we put that question aside until we get to Meeting B? I don't want us to sort of derail from the discussion.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: I understood that we are moving to the Meeting B, but I can wait.

BERAN GILLEN:

No, sorry. What I was saying was Meeting A. Instead of taking it day by day, we're going to do a stretch day two to day six. Now your question I thought was for Meeting A, which if it is, it's a very valid question, which I want to answer because this was actually brought up by Alan during our work party meetings. And the question was – or rather, the concern was – whether we should have concurrent regional meetings for all five regions because of staff issues. Will we be able to have staff present at all these meetings? Translation: present at all these meetings. So this was a concern.

We didn't change the schedule because we wanted you to see the original, and then bring in these suggestions and probably suggest breaking that apart. Instead of having a whole block, breaking it apart and sort of spreading it around the schedule. And just to answer your question, these are RALO meetings. RALO meetings. Thank you.

Okay, I see Evan's hand is up and then I have Maureen. And is there anyone else that wants to contribute to Meeting A? Because I want to close off Meeting A now because I have the sense that we sort of kind of have an idea of what we want up there. Moving things around, shifting them around, but basically what is there is what we're keeping. I am going to call on that at

the end of this discussion right after Evan, Maureen, and Sebastien speak. You're going to have going once, going twice, then I'm not going to take any more questions on Meeting A. We're moving to Meeting B. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Mine are more questions than comments. One of which I see there's two separate public forums there, and so my question about them is why is there a desire to have two public forums rather than one? And also I'm wondering if there's going to be the usual kind of remote hub participation that we have tried to do before that has worked very well.

And I'm also curious to know why there's so little time left in the schedule for anything that might be cross-community. That everything still seems to be very, very siloed and there's no time. There's meeting between ALAC and GNSO, but on subject-based cross-community work, there seems to be very, very little room in this to be able to engage to have to try – as we're trying to encourage more cross-community work, there seems to be very little space given to cross-community activity. It still seems like things are very siloed. Thanks.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. On your first question about the two public forums –thank you, Evan. On your first question about the two public forums, I'll let Sebastien answer that. Your second question about, it was something to do with staff or the cross-community.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, it was about the fact that there seems to be very seems to be very little time in the A schedule for [explicitly] allowing for cross-community theme-based groups as opposed to this meets with this and so on. So that was my question.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Evan. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Yeah, Beran, I think we need to concentrate on what is the need for – Beran, we need to concentrate on what is need for At-Large and I suggest not to reopen the issue of what Meeting Strategy Working Group come up with proposal. And it was accepted by the Board, and the two, why there are two public meeting, not [inaudible]. It's already a decision and I can explain to even one, it's why and when it was decided. But I don't think we have time to discuss that. What we need to

discuss is what area our needs, where we want to have our stuff done.

The second point, it's about regional meeting. I disagree with your answer, Beran. The regional meeting is request from the Meeting Strategy Working Group to have the five region coming each one at the same each of the five at the same time in this building, at the same type of building, with all the people engaged in one region.

It's not to deal with ALAC specifically or At-Large specifically. It's something we need to be organized for the whole organization. Will we have each A Meeting, a C Meeting? Maybe not. The proposal was to have at one of the two meeting regional gathering, and for the other was language gathering to have the possibility to have seven, because we have seven language now – seven rooms where we can talk about the topic we want to talk about in specific language.

Then I really think that this is the general, I will say, proposal made to organize those meetings. Now we have to see how we fit in all that. Thank you. I'm sorry for that.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Sebastien. Evan, I just want to comment on your question on cross-community work. That's actually been taken

into consideration in Meeting B. If it's something you want to see in Meeting A, we can also look at it and see how we can work around it. But we've got about three slots in Meeting B for cross-community work. I have Tijani in the queue and Maureen is also in the queue, and I believe I will close the queue now for Meeting A, and then we'll move on to Meeting B.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Evan, just to tell you that there is seven slots for cross-community in Meeting A, if you count them. So I think we cannot do more than that. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Beran. My point was going to be similar to what Tijani was saying. I think that the focus for a lot of these meetings is really to sort of like to get ALAC and the other, the ACs and SOs, just to be doing something a little bit differently. And I can see the point, and I'm sure Seun will agree with me that having just spent three days with the leadership team and [inaudible] like there's a lot of advantage in the cross-community interaction and people working together, or

changing the way in which we operate and trying to be a little bit inclusive and understanding how other groups operate.

So it's sort of like moving in another direction and it's something that we could develop. And I don't expect this to be sort of like making this major change in our very first year of meetings. I think that we can do things gradually and just see how they pan out.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Maureen. Evan, I just have one question. I think maybe there's a bit of a misunderstanding. When you say cross-community work, do you mean as in the cross-community working groups? CCWGs, CWG, ICG, CWG IG, or do you inter-community work, such as what we have on the screen?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'm thinking very specifically of the kind of policy and topic-based work that has been done before, such as was done on applicant support, such as was done on objection process, such as was done on various things. I'm thinking specifically policy. And in that sense, I don't mean ALAC and GNSO are meeting together. I'm thinking specific themes.

The consumer trust group – so there's an increasing amount of work that's being done. Once upon a time, it was ALAC

participating in GNSO groups. Now there's more of a bit of an even footing where something is deliberately designed to be cross-silo, but they're very, very specific topic-related working groups that are I'm thinking more policy than I am internal processes.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Evan. I think that's definitely a Meeting B. We've catered for that in Meeting B because these are issues that we're addressing in Meeting B. Having internal policy time to discuss and have inter-community discussions on policy, as well. And I think that's a wonderful transition to Meeting B, don't you think? Tijani, would you like to add something to that before we move on to Meeting B?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Just to say that those are, Evan, thematic meetings. And so you need to have the theme to have a cross-community group. We will not create any cross-community working group just to create a cross-community working group. It is the theme, and we have now some cross-community working groups. We had before and you remember very well, so it depends on the theme. That's all.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, all. I believe we definitely have an idea of what you would want to see in Meeting A. We'll do a bit of shuffling around with slots, and we'll see what we come up with and share it on the... Now we'd like to move on to Meeting B, which would be very interesting discussion. Ariel, can you put up the latest Meeting B that was put on the wiki by myself as well as the one that Sebastien edited? Yes.

All right. So on the screen... It's not very clear. Ariel, do you think you could help us make it a bit clearer? On the screen, we have a four-day session for Meeting B. I was made categorically clear that we cannot start earlier than a Monday, and we definitely cannot go beyond that Thursday. Crystal clear. So we have Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

Now the theme that the Meeting Strategy Working Group had in mind when they came up with this four-day meeting was day one would be outreach. Day two and three would be intra-community working. Intra meaning, I had to actually go through this and make it stick in my head. Intra meaning within the advisory committee or supporting organization. And then day four would be cross-community or inter, between advisory committees and SOs work. And that is where Evan's suggestion or concern comes in.

So looking at day one, if you look at it, all you would say it remains unchanged. So Ariel, if you can help me just scroll up a bit, or if you could... I don't know if you can have two separate screens to bring up Vanda's original. It's at the top of the screen, and then mine at the bottom of the screen. I don't know if that's something that we will do them together. But the original—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Beran?

BERAN GILLEN: Yes.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I have sent to you, I believe, the last version you gave to me. I put in those colors and something, and it's [inaudible]. I believe I have here the last one. I can give to her.

BERAN GILLEN: Okay. While Vanda is getting us a very colorful copy of what we currently have on the screen, the first day would mainly be outreach. Again, we have that on a Monday. So hopefully, this wouldn't be that much of an issue because if we're going to go out to universities or wherever it is that we're going out to, which is a concern in Meeting A, this would not be an issue. So

day one would be complete outreach. Now how we structure that outreach is really, again, taking into consideration the region's strategy on outreach and engagement working with the representatives of the outreach and engagement within that community. In this case, LACRALO.

We're able to agree on how the outreach will be done and where we'll be going, and what it would take to do this outreach. But just bearing in mind that for Meeting B, because it's still in fiscal year '16, we don't have a budget to go out. So for Meeting B, only for this year, the outreach would be mainly internal. I don't know if that makes sense. Outreach would be actual inreach internally, but only for, the first Meeting B, which is in Panama, but it's still in fiscal year '16 and there isn't a budget line for it.

Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that Heidi said that Nick just said that for Panama, he will provide some transportation presented. So...

BERAN GILLEN: All right. Well then I stand corrected. Thank you, Tijani. I believe that was just for Meeting A. So Meeting A, B, and C, that's wonderful. All right. So then we will be able to go out for outreach on Meeting B. Do we have any qualms or any issues or

any discussions anybody wants to bring up with regards to Meeting B, day one? I have Vanda on the floor and – I’m sorry? Only for the outreach.

I want to discuss the outreach, because the way, the structure that Meeting B is in, we have to follow that structure. Day one is outreach. Day two and three is internal work. Day four is inter and cross-community. So I want to follow that structure for the discussions, so it doesn’t get all jumbled up. So we discussed outreach, we’ve put it aside. We discussed [inaudible] we put those aside, and then we discussed the final day [inaudible].

Seun, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. I think one of the reasons I was raising my hand, you’ve clarified because day one wasn’t looking like outreach to me. So my other question is in relation to this four days. In terms of cross-community working groups – for instance, the CWG or the ICG – I don’t [inaudible] that they lasted that time, but of course, [inaudible] with the look of things, they may last that time.

So if we happen to still have those groups, it looks like none of those days, these current days, these four days under them comfortably. So it looks like it’s obvious that we may have to come [heavier]. So how is that factored in?

And then the – okay, let me [inaudible] before I make further comments.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Seun. If you look at day four on – Ariel, can you just scroll down, please, to the bottom? If you look at day four, we have 8:00 to 10:00 meeting with SOs and ACs, 10:00-12:00 meeting with SOs and ACs, and then 1:00 to 3:00 ALAC and regional leadership meeting. Now for 8:00 to 10:00 and 10:00 to 12:00, those meetings with SOs and ACs, there was a suggestion from Sebastien to turn them into CCWG, ICG, whatever cross-community working group is currently trending at the moment is what would actually be slotted into those slots. That's day four. 8:00 to 10:00, 10:00 to 12:00, 1:00 to 3:00 would be strictly cross-community work, whether it is CCWG, ICG, CWG, CCWG IG.

Whatever is trending at the moment would fit into those three slots would be six hours of dedicated cross-community work. I hope that answers your question. I have Vanda. Vanda, you have the floor.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. I'd like to just remember a little bit more about what was behind the concept for the group B. Because besides what Beran just said about the division of the days, we have general

concepts on this design. The first one is [inaudible] working groups, the second point was no obedience to normal ALAC work, maintenance of Board and ALAC meeting, and proposal for [inaudible] meeting with the AC and SO, and we have those ideas for the last day and we have also some intercommunity, especially in the RALOs, discussion that you can see over there.

There is something for some regional strategies, changes in the ideas like that, that is a little bit [innovative] for the meetings that we never had. This kind of change of opinions among the [RALOs is] strategies. So to use then also to have this internal experience [exchange] is just to add these concepts behind the proposal that we have designed. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Vanda. So I believe we've conquered outreach and engagement for day one. We can move to day two and three, which is internal work for the ALAC that's intracommunity work. So looking at day two, we have dedicated, if you noticed, a lot of slots to working groups because most of the intra work or internal work going on is within these working groups. We've also taken note that some of these working groups are a big stagnant or rather not active.

So we've looked at that and also identified that's the reason for the number of slots that we've identified is based on active

working groups that have been active over the ICANN meetings and have actually requested to meet during ICANN meetings, as well.

If you look, we usually would have two working groups. We would have 8:00 to 10:00, we'll have two working group meetings. We also avoided them to be running concurrently because we do note that a lot of people in different working groups need to all of these working group meetings.

So we have two working groups from 8:00 on 10:00 on day two, which is Tuesday morning, and then we have ALAC policy work for two hours. Then we have a break. Then we have ALAC policy work part two or strategy session, as it's now called, and then we also have ALAC and the Board, which we usually meet on Tuesday afternoon.

Then can you scroll up a little bit, Ariel, please? I just want to see that I don't miss anything at the bottom because I have a feeling there's a 6:00. Yes, there is. And then we have inreach with the fellows and the NextGen program, which is also part of intra work.

We have day three. Again, we have this cross-regional strategy exchange. Now what brought about this two-hour block is we realized that the RALOs don't necessarily sit at ICANN meetings to discuss issues, and what I've realized is most of these RALOs

are doing activities that maybe other RALOs might also – it would be helpful for other RALOs to also follow suit or possibly discuss how they can actually adapt those ideas in their regions.

So we then identified two slots, two hours for RALOs, depending on which RALOs, of course, would sit down and then have some changes and discussions on strategy and different things that are happening in the regions, and see how they can actually glean information and glean off of each other, and that's the purpose of that regional strategy session.

I have Tijani wants to take the floor. Vanda, is that an old card or a new card? Vanda? Would you like to take the floor? Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Is it different in this session that you speak about? Different from the secretariat meeting?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Tijani. Yes, it is completely different. This is a strategy session between RALOs and I think it will be very interesting to see what discussions come up from these strategy sessions and how we can actually learn from each other as RALOs. I believe we don't do much of that or enough of that. Please go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I would like to see what will be discussed in because I see all the meetings of the secretariat, which is a meeting among the regions. What is discussed is what is happening inside those regions. So what will you add to that? If you have material for that, I am happy to have it, but if you don't have something to put in, I don't know.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Tijani. If you look at the schedule, there isn't even a secretariat or RALO secretariat meeting. So the purpose of this strategy is not necessarily to replace the secretariat meeting, but what I realized in during the outreach and engagement strategy session that we had with Dev and the rest of the other RALOs is that we're able to learn a lot from the other RALOs. The other RALOs are able to learn a lot from us with regards to how we actually do things in our region.

And I just felt going in line with working within our ALAC, we're able to actually make sure that all the regions are talking because I just feel that sometimes there's disengagement in regards to the RALOs that we only sit at the table at a leadership meeting or a secretarial meeting. Other than that, there isn't that fusion or that feeling of belonging in the same or under the same roof. That was the idea behind this slot.

Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Beran. I completely agree in a need to have those two hours, and in time, we may realize that two hours are not enough. Why? Because we may have to discuss metrics, features, the problems to access the different ALSes. Even though these are different cultures, different regions, I know we will find that we have lots of things in common so that we can agree and be on the same page. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: I'll have Heidi to take the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Beran. Just a couple of questions, and I hope I'm coming in at the right time. I don't see any regional meetings of the RALOs here, but I do see are a lot of working group meetings. So I'm wondering whether for meeting B, would this mean that At-Large would consider bringing in the working group chairs rather than all of the RALO chairs.

I mean, I see some regional leadership. I see there's cross-regional strategy session, which would need the chairs, but I see a lot more working group sessions. So that's something that

may need to consider. I also sort of really stood out was a general assembly on day three, two hours. So does that mean that you would wish to have a general assembly at each meeting B and only for one day? So if you maybe think about that, a little bit. Clarify that a little bit. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Heidi. I guess we'll have to put our thinking caps on with regards to the working groups, bringing in the working group chairs. But with regards to the general assembly, I was trying to take – we were, rather, trying to take note of a comment that was brought in by Alan during one of the working party meetings of not losing the general assembly concept in a Meeting B. Because our first goal at the Meeting B structure, there was nothing on general assemblies. And the concern was that a general assembly might be lost completely in the Meeting B, which would mean that the LAC region or the Africa regional might not necessarily be able to hold general assemblies since they would be the ones that would be hosting most, if not all, of the Meeting Bs.

Now with regards to the length of the time for the general assembly, it's something we could always work out and [tweak] around, but I didn't want to lose that or we didn't want to lose

that concept and that's the reason for [moving] that into day three. Alan, you want to comment on that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

A couple of things. The issue I raised regarding general assemblies is we had, at one point, said that since one of the concepts of bringing people to an ICANN meeting is to show them the full range of the ICANN meeting, and particularly a lot of the general things that are not just ALAC focused and type B meetings don't have any of that.

So at one point, the theory was proposed that we would not hold general assemblies at B Meetings. But that does have the implication that we might never hold one in Africa again, as an example, or at least not for a long while, and that clearly was [not acceptable] if we plan to have five general assemblies between each summit. And the summits, we're still roughly N years apart.

So clearly, we would have to figure out how to make a general assembly a useful thing at a B Meeting. But I certainly wasn't planning to say, "Cut out three years and make that the general assembly." Every time we have a general assembly, we do our best to integrate the people who are coming from the ALSes into the rest of the meetings, and sometimes we have something

extra in addition to them. Just to make sure that we're really getting bang for the buck, so to speak.

But that's going to be flexible if and when we have a general assembly at a B Meeting, we're going to have to figure out how to make it effective and that may be sacrilege of an extra day, which I know we're not allowed to do, but maybe that's what we have to try to do. So it was just mentioning that there may well be general assemblies during B meetings.

Now with regard to the first question on RALO leaders, the decision was made very early in our discussions that the intent is to bring the same 25-27 people to a B Meeting as to others, because very early on, we said maybe there are different people. I'm finished.

We can always rethink these decisions.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Alan. So from what I gather, the general assembly for now for meeting B in Panama is out. And, well, whatever slot we've allocated for a general assembly can't happen in Panama.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You heard Alberto earlier today saying he was trying to ask for special dispensation to hold a regional assembly on very short

notice. You heard my comment that it may be difficult, but that doesn't mean we don't ask. So if we end up with one, we will have to accommodate it. Period.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. Humberto, you have the floor. Please note that we have 15 minutes left for Meeting C. I do know that Meeting C and Meeting A are quite similar. So we allocate the last ten minutes for Meeting C. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I will speak in English. We are changing of opinion about the possibility of asking for a general assembly at the beginning because maybe we think it's – because we have a precise issue in LACRALO, and we are trying to see if we can deal with that issue in other way. Maybe in the next few days we can have some news. So we are going to [inaudible] asking for a general assembly right now, Alan. Thank you very much.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you for that clarification, Humberto. So that's it for day two and day three in intracommunity work. The bottom part of day three would be the regional showcase, which would last for two hours from 8:30 to 10:30. Go ahead, Raf.

RAFID FATANI: [inaudible]. Do people still see a need for a regional showcase? Do people still see a need for a regional showcase? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. There is always a need for that. There is always a need for a social event, the regional that is organizing the event, the meeting. I think it is a very, very good habit or a very good tradition we had since Nairobi, I think. I think that it is one of the great moments of the meeting. Everyone of ICANN come to this social event and it is very well appreciated, so we don't have to get rid of it.

RAFID FATANI: Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Raf. Thank you, Tijani. We'll move on to day four. Very quickly, just I think we've already discussed most of the points in day four. So slot one, 8:00 to 10:00; slot two, 10:00 to 12:00; slot three, 1:00 to 3:00 are all cross-community slots for the different cross-community working groups. Slot four, which is 3:00 to 5:00, is ALAC work, the working groups' updates. So all these working groups that are going on during the course of

week, this is sum-up session where we discuss and agree on – we discuss and is an update on all the working group chairs with regards to what has happened over the last few days.

Then we have a last session on the ALAC policy discussions wrap-up, as well. So during the course of the week, the two slots that we've allocated for ALAC policy work, we will have a wrap-up at the end, which is sort of like in line with what we currently have as a wrap-up for the discussions. And then we move the ALT back two hours to a dinner meeting.

We believe that because it's just a few individuals, it could be a dinner wrap-up rather than a roundtable discussion. [Suggestion]. Are there any interventions before we quickly move on to Meeting C? Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Beran. You are [modifying] the structure of the ALT meeting. The ALT meeting is inviting some ICANN – not leader, ICANN staff and Board Chair. This will not be possible on a dinner. So if you decide to modify like this, it will not be the same meeting that we have now.

BERAN GILLEN:

Thank you, Tijani. We have Alan, but I just want to chime in a little bit before I give Alan the floor. It's just a suggestion, as

everything else that we've put up here. It's not cast in stone. There will be a roundtable discussion. I just wanted you to know that it was brought down two hours later than it is actually normally when you meet. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: The chance of getting those senior ICANN people on a day that ICANN is sufficiently still in session or the evening afterwards when they're about to collapse is close to nil, I would think. For the record.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. We'll take note of those and then we'll move on to Meeting C. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: My understanding was we were looking, in developing some kind of five-year planning, we were looking to having two general assemblies a year but there's only one, and that's the B meeting. So am I taking it that we are scheduling out general assemblies except once?

ALAN GREENBERG: C is next year. C Meeting is in the next fiscal year, not yet budgeted.

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't understand [the] explanation. Because if there are three meetings in the space of a year, and one of them has general assembly, that says there's one general assembly a year. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Holly. I'm a bit confused with your concern, but it seems Alan and Sebastien can come in and clarify that. And then I can come in. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: First of all, recall that A, B, and C meetings in a calendar year. A and B are in one fiscal year, C is in another. So at this point, we have not budgeted for the Meeting C. So we don't know whether it is going to be a general assembly there.

The other question is can we ever have two general assemblies in a year? I hope so, if we're ever going to have another summit again. And we probably will have to have some general assemblies at B meetings. Otherwise, Latin America and Caribbean and Africa may be in a problem. So all of this we don't know.

HOLLY RAICHE: I understand what you're saying, which is so one part's in one year, one year the next. The point I was making is if I don't care where you start and finish, but there are three within 12 months, and one of them has got a general assembly and the other two don't. Now if we are planning for two a year, they don't fit. There is not room for them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, I don't know where you got the idea that there is only allowed to be one general assembly per year.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm saying that's what's in the schedule. I'm not saying what is or isn't allowed. I'm saying that's what's in the schedule.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Holly. I'll let Heidi come in here and clarify.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a couple of comments. I think that we're getting into the weeds here. General assemblies usually are built on top of a normal meeting. So when there is general assembly approved, I think we can make the exception and plan around that.

Just to note, always conscious of the budget, so Meeting B is four days. So you're going to have the cost. The flight cost would

be basically the same, but you're going to have significantly lower costs in terms of a four-day of accommodation and a stipend versus a seven-day meeting – Meeting C, or a six-day meeting, Meeting A – where you've got more hotel room, there's month per diems. So consider that.

At the same time, consider what experience you want for those ALSs. Do you want them to have full-on show with the public forums, Meeting A and Meeting C, or do you want that to be in terms of getting to know what the ALAC and other ACs and SOs are doing during Meeting B?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Heidi. I'm going to give Sebastien the floor. Really quickly, Sebastien. I just want to breeze through Meeting C before we c[close out].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I guess the [prime] was when we work on those schedule, we didn't include the general assembly. When we came to the B Meeting, because it was a, [do we will] have the possibility to have a general assembly in the B meeting, we decided to add it to the schedule. But as I decide A and C meeting are open to have general assembly, but it will be built on top.

And I really think that the question or idea about how long time we want the ALS's rep coming, it's important question. Because, for example, the C Meeting is supposed to be organized to allow people not to come to the whole meeting, if it's possible. That means there are parts of the meeting we will concentrate some issue and other issue will be taken care in the other part of the meeting. Then people can decide, or it can be decided for them, to not participate to the whole meeting. It's something we need to keep in mind, and the answers the question of Heidi. It's very important [when] in the future.

But here, we are talking about the schedule. Please come back to this question. Are we agree with this proposals? If yes, let's go. If it is agreed, let's tell us what you want to be changed. And all the other topics about how long time the people will come for [inaudible] and so on need to be discussed, need to be solved, but not in this topic meeting. Thank you.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Sebastien. Very quickly, Holly, if you want to comment before we wrap up on this Meeting C.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think I'm beginning to understand a little better. I think what I'm hearing is Meeting B is a logical place for a general assembly,

but if we want an additional meeting, it will have to fit in with A and/or C, if we want. Because we were talking about two general assemblies, if possible, and since these aren't written in stone, presumably we can move [inaudible] everything there written in stone.

BERAN GILLEN:

Holly, just to clarify, the reason we slotted in the general assembly for Meeting B was because we felt Meeting B was very unique in its structure. It's not the status quo. So we don't have much wiggle room so we had to figure out a way of freezing in a general assembly so that the regions, LAC and Africa region, will not be disadvantaged with regards to general assemblies.

That's why it was slotted in. But it doesn't mean it can't be in Meeting A or Meeting C, where there is much more wiggle room to move things around. I hope that's clear now. Thank you, Holly.

Just [inaudible] speed through, we have exactly two and a half minutes before the end of this session. I believe we will all agree that Meeting A and C are quite similar in structure apart from the additional day that we have for Meeting C – what just happened to my schedule? Okay, it's back on. Thank you.

So we'll take note of the same issues that were brought forth with regards to Meeting A. One would be the outreach on a Saturday. We'll take note of that. I think one of the issues that was of concern, which I haven't raised, which I want some feedback on, is regards to the working groups, bunching them together. The concern was that if some people were not part of a certain working group, they would sort of have a line in the hotel or not necessarily join these working group meetings since they're all lumped together in a four-hour block. Is this something you want to dispersed across the schedule so that you would have more involvement from different people?

Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm afraid that's one of those items that you have to play by the ear based on what meeting groups need to meet, have something to do, and you have to look at overlapping membership to say you're going to have all the meeting in parallel doesn't help if there's a key person who's a member of two meeting groups. It's really hard to do that a year in advance not knowing the specifics of what we're trying to do.

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. So what then the suggestion would be for the Meeting B, at least we have some sort of idea working with the LAC strategy and the LAC region. I think what we'll do is.... As Holly said, this is not cast in stone. We will wiggle around with the time slots, taking into consideration what you've given us feedback on from Meeting A, we'll apply it for Meeting C, and then, hopefully, from the session on Thursday, we'll be able to better concretize whatever we've come up with here today. But I think we've made a lot of progress, and I think we've really got some tangible feedback that we can work with in regards to the schedules.

And I thank you all for your time and patience. I don't see any disappearing acts. I really do appreciate that. Thank you for sticking in on the long haul, and I'll see you on Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: This meeting is not adjourned. We're just changing chairs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Everybody can rush down to the ground floor for the coffee. It is closing at 3:30 sharp, so rush down. Well it's maybe we can catch it. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Did I misread the schedule and people are leaving because the meeting's over? The coffee break isn't supposed to start for 15 minutes, I thought. So we scheduled our break when there's no coffee. If we let people go now, we'll never get back. Enjoy your coffee. Be back in 15 minutes. I'm powerless at this point.

Ladies and gentlemen, may we restart? Staff, are we ready? Okay. Thank you very much. The first item on the agenda, which is the one we postponed from just before the break is the call for volunteers for competition, consumer trust, consumer choice, and consumer choice review team.

If you will recall, associated with the new gTLD program, the Affirmation of Commitments, which was last agreement that was signed between ICANN and the US Department of Commerce, NTIA, called for a review on consumer trust and confidence in gTLDs to be scheduled a year after the first deployment of the new gTLDs under the program.

That review is scheduled to start on January 2016, and there is currently a call review team members out. The deadline for submitting an application is October 30. These things get extended on occasion, but I am not presuming this one will be extended.

The process calls people to apply in general, but to identify which AC and SO they believe they will be representing. And for

their application to be considered, the AC or SO must endorse them. We have the option of endorsing any or all of the applicants.

We do not know how many applicants that are endorsed by At-Large will be accepted. Based on our participation in the overall consumer trust process over the last couple of years – and there have been several activities that are associated with this, and based on our participation in other AOC reviews, I am guessing we'll probably have two. Could conceivably be three. If it's one, I believe I would be outraged, and I hope we all would be. So I'm looking probably at two.

We need a process by which to select these people and I will make a proposal, and then like to open it for discussion. Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want any of us who have put in an application to leave the room or to declare or what?

ALAN GREENBERG: Neither is necessary.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have. I understood that by us, and to date, I have received no copies of it. So if they have been forwarded to someone, they weren't forwarded to me, but perhaps they won't be forwarded until the end of the application process.

The application process ends on the 30th of October. The review team is supposed to be named, I believe, at the end of December, and I'm guessing we will have it probably – says it somewhere, but I haven't checked. We probably have three weeks or so in which to endorse candidates or not endorse them. We'll make sure the URL is in the chat if you're not familiar with the process. Okay.

That may well say something, but I don't know what it says. Okay. Deadline for endorsements, 30th of November. We have one month in which to endorse. I would like to suggest that the first level of triage be done by the ALT, by the ALAC Leadership Team, with the proviso that if any of the ALT members are applicants, then we will ask for one of the other ALAC members from that region to replace them.

I don't know to what extent the process is completely confidential. I know in the past, we have been moderately restrictive in publishing all of the details ahead of time. The final selection will have to be done by the ALAC, which may be a simple process or may, in fact, be a subject of discussion of the

ALAC, which of course, will be done in closed session because the ALAC in general does not discuss personal issues in public sessions.

So I guess I'd like to open it for comment that the first level of triage, which may be the final selection or may not be, depending on how many applications we get, be done by the ALAC Leadership Team or with replacements, as necessary.

I will prefix it before I open the meeting for discussion. Within the past, we have had varied experiences with applicants for these review teams. Sometimes, we get very few applications, and sometimes we get a large number of applications – some of which, number one, seem to have no history of any involvement in the subject, some of which have absolutely no history of involvement with At-Large.

When I say initial triage, usually there is some work to be done to make sure that even if we have to do a detailed review with all 15 ALAC members, that we focus our time on serious candidates. But of course, at this point, we have no idea who's going to [abide] at this point.

So I'm opening the discussion. Tim, and by the way, we're talking about since this will be done in the November timeframe, it will be done by the new ALAC, not the outgoing ALAC [inaudible]. Yes, Tim?

TIM DENTON: What is the work that needs doing?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's really going to be looking at the applications that come in and questioning whether we endorse them.

TIM DENTON: That's not my question, so I'll be more specifically. Sorry. What is the work that the person would do if they were nominated by this work?

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay. They will be a member of the Consumer Trust and Confidence Review Team, which will be meeting probably for the majority of the calendar year 2015, many teleconferences and probably several face-to-face meetings. We'll be producing a report of recommendations for how the new gTLD program – Analyzing how the new gTLD program has run from the point of view of consumers and making recommendations for how any following rounds be modified to better suit the needs of consumers.

TIM DENTON: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan, by the way, again, there's lots of little details. The work is moderately intensive on any of these review teams, and although, like in any group, the amount of work that a single person puts in varies. Some people work very hard, some people are members and don't do very much. We have high expectations for anyone that we stamp as an At-Large-endorsed person that we expect a very significant contribution from them.

Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I wanted to address Tim's question, and to go into a little bit maybe more specifics on what the people in the Review Team will be expected to do. Sometime back, there was a working team on consumer trust that was created, cross-community, and the GNSO and the At-Large were consulted on, do you have a set of metrics on things that should be measured to determine whether or not the TLD expansion program served the public need, enhanced public trust, and gave consumers more choice and so on and so forth?

At the time, there was a set of metrics that were produced by the GNSO and the ALAC together in a working group. The GNSO, as a group, rejected the At-Large proposals, so we sent them ourselves to the Board. The board said, "You need to look at

both,” and so going forward, there was a working team that drew up how are we going to measure both.

As a result, I believe there was a fairly comprehensive and expensive survey that was done by ICANN on some of these metrics. So the review team, I believe, in large part is going to be going over the results of the survey and going over the results of other metrics that are being collected to see whether or not the metrics that were defined by that original review team were met, exceeded, or fell short.

Tim, I don’t know if that answers your question, but I mean, in a very, very specific context, there is metrics that were already laid down and the review team is going to go over the results of what’s been collected and see if that actually met what was expected.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl and then Olivier.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]. He’ll get to you, I’m sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is it me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I was told by a good authority that yours was up before hers.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Just to ask, we used to have an At-Large subcommittee on the selection of members of various things. There was the selection of Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, delegates to the ICG, and another third process, which I forget about.

That may be – was it ATRT? The membership of that working group, I mean, this has been put as a past working group. Rather than having the ALT discuss any endorsement, wouldn't it be a good idea, maybe, to have that working group revived or something and maybe change some of the members of the group? Just a wild question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly, that working group, which is formed several years ago, is not the appropriate one. We could constitute a new working

group. I am suggesting that we not take the trouble to do this, but use the ALT as the first pass. But I'm opening up – if you're suggesting that we do a call for membership in this new selection group, that's a thing that you can suggest, if you choose. Olivier, and then we'll go on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Just as a response, the only thing I could see would be opposition from some people saying that it would be the same people that keep on selecting all the people. But the working group as it is at the moment, I think that all of the members of that working group are still very active. So they wouldn't – no, Rinalia is out already.

She was on it, version one, and then there was a version two and a version three, and every time there was someone missing because they were applying for a position, they were replaced by their respective RALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if you would like to let us know who these people are, not listing them today at this very moment, but send around a message, put it on a Skype chat, something, then that is an alternative. We have Cheryl next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I just want to make a suggestion, knowing, of course, and recognizing that I may be subject to this scrutiny. One of the things – and I’m happy I think that the subcommittee idea is not a bad one. It’s probably a very good way to go, and the precedent is there.

One of the things I would strongly suggest you ask the aspirants is their perception of what they think the work will be. So to go back to Tim’s point, to ask the applicant what they believe they will be doing as part of a capital R, capital T Review Team, and get them to demonstrate their knowledge of the Affirmation of Commitment Section 9.1.whatever, which relates to this and also the body of work, which Evan was referring to, which is, of course, not just one, but two, cross-community working groups, one of which worked for probably 13 months on establishing the baseline criteria.

And there’s sufficient public information out there that that way, you should be able to rest assured that you’re putting forward someone who is going to be able to hit the ground at a fairly good level rather than be on a learning curve. Because as you know, having served on review teams, the learning curve, the time is just not there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will comment that if I had known you were going to be saying that, I would have say, “No, you shouldn’t be participating in this process.” Since you’re one of the people, you’ve already announced that will be subject to these questions. But however, that notwithstanding, that’s the process to be followed by this group, not who the group is. Thank you.

Next, we have Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. I guess before I go to my comment, I’d like to say to Cheryl that when I was raising my flag, I was just saying that Alan should see not necessarily that I’m chairing, not necessarily that I’m taking over chairing role from Alan, just for the record.

Two questions. The first one is, is there a number to this? That is, is there a number of members from ALAC that is expected to be part of this group? Is there a specific number that is [inaudible]? And then is there an intention to also have something similar to IANA issue mailing list to actually allow those who are actually not going to be member of this group to, one way or the other, commit and contribute their views to the process?

ALAN GREENBERG: To answer the question of how many, we don't know. I already said I expect there to be two. I would be unhappy if there was only one, and I'd be surprised if there were there. But we do not know. It's not under our control. The ALAC, when it endorses people, can choose to endorse a very small number of people, which essentially says we are choosing who will be on it, or we can endorse a larger number of people and give the selectors, the people who are doing the actual selection, which I believe is the Chair of the Board and the Chair of the GAC, if I remember correctly. The opportunity of selecting among them to ensure diversity in various mixes. So we don't know the answer in terms of how many there are going to be. Sorry.

SEUN OJEDEJI: The second question about whether there's going to be open participation, because I remember you mentioned that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, sorry. If there is interest, there will be a group that will do it. We have never had a group that was as active as the IANA Issues, among other things. There was always feedback from the participants within the process. And I will say AOC reviews normally are very much the AOC Review Team going out to the community and soliciting input. So it is an iterative process.

I would expect anyone the ALAC identifies to be interacting with us, whether it's that mechanism or something else, remained to be seen. Can we go around first? We're going to run out of time at this point.

Holly is next. Card down. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: It looks like I'm in sync with Seun today because I wanted to say something similar to what he said. One of the questions was related to the candidates that will be endorsed by ALAC. I understand that one will be appointed by the ALT, and if there is a second candidate, my question is, will that person also be selected by the ALT or will there be a different procedure to use that second applicant, that second candidate?

I think this procedure should be very clear, especially because of some comments we've seen in the list as to the fact that the same people are always appointed to those positions. I understand what Cheryl says in that we need to have experienced people. There's no time to go through this learning curve. This is totally clear to me.

I just would like to balance these two things. On the other hand, I think I would also be a good idea to have an internal At-Large work group to support this candidate, similar to what we did for

the IANA transition and the ICANN accountability work. I was part of that group, even though I was not an excellent representative, having this support group in ALAC I think is very good for the representative who is in another group so that he can take the At-Large positions to this other group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll try to answer all of it. No. I think you misunderstood the process. What I was suggesting was a group – the process will have to be there's not a lot of choice. Some group, some small group, will have to go through the applications and make recommendations. That group may make recommendations to the ALAC, the entire ALAC, to endorse candidates, or it might give a – if we have 20 applicants, that group may narrow it down to six and suggest to the ALAC to pick four of them, or something like that.

So the question of whether the initial group does the selection. Remember, we're not selecting the candidates. We're deciding who to endorse. So whether we simply say we are recommending to the ALAC to endorse these four people out of whatever the number of candidates are, or that group could give us larger set and give the ALAC some choice.

If, for instance, there were very different types of candidates that were all good, we may make that choice. So that's up to the

initial group. I suggested that the initial group be the ALT just because it's a group that meets regularly and has some level of knowledge and experience within the group, within At-Large.

Olivier suggested that we create a selection team, and I'm quite happy with that, also. It just is an extra level of work that we have to do moderately quickly because the group has to start working in about two weeks. So I don't much care which of those it is, but we need to decide today which way we're going to go.

And Tim? And I see Garth, also. Go ahead.

TIM DENTON:

Mr. Chairman, I have not yet been in a group that has failed to function by a motion, a discussion, and a vote. Talking about talking, would it not be possible to have someone make a motion for some particular object to be achieved in the selection or recommendation process? And then we discuss it, and if we don't like it, we vote it down.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I believe that is what I did to start with.

TIM DENTON:

I haven't heard the motion yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: We tend to be a little bit less formal than motions. I suggested that the ALT be identified as the group, endorsed by the group by the ALAC, to do the selection. And we have had a counterargument or a counterexample.

TIM DENTON: So we've had the ALT is going to be our proposal that it be the nomination group, and some are speaking against it. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. The Chair suggested the ALT. I did not consult with them ahead of time.

TIM DENTON: Okay. So you have made this recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

TIM DENTON: Okay. I support your recommendation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. It's good to have new blood. It reminds us of our purpose. In relation to that, who's making the final decision? I mean, not in terms of ALAC promoting candidates, but who's making the final decision for the actual working group? I feel like these are really opaque sometimes, these decisions.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, my recollection but I haven't gone back to read it, if staff maybe can quickly scan it. It was correct. It is the Chair of the Board, and the Chair of the GAC that does the selection. That was specified in the Affirmation of Commitments originally and we are following that pattern.

The recommendations from the Accountability Working Group that are currently discussing things are suggesting a different group of people do the selection in the future if and when those bylaws are adopted.

TIM DENTON: So just to be clear, two people make the choice.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is exactly correct. Raf?

RAFID FATANI: I was going to ask [Garth] a question. But with Tim’s comments at hand, I don’t support the motion that the ALT should make this selection. I think this selection should be for the [inaudible] the ALAC, the incoming ALAC [inaudible] people, the whole 15 ALAC to choose, make the selection for recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. [When you say] recommendation, do you mean endorsement? You’re suggesting the third option that we not have a new committee group doing it, but the whole entire ALAC read all of the applications and do the triage.

RAFID FATANI: That’s correct. All 15 people.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments? I will comment we have done one like that before. It was an exceedingly not tedious process, but a very difficult process for reasons I can share in private. I prefer not to do in public.

RAFID FATANI: It’s also very democratic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. Well I believe we don't have time. So I support your suggestion to have [inaudible] and select this first group and [to work] very quickly to the solution. We don't have time. All the other solutions takes a lot of time. It's very difficult to – I do support the idea to have people around but normally does not work short time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I am fine with either, but if it is possible, we can revive the group. It is very easy because we have already the group and we can complete it people who already left or who are a candidate. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Beran, did you have your hand up? Anyone else? Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

All right. I actually posted in the chat, but I just want to reemphasize. I think the reason why I was actually asking whether there would be some form of engagement of the community is actually to view the experience. One of the things that you were saying was that [inaudible] have experience of these recommended to – experience is required to apply and [other stuff].

I think the only way to build the experience is if people are also involved in the process one way or the other indirectly, though. So that's why I'm thinking that it would be good to have some level of engagement of the community at the ALAC level. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll repeat what I said before. There is no question we will have an opportunity for engagement. In the past, we have had varying amounts of interest – some of it very, very low and very, very little. We're not likely to schedule meetings once a week if there's no interest. If there's lots of interest, there's no limit to how much we can engage.

Beran?

BERAN GILLEN: Thank you, Alan. I notice you said there's a shortage of time, and Vanda and stressed it. But I'm just curious how many applicants are we actually looking at to go through?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have no clue. I've been told by two people they have applied. There may be 30. We have received numbers like that in the past. Other times, we haven't. That simple. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Just for clarity, the ALAC will be the final decider of the candidates. The group that Alan is speaking about is to make the triage before the ALAC choose the people who will be on this group. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to clarify what Tijani said, the final decision is not made by ALAC. The final decision is made in accordance with the process, which is one level up. What we're talking about, what you mean, is selection of the candidates we put forward. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Kaili, in a moment. Just for clarity, if we only put forward one candidate, then chances are that person will be selected. If we put forward 12 candidates, we can guarantee we will not get all 12 selected. But we don't know whether it will be one, two, or three, or whatever it is. That is out of our control.

All we can do is endorse. How many we endorse may influence how many are selected – maybe. Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Without much background knowledge about this process, I think about whether we have ALT to decide for ALAC or we have higher ALAC people, the 15, to decide on the people to endorse. I think that's basically a balanced tradeoff between efficiency and, say, broader in democracy.

So whether we need broader democracy, I think that depends on the importance [of the] issue and how much we have trust in our ALT. My understanding is the ALT is democratically established, which many issues represent the overall ALAC people's ideas. So that's my thinking of this issue and, well, whether this way or that way, probably I think other people, current members, would know better, because I'm not in position anyway until a few days later. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just for clarity, what was originally suggested is the selector group, whichever it is, could present a small number of what it believes to be the ones the ALAC should endorse or could select or could pass on to the ALAC a larger list and suggest “here are six people, we suggest you endorse three.” Okay?

Given that there may be a significant number of people – may not be, we don’t know – having 15 people sitting around a table, an electronic table, because it’s going to be via conference call, and make that kind of decision and come to tradeoffs is just a very difficult thing to do in terms of simple logistic and discussion to have.

We have a whole bunch of speakers – sorry. No, no. I understand. We have a large number of speakers. I’m going to ask for the timer to be started because we really are going to – this wasn’t supposed to be a two-hour discussion and we’re eating into time that we really need to talk about other things.

We have Raf, I don’t know which order, Tim and Garth went up. Garth, Tim, and Fatima. Maybe someone else I missed. Raf?

RAFID FATANI:

I think to answer or to build on Kaili’s comment, I completely agree with you. With the sticky caveat that the democratic

process in selecting the ALT, in which I don't believe exists. So therefore it puts a cloud over on this issue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, the ALT has not been selected. There were nominations and I think they're still open, although I don't remember the date.

RAFID FATANI: No. I'm referring to the process. I'm not referring to this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I stand by what I said.

RAFID FATANI: So do I.

ALAN GREENBERG: Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. So we've established that the Chair of the GAC and the Chair of the Board get to pick the members of the working group, and it also sounds like they get to pick how many people

from each community are on the working group. In the US, we call that gerrymandering.

ALAN GREENBERG: It can be called whatever you want. It's not something that we have under our discretion at this point.

TIM DENTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to sound like I come from another planet. It's because I do. I think this staff should have a written proposal up on the wall in large print that we can look at and agree with or not. This is a point in the meeting when people come to actually make a decision about a structure that will make a decision. Perfectly reasonable process. We either agree with you or we don't. Fine. But it would really help that if there is going to be a structure to our discussion, there be a motion put up on the board that people can see. They don't have to agree with it, but at least it is some sort of conceptual clarity as to what were discussed, and you have attempted to provide it.

I make no objection to that. I'm in agreement with your proposal. I don't really have a problem with that, but I find this talking about talking about talking gets to me. So I'm just trying to say that we should have staff [inaudible] when there is a

motion on the floor to be discussed, a precise [inaudible] on the board in writing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tim. For the record, the ALAC attempts, whenever possible, to make decisions simply by consensus, and not by formal motions and votes. So that's the long-established process. When this item was put on the agenda, it was expected to be a five-minute item, and we will come to a complete decision given that it is not – we are not going to make a decision today, there will be a formal motion that will be done on our working meeting on Tuesday or Thursday.

TIM DENTON: Good, because I think that it might have been shorter had we had a precise proposal, and times when groups such as this need to act as parliaments and have broad-ranging discussion. There's other times in which we just, for a simple procedural matters like this, that can actually make a decision effectively or not, but at least we've had a decision to make, and it's precise about what we need to decide. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks. I will be speaking in Spanish. Tim, welcome to ALAC. I will speak in Spanish. Why are we taking so much time in this discussion? Part of the reason is why some of us are brave and are discussing aspects that other would not dare discuss. That's my personal view, and this is something that we already read in the mailing list. Why is it always the same people? And given this endorsement, just to the ALT's hands might cause this fear that, again, the same people are being chosen.

So this is now clearly outspoken on the table. That's why this turning around. That is the issue. There are some people who want this decision to be in the hands of the entire ALAC because, in their opinion, that will give opportunities to other people. I'm just conveying out loud what is not being said. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have Olivier, who wants to speak next. Before that, I am serving notice. After Olivier speaks – is Holly? Holly and then Olivier. I'm going to take quick straw poll of the current ALAC members on whether we want to do it with selection team, as Olivier suggested, or the whole ALAC. Holly, Olivier, and then a straw poll. I'm taking that off the table. If people are rejecting to it and want to do extra work, I'm fine with that.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's really a question by whoever the decision is made, what I would hope is that we have a nomination but also a full form that would indicate the background, the experience, the whole application, so that there be an informed decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I was going to summarize the discussions that we've had here. We have a choice between A, B, and C before you took the A option out. The A option was selection of candidates to endorse the candidates. The question is, selection of candidates endorsed by the ALAC to serve on the Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team.

So it's an endorsement of candidates, it's not a selection of candidates. A, selection or endorsement of the candidates by the At-Large Leadership Team. The plus for it is that it's a small, nimble team. The negative is that it's not seen as being democratic.

B, selection of candidates to be endorsed by the complete At-Large Advisory Committee. It's seen as being more democratic,

although there is a potential problem in that it's a large group, so it might not be possible to get everybody to be involved with this.

Third, a selection of candidates by a specialized selection committee. There is one that is in existence, and that has already made such work in the past. So it's A, B, or C. These are the three things on the table. The negative part of it, I guess...

There's a couple of more negatives I could say for the other things. Selection solely by the At-Large Advisory Committee completely puts the RALOs on the side because the RALOs themselves will not be in the At-Large Advisory Committee. And selection of the candidates by the specialized selection committee does have people who are both on the ALAC and also in the RALOs. There are three people per region, I believe, on the list, and the link is actually in the chat if you want to see the people that are in that committee.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I'll point out that that committee was chaired by the Chair of the ALAC, who is no longer the Chair of the ALAC, and therefore, that part may well change.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That part can. Fine. I'm happy with changing the chair of that committee. So it's A, B, or C what I think we should do is now to move on and the A, B, or C will be chosen on Thursday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or Tuesday.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Or Tuesday, whichever time you want to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next topic. All right. The next – I'm sorry. It doesn't matter. He just said we're not doing it now. The next topic is planning for the future ALAC meetings with other groups. The majority of them are already planned with agendas, and specifically for the GAC and the ccNSO. That was not known at the time this agenda was drawn up.

The meeting with the NCSG is not happening. We could not arrange one at the time. We therefore have a meeting to discuss any possible discussions with the Board that we meet with on Tuesday morning. There are two current items on the agenda. One is a brief review of some of the recommendations that came out of the At-Large Summit in London. As we're preparing for a new budget request for future GAs and summits, we feel it is

worth our while to raise the issue with the Board just to do [inaudible] raising that there is work going on and good things have come out of that summit.

That would probably be a 10 or 15-minute review. The other subject, which I believe we have an interest in talking about and the Board has explicitly asked for us to talk about is indeed our position on the accountability, on ICANN accountability.

For those who have not been participating in it, the ALAC and the ALAC representatives have been instrumental in directing much of what has happened throughout this process. Although we started out as a splinter group that was not in line with what the rest of the accountability group was thinking in many times, and there was some very strong statements, strong feelings, in the CCWG looking for enforceability a level of courts and, essentially, taking discretion away from the Board that At-Large felt very uncomfortable with, we now appear to be almost 100% in line with what the ALAC was looking for. And in fact, the model that we're likely to be using, not guaranteed at this point, is indeed one that At-Large proposed several weeks ago.

The fact that we have, to some extent, supported the overall position of the Board, not because we're trying to impress them, but just our beliefs were more in line with them than some of the other groups. Largely, perhaps, because we have no large

financial interest in ICANN and its outcomes, and some of the other groups have very large interests in this.

There has been no secret about some of the people involved in this because they're lawyers and they want, when they're defending their clients and suing ICANN, they want a good basis for, perhaps, winning their cases. These are quite public statements that have been made.

So I think the Board is interested in our current position. Our current position has been that we will support what has been proposed, but we don't like it. It would appear that what it is that... How the proposal is changing is very much in line with our thoughts. So I think there's some interesting interchange.

On the other hand, some parts of the Board are still opposing vehemently some of the aspects of what we are suggesting. Whether that will still be the case on Tuesday morning is not at all clear. This is a very fast-moving situation.

So I believe spending a significant amount of time on the accountability issue is something that is warranted. If you will recall, the format that we were asked to participate in in Buenos Aires was four selected people from the ALAC and four selected Board members.

We have made it clear that the ALAC did not appreciate that, and this is a meeting between the ALAC and the Board, and we expect all 15 members of the ALAC to be seated around the table. We've been told that given the physical shape of that table, it's going to be really tight, and there may be room for one or two Board members. That is what I'm told will be done.

Last, I'm told there were 16 seats around the table. That allows one Board member. The question is, are there any other subjects we want to raise to the Board's attention other than these two? Open the floor. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Alan. I endorse your proposal and I recommend not adding anything to those two subjects. I propose that the first one will be very, very short. It will be a report from ALAC about the recommendations, and then we go directly to the accountability issue because it is very important at this stage. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Just for the record, Rinalia did suggest the other order, and that if we run out of time, ATLAS recommendations drop off the agenda, but we could do it either way. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Plus one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Plus one to what Tijani said, what I said, the modified [inaudible] all of the above.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: To what Tijani said.

ALAN GREENBERG: You don't care about the order and the two topics are the ones you want. Leon? I'm sorry. I've been told that we have a [cultural] issue here. Plus one is what people often reply to in e-mail if they support what someone else said, and also in the chat. So plus one is a shorthand saying, "I support what someone said." Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, I definitely agree that we should – what was that? I definitely agree that we should privilege time for the accountability track, and I would support Rinalia's approach.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tim?

TIM DENTON: I support the limitations of topics to two, and preferably to one, the transition to any new state of ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else? I see no other cards up, no one in waving their hands, and the topic is done. We will do them, the two topics in the order of accountability, and if time, the ATLAS recommendations, and Tim, for the record, that's about how long I expected the last item to take. We are early. We have extra time now. That item didn't take nearly as long. Sorry. We may actually adjourn early, but I think Holly is trying to say something but she doesn't want to say it on camera.

HOLLY RAICHE: I do. I support anything [inaudible] so we could [inaudible] – some of us have to get time, have time to get to the other end of Dublin, before we actually get in a cab to go to dinner.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. We've dealt with the questions or discussion with the Board. I'd like to hear what the questions

and discussion will be with the ccNSO, the GAC, and the SSAC, please. Just a summary if they're already ready.

ALAN GREENBERG: The SSAC, I do not know what it is, but it is set. They have proposed something. Is Julie here? Or is it written on an agenda? I can't tell you about the SSAC. They do have a new report published, and I believe that was the major focus. With regard to the ccNSO, they have suggested a rather exhaustive list of topics, which includes how are we going to react to accountability, but there are some other ones. Geo-regions one is another one of the ones. I don't recall what the other are, but they are listed on the respective agendas.

And the last one is the GAC. The GAC has suggested about five topics. There's no way we're likely to get through them all, and we will do them in the order that they are happy with, as far as I'm concerned.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we have them, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought that they were actually on the various meeting agendas.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All I was asking is that [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Can staff read [inaudible] please?

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Sorry. Just to save some time here, I've got the ccNSO here to hand. We're meeting with them tomorrow afternoon from 4:45 to 5:30 PM. And the topics we have is CCWG proposal and how each group intends to handle it. Topic B, submission of final report on geographic regions. C, time permitting, a brief update on each group's interest in the use of country and territories as TLDs and geographic names.

ALAN GREENBERG: The SSAC has their new report on the root zone key rollover. And the GAC?

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: And the GAC on Tuesday afternoon from 4:30 to 5:30. Topic number one, IANA stewardship transition. Two, ICANN accountability. Three, new gTLD safeguards. And four, new ICANN meeting strategy. And I think that's already four topics for

one hour. I'm not even sure we're going to get through the four.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly and then Olivier.

HOLLY RAICHE: On the GNSO, I am assuming that they're going to run through stuff, but there are a couple of things that are coming to a head. One is WHOIS conflicts. That's an implementation working group, but I've got to say it's a fairly contentious one. I don't know whether we talk about that in front of them or offline. The other is the—

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, we're not meeting the GNSO. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. So we have four topics for the GAC. Could we perhaps here decide to shrink this to two? Because having 15 minutes on each topic sounds just like you introduce it and then move on to the next topic. So could we maybe decide among ourselves so we know if you're asked by the Chair of the GAC, "What do you want to start with?" you know which ones to start with and which ones to shrink to.

ALAN GREENBERG: My belief, and I believe it is correct, is they were in priority order. The IANA transition one is a matter of overall timing. I don't think we're talking about the process. Accountability clearly is going to be on everyone's mind, and then the GAC may well be the only group that will not be able to endorse the proposal because of one particular aspect of that proposal.

If we get to the gTLD and the meeting structure, I would be very surprised. I believe, in both cases, the group supplied items in priority order. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Is there a new report from the Geographic Region Working Group? Because I heard that they [want] to discuss the final report. I didn't see it.

ALAN GREENBERG: The final report is two years old. The Board has never, for reasons that are not 100% clear – and we could probably describe, if anyone really cares, and we don't want to leave here early, why it has been delayed this long. Cheryl, who happens to be running that group, could illuminate us if someone wants to know. Tijani wants us all to know. Can you please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly. In fact, it was delayed at two points, Tijani. It was delayed after our final public comment and before it went to the chartering organization. The primary chartering organization was the ccNSO, and that was for a number of administrative reasons. The ccNSO Council was occupied with other things, so we missed a few opportunities there.

It then needed to be reviewed in terms of some of the other policy work that was being done. Because one of the recommendations out of this is for some specific policy work to be done. We have looked again at the document. Yes, it is “two years old” but what was published and has gone out to the leadership and groups for another review has, in fact, had a few minor modifications and updates. And as a result of this current review, we have received, at least from the GAC, that I am aware of, some additional commentary and edits, which Rob and I are making before it then goes to the ICANN Board for Marrakech. So that’s set in a potted history.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl, and that is different from the last version I heard where the Board was going to be approving it at this meeting. Don’t need to discuss it.

We have some housekeeping and details about dinner. Is there anything else that anyone wants to raise before we get to that? Then I turn it over to Gisella, I think, to talk about whatever you want to talk about, and where we meet for dinner and who is included in the dinner.

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Thank you, Alan. The famous last words is I might give you a few minutes of your life back. As the agenda run over, I didn't prepare a little slide for the housekeeping, but it will be short and sweet. I've sent an e-mail around for the meetings tomorrow. We've been through this. Please do look at the ALAC wiki pages for the agendas. We're starting at 8:00 tomorrow morning and the ALAC will reconvene here tomorrow morning at 9:00. I'm just double checking the timings. Sorry about that.

The At-Large Review Working Party, please do meet here on time tomorrow. We've only got one hour and I do believe that it's going to be a fully packed agenda, and Larisa will be with us as well as [Charla]. Please do be here on time. And then we need to start promptly at 9:00 because, again, we're running into a very busy schedule tomorrow and unless we start on time, we're not going to get through the agendas this week.

With regards to the dinner this evening – sorry, I was just looking at the agenda tomorrow because I do believe that Fadi is coming

to see us, as well. So yes, before I get anything about coffee breaks tomorrow, I thought I'd just let you know, the afternoon coffee break will be fine. You'll all get coffee break, but in the morning, during the morning coffee break, Fadi is meeting with us. It's basically that or we don't see him.

So if you can maybe just slip out before or after or get a coffee or get someone to get one for you, I think that would be a great idea, but it's going to be very tight tomorrow morning. The afternoon will be fine.

With regards to this evening, I sent an e-mail around to the ALAC, to the regional leaders and liaisons, and there's a dinner on this evening, 7:30 at the Old Spot downtown. Please, if everyone coming could bring 40 euros cash, that would be great, because the places here are not willing to do separate bills. As much as we've tried and begged, they're not willing to do it. So 40 euros cash, please.

And we'll meet there 7:30-7:45. I'll be there to welcome you all and the very important France/New Zealand starts at 8:00 PM and there is a television screen.

Sorry, and I haven't heard the South Africa/Wales results this afternoon. Sorry, that's very much part of European news at the moment. Thank you. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: So no provided transportation.

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: No. No provided transportation. I have asked people if they – we’ve come to an arrangement. If they get four people in a taxi, we’ll come to an arrangement.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just asking for people.

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Yeah, sorry. Clarity, there’s no arranged transportation. Everyone is going kind of gets the gist of what I said about the just get four people into a taxi.

ALAN GREENBERG: And what time are they supposed to be there?

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Between 7:30 and 8:00. I mean, if everyone could be there, try and be there for 7:30 onwards, 7:45.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we think [inaudible] how long to get there?

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Probably about 15 minutes. Last night traffic, even with one direction, was very good, because we're going in the opposite direction.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know what direction it was. I went to the Westin last night, and it would have been faster to walk.

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Yes. One Direction is the band playing in the 3Arena this evening. Just allow yourself enough time. The later we get there, the later we're going to start dinner, and the more likely we are to have less people awake tomorrow morning, and that is what we're here. But we would like to have a nice evening together and to get to socialize and to get to know each other, and that is also part of the networking. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is this place within walking distance?

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE: Everything is within walking distance. It just depends on how fit you are, but yes, it is. It's about a 22-minute walk from the Convention Centre. Yes, it is.

Sorry to interrupt, Alan. I've had some very important information from Evan, who's clearly been right into the menu, that it's actually 45 euros if you want the steak.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Two more items of housekeeping. One is about the meeting reports. I don't know whether you were going to mention those, but I'm putting a link into the chat. For those people who haven't been here before, you will have some time that you will spend in other rooms in the building, and be following other meetings that are not just ALAC and At-Large meetings.

It would be very helpful if you could write a little report about what you heard, what happened in that place, and so we have a wiki page that is specifically for that. I know that some are very good at doing this, others have not ever filed a meeting report, but it would be really helpful that you could all do so. If you cannot edit the wiki page because you don't have the rights to edit it yet, then please send your reports to At-Large staff.

Secondly, this is not just the end of the day for everyone. There is a working group meeting that will continue after this, after

finishing this meeting. It will start at 5:30, so in about half an hour.

I'm not sure that we can because there could be some people who are following us remotely or who are coming – well. So we might start it a few minutes early, yes, and, of course, everyone is invited to remain here for that meeting. It's about ICANN accountability and IANA stewardship transition. So it's the really discussion of the day.

And Alan will no doubt be able to brief us about what happened earlier this morning. That's it for my announcements. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I do have one other announcement. Stop me if this was already made. The ALAC/At-Large meetings are obligatory. If you are attending some other meeting because you believe it's of much more importance or you're specifically assigned there, or have a responsibility there, please let staff know so we can know where you are. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, Alan. And I just wanted to note, did you cover off the matter of exercising some self-control as to what topics are to be brought up by our members? You were talking this morning at

our Leadership Team and I felt, well, you were reading housekeeping, you might want to raise that.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're talking about the Board meeting. Okay, but we have already identified the only two topics that we're talking about at the Board member.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. You didn't tell everybody what – yes, you did make it clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll make it clear. At the Board and ALAC meeting, we raised a number of topics, which were perceived by some Board members as the ALAC complaining we don't get enough money. Do not raise anything that will be raised as complaining that we don't get enough money. That was not what we were saying at the time, but it was perceived that way. So exercise caution. Thank you.

And that goes along with we don't want to hear at the Board meeting that you've had travel problems, that your hotel rooms are rotten. If there are rats, you can mention it. That did happen once. No visa issues, no travel issues, no walking too far to the

hotel, none of that. We will address some of those with senior ICANN management, but not at the Board level, please. Thank you for reminding me, Cheryl.

This meeting is adjourned. We will meet most of you, I hope, for dinner, and 8:00 tomorrow morning. And thank you. I'm not. The IANA issues, for those who were concerned, will be meeting here. For those who are not, we will see you at dinner, as I said, at 8:00 tomorrow morning. And I think technical staff and the interpreters for putting up with us today. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And the IANA Issues meeting will start 15 minutes early since whether finished early. So we want to start at quarter past. So if you need to go to the bathroom and so on. Ten-minute break, yep. Quarter past, we start.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]