
HELSINKI – At-Large Outreach and Engagement Session PM
Monday, June 27, 2016 – 13:30 to 15:00 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

ALAN GREENBERG:

...at the table, that would be nice. If there are any ICANN Fellows in the room – and we're told there should be about four or five – it would be nice to have sit at the table. Here's a seat.

All right, thank you. I'm afraid we're developing a pattern of starting ten minutes late. We'll try not to continue doing this. This is an unusual session. It was originally billed as an outreach session, and we were expecting 25 or so ICANN Fellows to be here, and we were going to explain things, what we do. We've been told that we'll only see four or five of those, who are particularly interested in what we're doing and already know what we're doing, or at least to some extent.

So what I'd like to do is first go around the table and introduce the Fellows. I don't think we have enough time, unfortunately, to do a full set of introductions. But around the table, we have the ALAC, which is 15 members, most of whom are at this meeting. And from each region, we typically have the Chair and the Secretariat, the two people responsible for the region.

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.

I'm Alan Greenberg, the Chair of ALAC. And I'd like to go around the table, or outside the table if applicable, and have any of the Fellows who are joining us introduce themselves. And then we're going to move into a review of the fiscal year '17. That is the fiscal year starting at the end of this month, going for a year, the requests that At-Large and ALAC has made – some of them, the ALAC itself; many of them, the RALOs – the requests we've made. And we'll be reviewing what the results are.

This may sound boring, but in fact, this captures an awful lot of what we spend our time doing, because the budgets are the mechanism by which we do a lot of the interesting things that we do. So we're going to be reviewing the total requests, including those that were rejected, and the outcomes of some of those are more positive than you'd think, with the word "rejected." And we welcome input or thoughts, questions from anybody around the table, Fellows or ALAC or regional leaders.

So if we could start at the far end, I don't know where the first Fellow is. I recognize all the faces on that whole – well, I was looking on that side. I don't see any.

AIDA MAHMUTOVIC:

Okay. So good morning, good afternoon, everyone. I'm from Bosnia and Herzegovina. I come from civil society. I'm also involved with the national IGF of Bosnia and Herzegovina and

the executive committee for SEDIG, which stands for Southeastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance, basically sub-regional IGF. And I'm an ICANN alumni. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

NARINE KHACHATRYAN: Good morning, everyone. I am a representative of Armenian At-Large Structure. In our country, I am a coordinator of Safer Internet Armenia, which is a cyber-safety and Internet safety awareness raising. I participate in the work of At-Large, APRALO, EURALO. I am engaged in several working groups, and I have been actively participating in the European Dialogue on Internet Governance, EuroDIG. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Before we continue, I'll remind people or tell people, we do have English, French, and Spanish interpretation. So if you speak all of those languages, you don't need a headset. But otherwise, you might want to pick them up. But feel free to speak in any of those languages, if appropriate. Back to you. And we also have a roving microphone, for those who are not at the table.

Anymore fellows?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Always a Fellow.

ALAN GREENBERG: You don't count anymore as a Fellow.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Fellow Alumni, I am a member of the ISOC Zimbabwe chapter, and I am also a mentee to Cheryl, within the At-Large.

CHRISTIAN MULOLA: I come from Rwanda, second-time Fellow. And I am also ALS leader in Rwanda. I am also a national coordinator for IGF, and also East Africa coordinator for IGF. Thank you so much.

CHRISTOPHER MOMANYI: From Kenya, I belong to the GNSO. I'm also in the Next Generation group in my country. Thank you. I'm a Fellow alumni.

ISAQUE MANTEIGA JOAQUIM: Hello, everyone. From Mozambique, I'm from civil society, academia, Internet user. I'm here to start to be a part of At-Large community.

OLEG DEMIDOV: Hello, everyone. I'm a second-time Fellow, and I'm based in Moscow, Russia. I'm a member of the Russian chapter of ISOC, and I'm also a member of the Research Advisory Network, under the Global Commission on Internet Governance. I represent the academia center and PIR Center in Moscow. Have been cooperating with regional representatives of ICANN for the global stakeholder engagement in my region, which is Central Asia and Eastern Europe, and have been engaged in conducting a research study on security, stability, and resilience for ICANN as well. So I'm glad to be here.

ANDREW ARKDON MOLIVURAE: Good afternoon, everyone. I am a second-time Fellow. Also, I also represent an organization in Vanuatu that's called Vanuatu IT Users Society that is a new ALS that was created recently. And I'm happy to be here. Thank you.

STANLEY OSAO: Hello, I'm from Papua New Guinea in the Pacific Islands. I'm involved in community groups, civil societies. I'm working on the Internet user group in my country to have it affiliated with ALS, APRALO. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Anymore Fellows this side? Thank you.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS: Good afternoon. I am from Pakistan. I am an ICANN Fellow. This is my sixth meeting. I am also president of ISOC Islamabad chapter, which is an ALS. Thank you.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Hi, everyone. I am from Mexico. I am from the government. I am involved in the [Initiative Group] on Internet Governance that is the IGF national structure. I am also involved in the ISOC Mexico, and also [inaudible] Mexico and a couple of government organizations. And second-time Fellow.

BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Hi everyone. From Nepal, Nepal chapter Internet Society, Nepal chapter. This time I am not a Fellow, but I am representing my own. Toronto 45 was my first Fellowship. I am involved in At-Large, APRALO, ALAC, and NPOC. My interest area is in security also. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just one more, please.

[ANDREAS ZODE] Hello. I am a UI/UX designer. Originally from Ethiopia, but I came from US, representing my company. I work for FDA, US government. So I'm an Internet user. Thank you.

BEATRIZ RODRIGUEZ: Good morning. Sorry, good afternoon. It's the change of the time. I will speak in Spanish then. I am from Uruguay. I am an alumni. I represent the Uruguay Internet Society chapter. Thank you very much.

ANA KAKALASHVILI: Hello. I am from Georgia, Eastern European region. I am academia, lawyer, cyber-security. I'm a part of ISOC chapter Georgia and initiated recently Georgian IGF in my country. Thank you. And do I have to say that I'm also user? I'd be surprised, if not.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, seeing we have new faces here, can I please just remind you that we have French and Spanish interpretation. For that reason, and also for transcript purpose, please always say your name when you speak, each and every time you speak, so that the interpreters can also identify you on the various language channels and also for our remote participants, who are joining us via the Adobe Connect room.

And we have cameras in the middle of the room, which will be working with your microphone. So once you have spoken, please just put your microphones off. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Gisella. As I mentioned earlier, we were originally warned that we would probably only have four or five fellows here. We seem to have a few more. I hope whatever other meetings are going on are not feeling too lonely. But thank you all for attending.

The bulk of this meeting, as I earlier said, will be a very fast review, because it's a large one, of the fiscal year '17 requests that were made through At-Large and the ALAC. Rob Hoggarth will be presenting them. And I'll turn it over to Rob.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you all for allowing me to attend and taking some time out of your agenda. I think I have 35 minutes. By my calculations, there are approximately 20 separate requests that were submitted through the At-Large community, which leaves about a minute and a half for each one. That won't do justice to any individual request. But recognizing that some come from the ALAC itself, some come from individual regional At-Large organizations, I'm delighted to

do follow-ups with any particular group. Sometimes I appreciate that the follow-up for a not-approval – we don't use the term "rejection," Alan – the term for a not-approval is probably a more important discussion than for an approval, in that there are lessons learned and opportunities to find ways to do a better job, from a staff perspective, as well as from a proposal perspective in the future. Maybe opportunities for additional dialogue with ICANN staff. So I just wanted to identify that as an overview.

The second thing that I'd like to share is two overall points when it comes to the special budget request process. As many of you are aware, it was a process that ICANN staff started about 5 ½, 6 years ago now that was designed to be an addendum, if you will, or a supplement to the overall ICANN operating plan and budget efforts. The idea was that there would be new concepts, new ideas, ways to improve or expand existing resources for the community, and to be able to do that in a way that was not tied to the overall budget process. Many of these requests are not to the level of taking a major percentage of the ICANN budget, but represent novel, experimental, or just very good ideas that are worth considering or looking into for the future. And so that's one of the reasons why the process was started.

Under the evolution of the work over time, what we've really focused on, from a staff perspective – and ultimately, the Board

approves these requests or does not approve these requests – it becomes a matter of providing the capability. While it's called a budget process, this is not intended to be defined as you get \$12, or you get 15 euros, or some other specific amount for a particular project. When a budget gets approved, there's the recognition that it will take place, but a matter of trying to figure out how that will happen or how it can be managed. And staff has given guidance, in terms of how that can be done. But it's important to note that, from many respects, from a staff perspective, there is a commitment to try to deliver a capability.

In some cases, it's a matter of – and you'll see in some of the requests that we go through today, it's a matter of future collaboration or opportunities to have further discussions with staff, to maybe further flesh out an idea, to explore whether it can work from a practical standpoint. Because one of the other considerations that we take into account when there is a review, and ultimate Board action, is not just the financial implications, but the overall resource implications. It's really a recognition that very few projects are simply opening up a wallet and paying an invoice. There's staff time. There's organizational time. And a recognition that there's not an ever-expanding pot or pie, if you will. And so that's another aspect of this.

And finally, just a recognition that the overall opportunity for special budget requests is not unlimited either. Every year, when

the draft budget comes out, there's an envelope. It basically says, "Within this envelope, we hope to be able to provide some additional support, do some experiments, figure out ways to move forward." And from that perspective as well, it's a case where, unfortunately, not every request can be approved or accepted, simply because there are not enough resources to do it.

So those are my overall caveats and perspectives, in terms of the context in which this work is considered. Now what I'd like to do is we'll just go through each one individually. Again, I'll be very brief. And I would ask that for the most part, if you have really detailed questions or there's something that we should work out, we should schedule some time with the individual group or requestors who've made the request. We may have discussions, and I'm more than happy to answer any questions. But, Alan, I'm going to be very conscious of your time and your agenda.

I believe Ariel has put together a really great list. It's posted up on the screens, and I guess on the Adobe Connect pod. So I'll just use that as my guide. And perhaps if you could just scroll down sort of as we go through each one, that would be great.

Do you have numbers associated? Is it wide enough to show the numbers of the designated requests? That's all I would ask. No? That's okay. I've got my own separate list.

The first one is “Strategic Working Session for ALAC and RALO Leaders at ICANN 55.” That was a developmental session.

Oh, I see. Thank you. Ariel, this is the first time I’m looking at it, so I’m just figuring out the layout here. Thanks for your indulgence. No, that’s good. If you just keep that main text, that would be good.

We’ll call this, for right now, just the first request. And we’ll go through each of them. As you’ll see on this, the request for this strategic working session between ALAC and RALO leaders was approved. But the original request was for two meetings, and the approval came through for one meeting only. That would be ICANN 57, which is the Meeting C. So this request was approved.

My sense, Heidi and Ariel and Alan, is that I’ll go through each one of these, just say approved or not approved, pause for a second, see if there are any hands for questions, and then just continue to move on. Will that work? Thank you.

Ariel, if we can scroll the next?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I didn’t realize that was the pause. My only question on that one would be if it was useful in one, why would it not be useful in two? Or is that purely a budget decision?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I'm hesitating and pausing simply because I didn't make the decisions on all these. So I'm looking at it and trying to remember, in terms of the feedback that I received. On this one, my recollection was that Meeting C provided the time and the schedule to permit this activity to happen, whereas the next meeting, 58, which was Meeting A, would not do so. But I'll look to clarify that for you, in terms of the specific reason.

Sorry, I couldn't hear what he said.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I was saying that I am sure that he's right, because it ways of meeting. A, B, and C were set up. The C meeting is one day more, on Friday, to allow each and every SO and AC to have one day to sit the new body after the end of the [IGM]. And I am sure that, hopefully, those requests for budget will not be needed in the future because it will be embedded in the organization of the C meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, this was the meeting at the beginning, was it not? Yeah, this in fact is not the seating meeting at the end, but extra facilities for the first day of our working session, just for the

record. Let's go ahead. We're not going to debate this right now. It makes little sense to us, but go ahead.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. Ariel, next on the list?

The second is "ALAC Development Session at ICANN 57 Second Pilot Activity." This request was also approved. As Alan noted, the previous request was for the meeting at the beginning of the sessions. This was for the meeting at the end of the meeting. And this is to cover Meeting C, which is the next meeting in Hyderabad, in FY17.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the new people here, Meeting C is when we tend to have a large number of new ALAC members seated who many not have a history. And this is an integration meeting, to try to get everyone up to speed, to get the new group working together as a team. Because in many cases, there may be a significant number of new people in the group. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. Next, Ariel.

The next item is the request for real-time captioning of Adobe Connect meetings in English, Spanish, and French. This is the

continuation of an existing pilot effort in FY16 to test the capability to provide real-time captioning for a variety of reasons for people who have accessibility issues or the ability for certain languages. Ultimately, the idea is that it is more effective and efficient, from an ICANN perspective, to be able to provide transcripts through this different service provider.

The hope and expectation – and I’ll let some of the requestors supplement my comments if necessary – to essentially give more opportunities so that we can more effectively manage the service. And this was a pilot that started in FY16, seemed to be going well. And so the capability was provided for the next fiscal year, basically to provide a nice six to seven months, in close to total of 15 telephone calls, for this pilot effort. I think at the end of the process, the expectation is that you all, as a community, will say, “This works and this is great,” or that paying less for a more real-time service might not be effective. But I think, based upon some of the initial feedback, it seemed to be working. And so this request was approved.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. So the captioning will be for the three languages? Because the pilot was only for English.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: The pilot is continuing. So the pilot is remaining in English, to see if that works. Ultimately, again, if the decision is, or the assessment is that it is working, then it provides the road to be able to do it in other languages, as well.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, so my question is, if we were not going to go to expand to French and Spanish, then my question is, why was only two additional months being granted? Because then we have the whole fiscal year to wait for another chance, because a decision is not going to be made during this year to extend it. It will be for the next fiscal year. But what about the rest of this fiscal year? And curious of why they chose two months and not three months or longer.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I believe the explanation does say three months. And if you take those three months, it takes you into the fall, which is the timing for the next fiscal year, for FY18.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That's only six calls.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I'm reading an additional three months, six conference calls.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, but the current pilot was three months, with three calls each month, for a total of nine calls. And this is basically six calls. So it's the equivalent of two months for what we had three months.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I don't know if in this fiscal year you utilized all of the nine.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: We did. We did.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Okay. All right.

ALAN GREENBERG: As Rob said, he wasn't the one who necessarily made all the decisions. So we're trying to give a quick overview. We didn't get everything we wanted. We didn't get a lot. So we're just trying to

review it right now, not debate whether we were treated fairly or not.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm not saying that.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you both. Let's go to the next one, Ariel.

This next request was more of a process request, I think, than a specific resource request. You all asked for discretion to use allocated travel slots to support your volunteer leaders. And the recognition was that you do have that discretion and can proceed in that regard.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm supposed to make a point that it was actually used already for this meeting, even though this was not the fiscal year. I will take the opportunity, without being prompted, to note that there were three requests in this budget request which weren't really budget requests. They may have had dollars associated with them, but they were all issues that the ALAC had been asking for, demanding, begging, crying for and were ignored, some of them not requiring any money whatsoever. And the fiscal year budget process seemed to be a way to catch senior

management’s attention, and it did. That, to me, says we have something broken in our organizational structure, if we have to use a fiscal year budget to catch someone’s attention because no one is listening to us. But this was one of those. Thank you.

By the way, the wording in the result is not quite what we asked for, at least what I read when it was announced. And we will talk about that further, but not right now.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you, sir. You can go to the next one.

This next item was a request from the RALOs to fund local engagement activities. And the specifics, from a process standpoint, I think made approval, as submitted, not possible. The request asked for the dollars to be made available without condition. At least that was the interpretation of the request. There was a recognition that expanding support to a local level was indeed a good thing, and certainly worth testing and trying to figure out, on a pilot basis, whether that could be managed effectively.

Basically, the decision, as provided, basically said, “Let’s give some additional resources to the regional teams of ICANN and provide the opportunity for collaboration and interaction to take place at that level.” I think that this is a common theme

that we've seen through a number of requests over the years, where ICANN, or the advice that ICANN has received from our legal and financial teams, is that grants of dollars are simply not possible, because there's not the process for being able to review them. That may change in the future, but that's the current process that we're operating under now.

And so resources, on a nominal basis, were essentially provided for the availability of the regional teams. And I think that the practical impact of this decision is that individual groups, particularly on the RALO level who are interested in taking advantage of more localized activities, should reach out to their regional teams as part of their overall collaboration, to continue the good partnerships that have been developing and that we hope will continue to develop and mature, and use that as a base moving forward, opening up further lines of communication, understanding that there are now nominal funds that may be available for particular projects. So that's something that we hope can be worked out over time. We've seen that in the past with a number of other activities and requests with other communities that seemed to have worked, with the idea of creating more dialogue. So that's the resolution of that item.

That's my pause. We can go to the next one.

The next item is, I believe, one in the category that Alan just referred to of an item that didn't reflect a specific dollar amount, but reflected a concern of your community about lack of movement in a particular area. This one had to do with bugs regarding ICANN's machine translation tool. I think this request, from what I observed, immediately prompted dialogue with operational staff. I can't comment, because I simply don't know where the status of that is or what that prompted, in terms of success. But I understand that there is now dialogue and conversation about improving something that could be a really useful tool that apparently, to date, just hasn't proven to be effective.

ALAN GREENBERG:

For context, for those who haven't been involved in it, for our Latin America/Caribbean region, where the two predominant languages are English and Spanish, we have two mailing lists, an English and Spanish list. And any message to any one of the lists would be automatically translated to the other language and posted. The mechanism that was used resulted in close to unreadable messages, often misleading, and subject lines that were so filled with brackets and punctuation that they had no content whatsoever. And since many of us decide whether to read a message based on the subject, that was futile. And it's gone up and down, but basically we've been using that since

2008. And we were just a bit frustrated, going into our eighth year. We considered waiting for our tenth birthday of the problem and decided not to wait.

Dev, what's the current status?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Frustrated. Obviously, very frustrated, as someone from the region. So what has happened is that ICANN's IT, there's a new community services manager for IT Services. So that person, they have now gone out and tried to developer to help, to be hired, to actually fix the remaining bugs. To date, that developer has yet to be found. But the fact that it's now been formally recognized and they need to now get a dedicated person to really work on the issue, thank goodness it's happening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given the focus within ICANN of perhaps needing to work for other working groups in areas in multiple languages, I think the community might be served well. So we have hopes.

Rob?

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you, sir. Ariel, next one, please. Oh, I'm sorry, Vanda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Vanda, please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, the problem of this translation in LAC region, generates a lot of misunderstandings among people and generates a lot of problems for the community. And for instance, especially for Brazil, there is [not] both language, but they can read one or another. But some of them has more difficulties in English, so they try to get the Spanish. But the Spanish, it's impossible to read when it comes from English, and it's completely out of sense. So most of the time, I need to translate myself and send to my friends, because that's the only way to make them participate, or they will never understand what is going on. So it's something that needs to be fixed. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: Thank you. Ariel, can we move to the next one? I was having her slide it over. Thank you. For those note paying attention up here, I'm getting cues from my fellow staff, so I appreciate your patience with my pauses.

This item, the next one is the RALO developmental session at ICANN 57, noted as a second pilot activity. This was also approved with a notation that, from a resource perspective, we needed to use staff facilitation capabilities. This is also going to

take place at Meeting C. And I hope there will be additional learning from this.

I think a number of you will observe that a lot of the requests seem to be focused on the Meeting C. So that will be a real milestone or a set of benchmarks for learning, I think, for a number of these activities.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You'll recall earlier, there was a similar session for ALAC, where I said that was a session to try to bring the group together, perhaps with many new members, to work as a single unit. This is a comparable session, but parallel to it, for the RALO leaders.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you, Alan. And you all did a good job this year of being able to explain those and the differences between each one, as well as being very helpful in terms of sharing what day, what timing, and things like that. So that was very helpful. Thank you.

Ariel, the next one, please?

AFRALO General Assembly and capacity building, this is one of three. And I'd like to discuss them collectively, if I can. I believe, timing-wise, for this year, we received three General Assembly requests, from AFRALO, LACRALO, and NARALO. As in past years,

one of the concerns we have, from a staff perspective, was not only the ability to staff it – and of course, Heidi and her team are very confident in that capability – but also the challenges it presents from a budget perspective.

I believe, when you read the grant requests, the staff and Board did something similar to you guys that we did in FY16. It was, “Well, there’s three requests. We can only do two. So you guys pick.” But I think what we’ve been able to do, through a number of staff discussions, between the Board approval or action on these requests at the end of April and today, is to work through the capabilities of being able to give you the option to address all three.

This is something that Heidi may want to talk with you all in more detail with as you begin the planning. But it does appear that we’ll have the flexibility, through some novel work and some really hard conversations, to be able to give you all the option to do three Assemblies this year. I’ll leave you guys for further discussions, in terms of what the process and the details of that might be.

Heidi, did I do an appropriate job of explaining that? For the record, I got a thumbs-up, so.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll point out, we did have a fallback if you had not managed to do that. And that was we happen to have a meeting in Johannesburg in June, correct, where we would like to hold the General Assembly. If the General Assembly had not been funded, we were then going to ask to, if you are likely to fund it in fiscal year '18, can we use the money a month early? You won't get the bills until July anyway. But luckily, it looks like we're not going to have to ask that. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: That would be another uncomfortable conversation, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: We really like pushing the envelope.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: For the record, all I'm doing is smiling. I'm not responding to that.

But in terms of just –

ALAN GREENBERG: He's a wise man.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: In terms of just a general observation, and I think it's important to share this with all of you, from a Regional At-Large Organization perspective, there's great appreciation, I think, on the staff and Board level, and I hope within your own communities, about how you are all being very creative in your approaches, in how you manage the resources that are made available, the novel ways that you approach these, and the spirit of "can do." And so I just wanted to share that perspective.

Ariel, can we go to the next one, please?

The next one is entitled "AFRALO Workshop at the 2016 IGF." And again, I'm going to group this request in with a number of others, noting that this one received a no/yes, and just share with you the overall approach on this item and a number of others, because I notice there are seven minutes left on my agenda and we'd never get through all. But I think this is an important overview, if you will, in terms of some of the considerations and feedback we were getting on a number of these requests.

The number one, or first, aspect of this is that IGF is an important community event overall for the Internet community. From an ICANN perspective, there are many different pieces that go into participating in an IGF. The IGF represents perhaps an exception to something, if it has not been specifically noted, but

generally recognized and may be observed somewhat as a tradition within ICANN resources, is a general reluctance to fund participation in third-party meetings. The idea is that the resources are available in the ICANN budget to participate in ICANN events and not additional events within the general I-star community or Internet community.

The IGF represents somewhat of an exception to that. And so I think our colleagues who are responsible for that area of the operations looks upon these requests with good spirit and goodwill, and looks to see where there are impacts that are being made, trying to get an assessment as to what works, what can work better in the future.

Excuse me. And so in that realm, you'll see a number of requests that were made this year that were for third-party meetings. And a number of those could not be granted within the bounds of this program. But a number of those, where those requests were not approved, were where it seemed as if there was some encouragement that was made, even though no funds or resources were made available. There was also the additional comment that says, "Please coordinate or reach out to," I think the terms was, "GSE." But you know them as the regional teams. Those are the people who are on the ground. Those are people who, from a staff perspective, are already collaborating with you all on some level, who are looking to increase that collaboration.

And so there is encouragement for all the requests, as a follow-up, to say, “Please reach out to your regional teams to see how some of these ideas might be accomplished.” Maybe not through the funds from the special budget request themselves, but through other, in kind contributions or help or work or partnerships. So I wanted to share that overall perspective on third-party meetings and the IGF.

There’s a sub-component though, when we talk about some of the IGF grants. And this is again something that’s developed or evolved over time with respect to IGF requests. There are always a couple of conditions that go with ICANN approval for primarily these workshops at IGF meetings. The first is that ICANN staff can’t judge whether your session is something that’s going to be of value to the IGF. It’s a third-party meeting.

And so, first off, those approvals, if you will, are conditioned upon approval by the MAG of those sessions. Generally, the support that’s provided by ICANN is in the form of travel support. And from a budget perspective – and this is hard sometimes for people to appreciate – essentially what happens every year is that the ICANN finance team, in partnership with the travel team – thanks very much – basically looks at what certain trips will cost, from a budgeting perspective. And so they’ll say, “What does a three-day trip in a local region cost? What does it look like a trip to an ICANN meeting will cost?” Because from a budget

perspective, you can't sit down and just come up with multiple different numbers. And so it will just be a set number.

For this year, there was a number set aside for travel to the IGF. And so some of you may see numbers associated with some of these requests. What you should know though is that again, from a capability perspective, where there has been approval for pursuing a workshop at the IGF, the number of travelers is identified and resources are provided to cover the travel for those individuals.

I don't want to pick on the AFRALO in particular, but as an example, in the case of this request, there was a recognition that the workshop would be a good idea and capability was granted. If you can scroll up, Ariel, I can see how many people were supported here too. Tijani and Aziz were already aware of that. And so that's what was approved in this case.

Now, this request included an additional component that was not approved, which was the outreach component. Now, this reflects another, I think, common theme, in terms of the consideration of these requests. And you'll see this, if you've looked over the last couple of years, in terms of how they've been assessed. And in general, the recommendations that ultimately went to the board provided some capabilities where the IGF is in the region of the RALO that's requesting it. And there

was reluctance or inability this fiscal year, again, to extend that support to provision of support outside of the region where the IGF is occurring.

Now, you'll see in some of the requests, there is some flexibility provided because there's a recognition that some of this can be tested or should be looked at for the future. And an additional component this year that you all should be aware of is an expectation that anyone who is participating in the IGF for this particular activity for a workshop or the rest, a report is going to need to be filed within 30 days after you get back from the trip, which shares information about the trip.

One of the things that we hope we'll see in the future, particularly for a request like this, because I guess that there is some reluctance because of lack of evidence – there is a perception from some who say, “Well, AFRALO going to Mexico, you're not going to have people there to reach out to. So why would you do an outreach event?” Well, what we hope, through some of these reports, to see is that some of you may come back and say, “Well, actually, the IGF is an international event, and we do have people from Africa who go there. And this last year, we had 20,” or, “We had 30 from the AP region.” And so over time, if we can build that record or evidence, if you will, then maybe that opens up the possibility for folks to be more open to that, from a resource perspective. So that's the other aspect. And I

think that covers probably about five or six of these requests as well. So as we go down the list, we can probably skip.

I'll pause.

ALAN GREENBERG:

First of all, I'm sensitive that we're just about out of time, and we do have a session on the CCWG Accountability that we do have to get to. But I'll make one very quick comment.

It wasn't very many years ago that the only people who ICANN funded to go to these kind of meetings were ICANN staff and Board members. And ICANN staff and Board members are not all of ICANN, and it is really welcome to see the kind of funding we're getting. We're not getting enough, of course, but it's really welcome to see that there's a recognition that ICANN is not made up just of staff, Board members, and of course registries who can afford to go on their own money. So thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you. As I said before, I'm just the representative.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Pass it on.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I will. I will do so. Thank you.

I want to take a cue from you, Alan, in terms of time. If I only have a few limited minutes, what I'd like to do is touch on one other, and then perhaps we can have individual discussions if we haven't gotten to a particular proposal that someone has questions about. What's your preference?

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, we really have to get to the CCWG discussion. So I would take five more minutes and use it however you wish. And we may have some extra slots later in the week, and we can bring you back if indeed they stay open.

ROBERT HOGGARTH: I always enjoy participating in joining all of you, so I'd welcome additional agenda time, if it ever becomes available.

What I'd like to talk about just for a couple minutes then as a wrap up is to explain to you all another feature of the special budget request program again this year. And that is, in addition to the individual requests, what happens is many of them can be similar or they fall under a common them. They're not just coming from the At-Large community. They're coming from other communities within ICANN.

What staff tries to do, in developing recommendations and assessing the requests, is to see, is there a way, from a management perspective, resource perspective, to be able to provide resources that may not be as personalized, but in a program sort of way. Again, this year we've been able to do that. The largest piece of it, I think, is once again being able to share the capability of CROPP, the Community Regional Outreach Program, again.

For budget reasons and planning reasons, there are still two Ps in CROPP, the first P being "Pilot," because that is to reflect the flexible nature of this resource. It's something that you all seem to have operationalized in a very effective way within the At-Large community, particularly the ALAC and RALOs and your collaboration. But other communities still haven't achieved that. So we've continued the pilot program, continued the capability for another year. I appreciate the patience of some of you as we get the new site up and operating so that we can do that effectively.

The other big area is in the area of publication support and content support. The special budget request isn't just solely for individual stakeholder groups or Regional At-Large Organizations. It's for the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well. And once again, this year there will be fund available for your publications, for helping with different

content production and the rest. It's something that people will continue to ask for.

And then just in closing, just the one final theme I'd like to reinforce, we touched on it a little bit earlier. From a staff perspective, as Göran has come on board, we've received great comfort, in terms of being able to continue a number of the programs that we've been involved, and I think a renewed emphasis in collaboration between the ICANN staff and all of you, as community leaders and community members. And I'm hopeful that we can continue that.

What I'd hope, Alan, is going forward, particularly as already we're beginning to think about FY18 planning, is perhaps some opportunities for dialogue in the Hyderabad time frame so that we can be talking about some of the plans and expectations that many of you have. Again, as Alan noted, we've made some progress. We continue to make progress every year. But if there are ways to speed that up, move things a little bit more quickly, so you don't have to wait a year and then another year for things to move incrementally, we'd definitely like to explore that with you. And collaborating in the budget process, collaborating with your regional teams, and deepening those relationship, I think, are ways that we're going to be able to move more quickly and make more changes.

Thank you again very much for the time. I always appreciate the opportunity to be here, even if it's just sitting in the back of the room. So thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Rob. This will be followed up by a Finance and Budget Subcommittee meeting, which will be going over some of these in somewhat more detail. Those meetings are, of course, open. And once they're announced, anyone else who would like to attend is welcome to participate. So there will be follow-up via teleconference on that. And that's a really important thing.

The other thing to mention, which some of you may be aware of and some not, are that Rob earlier talked about the General Assemblies. As you may be aware, there were a number of General Assemblies held when RALOs were formed, in the 2006-'08 time frame. In 2009, we held a summit in Mexico City, with representatives of all ALSes. In the next few years, we held General Assemblies for each of the regions, one by one when we were in the appropriate region. 2014, we held a summit in London. And we have held one General Assembly since. And you see we're going to be funded for a number more.

Every time we have done that, we have had to make the case about why it was important to have a General Assembly or a

summit. The General Assemblies, since we've had this program, which they started before this program, was done through the program. The summit was expensive enough that it would have used up the whole AC/SO budget, so clearly could not be done through this process. So each time we funded one of those, we funded it by going to the Board and said, "Surprise, we'd like a half a million dollars," or something, and they were approved.

We have now put together a proposal to plan for, and ultimately budget, these regular pattern of General Assemblies on a regular basis and a summit every five years. The Board has approved it. It is now part of the formal ICANN Operational Plan. So although we still have to make budget requests on a regular basis for these things, we don't have to justify the existence of them. And that is a vote of support for ALAC and At-Large that is really important. And I just wanted to note it for the people here.

I see, Tijani, you want to make a quick comment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Very quick. Speaking about the CROPP, Rob, you know that, we spoke about this several times, the CROPP is funding people to have one working day, only one, only one working day and two nights, because you have one day for traveling, one working day, and one day for traveling. So it is only one working day. This is something that, personally, I am always paying from my pocket

the remaining days. I think this has to be fixed. I don't say that we have to increase the number of days. It must be dynamic, according to what you will do there. And it should be assessed so that we know if it is really a good thing to do or not. Thank you.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I spoke earlier about the evolution of the program. You may recall that from the first year to the second, the innovation, if you will, was to provide the conference fees that weren't initially provided. Somewhere in there, whether it was between the second and third year, and midyear at one point, we expanded to include the fees for visas, up to the number consistent with the ICANN Travel Guidelines.

I'm pleased to report that, going into this coming year, we've got the flexibility to be able to expand that three days, two nights to a longer period, to at least four days and three nights. So we've got more flexibility in FY17. And that was a direct result of the feedback from you and others about the challenges that it presented. It's challenging to do that, but I think it's a recognition that we are learning collectively, going forward, as to what works, what makes it most effective.

ALAN GREENBERG: The program was originally designed really for outreach, to go somewhere and tell them about what we're doing. The reality is, in many cases, this kind of outreach is done at conferences, and it's really, really foolish to send someone a relatively far distance, to a conference which will be useful to them and to us, and then say, "You can only be there for one day." So thank you for the flexibility. Thank you for being here.

Is Leon in the house?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Leon was in the house. He had to go.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He will be back in one moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: He will be back in one moment. All right. Let me introduce the subject before our expert gets here. The overall subject is the CCWG, the Cross Community Working Group, on Accountability. As any of you been following this at all for the last year or so, this group was created as an adjunct to the IANA transition. The concept of the IANA transition, where the NTIA may conceivably transfer the stewardship of the IANA functions to ICANN, the RIRs, and the IETF was that if the NTIA was not going to be

overseeing it and ICANN – there was some question about how accountable ICANN were to be, due to long history we won't go into, that ICANN had to do some work on its own accountability. And this group was put together.

The result was we have a new set of Bylaws that have been passed, conditional on the transition happening. We of course cannot predict whether the US government will actually do the transition this year or not. But if it does, then we have a new set of Bylaws which, among other things, make the Board answerable to the community in a whole bunch of ways.

The CCWG Accountability did the work that was necessary for the transition, but there were other parts, other aspects of its work, which was deemed important but not necessary for the transition. And those were put into what was generically called Work Stream 2, the original work being Work Stream 1. There are a number of different topics that will be covered in Work Stream 2, and we do have a slide of it somewhere, which will be put up very shortly, as we are speaking. Or not. Work Stream 2 topics, if we could? I know there's a pretty slide with listing them. It will come up in a minute. The work is just about to kick off. And we are populating working groups to look at each of these topics.

Sorry, is there some confusion?

The work is just about to kick off. There was a CCWG meeting on Sunday, which reviewed these topics. And we are convening small groups, with people who have an interest in each of the topics. We are still soliciting members and participants, the difference being – I’m sorry. Members and observers for these working groups. The members are the ones who are committing to do some work. Observers will simply be subscribed to the mailing list and can obviously listen in on the teleconferences, but are not committing to do work. You can sign up for any of them in either capacity. If, when we see the subjects in a moment, any of them are of interest, we strongly recommend that you sign up. You should also make sure you’re subscribed to the general CCWG list so that when – these subjects will all be discussed by the small groups, recommendations made, which will then go back to the CCWG for final decisions and recommendations to the ICANN Board.

So the subjects include things like human rights and what is their implication within ICANN, staff accountability. We now have processes by which the Board can be held accountable. What about staff? What does that mean. Transparency, how well can you get information about what goes on within ICANN? And simply getting dumps of data does not mean information. How accurate is the information? How easy is it to find what you’re looking for? And this goes from the mundane to

john.smith@icann.org, what department do they work for? But it also goes on to the far more substantive than that.

Does anyone else remember any of the other topics, which have slipped my mind right now?

Leon. We have Leon here. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Well, the nine topics that are going to be subject for Work Stream 2 are diversity, human rights, jurisdiction, SO and AC accountability, the role of the ombudsman, transparency, staff accountability, the Guidelines for Standards of Conduct presumed to be in good faith, associated with exercising removal of individual ICANN Board directors, and reviewing the CEP. So those are the topics that are open for Work Stream 2.

And as Alan was saying, we're still open for those who want to volunteer, either as participants or as observers. There is not a deadline to sign up, but the sooner you sign up, the better because you'll catch the work from the beginning and it'll be easier for you to actually contribute to this effort.

So yesterday we had a day-long meeting. I'm not sure if you have already said this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I said we had a day-long meeting. No more about it.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. We had a day-long meeting. And basically, what we did yesterday was to brainstorm on some of these nine topics. As you can of course see, those topics with the most activity were diversity, human rights, jurisdiction, and transparency. So these are, I believe, issues that go deep into what the At-Large community's mission is within ICANN. So as I said, the more volunteers we can get to sign up to help us in this process, the better.

So I'll turn back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The ALAC, in many ways, is very good at generating statements and comments when things go for public comment. We are not as good in actively participating in framing the outcomes of these discussions. We have been very, very active in the CWG IANA transition and in the Accountability CCWG. And as a result, both of those end products, I think I can say with some level of assurance, are very different than they might have been if At-Large was not present in those meetings. I think that's a good thing. I think it's something we need to continue, going forward.

The other activities, be it the Work Stream 2 activities or other things that are going on, may not have the same level of flash and excitement as these do. But it's really important. We do provide a different perspective from many of the other parts of ICANN. We certainly provide a different perspective than many of the business community parts of ICANN. And we, quite noticeably, provide a very different perspective than many of the non-commercial parts of ICANN associated with the GNSO. When I say, "different," often we are directly the opposite.

So we have really had a major impact, and I want that to continue. And you should want that to continue. So look at the subject list. Does the previous slide have it in a way that we can look at it? I know there was something that was not quite as confusing as those spiders. That is the subjects, but broken down in excruciating detail such that you can't actually read it. But it's really cool. Yeah, it is really cool. It's a mind map, but a mind map in a different format than they normally provide it.

LEON SANCHEZ: Alan, if you want me, I can repeat the list of topics.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you repeat them slowly, so people can absorb them? If any of them are of interest to you, we can give you the URL for

the Google Docs, where you can sign up yourself. You're not making a commitment. But think about it. And if you put yourself down as a member, please do participate. Don't just listen. Contribute. You will influence the outcome.

Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Just briefly on that, there is the opportunity to have the more active role and the more passive role. And it's a good opportunity for you to do something you're passionate about, something you might be interested in, and something you've never thought of. And certainly, that's what the three mentees I'm working with have done. So we'll have six of the nine topics covered just amongst those three people.

LEON SANCHEZ: So the list of topics is the following: diversity, human rights. And when I say, "human rights," from the CCWG perspective is how ICANN will respect human rights, within its mission and under day-to-day operations. That doesn't mean that ICANN will be human rights police, of course. So if you're trying to come into

the group to wave the flag on human rights and how we should enforce human rights, that's not the place to do it. Just a warning. Jurisdiction, SO and AC accountability, ombudsman and the role of the ombudsman, transparency, the staff accountability, the Guidelines for Standards of Conduct presumed to be in good faith associated with exercising removal of individual ICANN Board of Directors, which will be one of the main [access] on the future way that we relate to the Board. As you aware, that we have now an empowered community. So the empowered community will have to look into these good faith standards when it comes to actually having to remove a Board member. Then reviewing the CEP, whatever the CEP means. What is the CEP? I'm sorry. Does anyone know what the CEP is? I don't recall.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the specific standards of behavior out of the customer system for the IANA customers.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One comment. The concept of jurisdiction is a whole bunch of things rolled into one. It is, where is ICANN

incorporated? Where is it headquartered? What laws does it work under? What laws does its contracts work under? So there's a whole bunch of different things that are all rolled together. It is a highly controversial subject for many people. It's going to be interesting. I'm not sure how productive, but I want to watch it.

I have a whole bunch of hands up, some of whom – you withdrew your hand, Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, because my question was [inaudible] explained.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next we have Seun. And again, we are six minutes before. So two-minute timer, but please keep it to one minute if you can. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: I just hand up, but I had no idea we would be doing this one-by-one. What is the meaning of CEP? Google is not opening.

My main point which I wanted to make is in relation to going forward for At-Large. Just to be clear, are we going to discuss that after this? Thank you. That is the point of, how do we actually engage people in this WS2, in terms of At-Large level?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is we will be sending out additional e-mails, as we already have, encouraging people. Within your region, the RALO leaders and the ALAC members from the region can do additional things to the extent you wish. If there's any demand, we will certainly put on webinars. We will put on tutorials. It's up to you to decide what you think will be useful within your region.

SEUN OJEDEJI: IANA issues, list continues. We are not creating any new lists? The same mode of communication or interaction continues. Is that the case?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Is there any part of our [inaudible] that is going to be changing? Because we have multiple topics right now. Is it going to be mentioned in the IANA issue list? Are we going to [inaudible] list, etc., etc.?

ALAN GREENBERG: How we will come to conclusions on keeping people alert, I don't know. We haven't discussed that yet. It's certainly a

discussion that has to be had. It's not going to happen in this session, obviously. And thank you. We'll try to put that on the agenda, if we have a few minutes. Or we'll carry it over to the next ALAC meeting. But in general, the standard methods will apply. Whether we use the IANA issues group or something else is not clear. I doubt we're going to form six or eight new groups. So we will probably somehow group them together. Perhaps do one subject. It's going to take a while for some of the subjects to become really current.

Your first question was something about CEP.

SEUN OJEDEJI: CEP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We had an answer, and I didn't quite get it. So let's take it offline. We have it on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry, I'm not looking at the Adobe Connect. Okay. Sorry.
[Bastian]?

[BASTIAN HOEFLING]: Thank you, Alan. This is [Bastian Hoefling], from ISOC Netherlands. I'm here as part of the on-boarding program. And I'm indeed one of the mentees that Cheryl referred to. And I happily volunteered for a number of the topics. So maybe a question. And if the answer is negative, then maybe a suggestion to have a list available, if possible, of who else from the At-Large community is actually participating in the different topics. Because I'm a newcomer here. So on the expression of interest form, here are a lot of names there, but I cannot see exactly who is from which constituency or stakeholder group. But it might be good, people from ALAC also within the same topics of interest can liaise with each other and discuss stuff.

And then something else, I think you touched upon that, Alan, so maybe it's not a topic to discuss here. But I would also be curious to know if I would start work in several of the topics, how would I fit? What would I find there? The input I receive or feedback that I have, how would I fit that into the At-Large community? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The last question is the one that Seun asked, and we need to come to closure on that. On who belongs to what, I guess a third column in that Google Doc would have been nice, but they didn't

put one in. So we're going to have to fake it and go through and find names we recognize.

LEON SANCHEZ:

We can fix it. One thing to take into account is that we're trying to preserve the bandwidth and prevent volunteer fatigue. So if you want to sign up for different topics, of course you're free to do so. We only ask you to consider that whichever group you sign up for, the expectation is that you will be actively contributing to it, if you sign up as a member, of course. If you sign up as an observer, well, that's a different history. But just keep in mind that whatever you want to sign up to, there's an expectation of contribution.

[BASTIAN HOEFLING]:

Thank you very much. Just to clarify, as a member, I only registered for one. I only subscribed to one. But I have to be also honest. The prospect of subscribing to the CCWG, the general list, it sounds a bit daunting, in terms of what I might receive in my inbox coming from that. But we'll see.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Filter it all out. Sorry, I was being distracted by another query I had. Next we have Tim.

TIM: Does anyone in this room have a reasonably accurate estimate of the time it takes each week, on average, to participate in these kinds of committees? Anyone want to hazard a guess or relate their experience?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think the experience from the past ones is relevant. The level of work was just different than it's going to be now. Leon, I think there was discussion of how often these work groups would meet.

LEON SANCHEZ: I'm sorry, I didn't quite get the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: How many hours a week are we expecting for these various topics?

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, that's something that's unforeseeable at this point. It depends on your involvement, of course. And it depends on how complex the discussion evolves. I would say that if you sign up, for example, for the human rights discussion, I anticipate that

will be a hot topic. So maybe ten to eight hours a week, a little bit more. I'm not sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of teleconferences? I hope not.

LEON SANCHEZ: Teleconferences, no. But if you want to follow, of course, the list and you want to actively contribute to it, you want to have background on the issue, then eight to ten hours a week might be a good number to consider.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I suspect on most of them it's going to be typically something like an hour of teleconference a week, maybe two, but probably not on most of the topics, and some background work. Depending on whether you end up being a rapporteur and drafting things, or you're just participating in the call and then quickly do your homework before the next call. So I think it's going to vary heavily, and it will probably vary heavily between the topics. So I don't think we can make a real guarantee. The only caveat I can – not caveat. The only thing I can add is you can always drop out if it becomes overwhelming.

[BASTIAN HOEFLING]: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: May I?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, we have Tijani and then Sebastien. I'm trying to triple program here.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. For the jurisdiction, where ICANN is incorporated or where it is based will not be discussed. It is something already treated in Work Stream 1. In Work Stream 1, we said that the empowered community. It is according to the California jurisdiction, so it will stay there. The issue is about the jurisdiction that will be used for the contracts, etc., for the management, but not regarding the place where ICANN should be or the incorporation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a good theory. We'll see if that plays out or not.
Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just to add about the answer the question about [times], if you look to the Google Docs, it's written at the beginning the ways to volunteer. And for the active participants, it's expected to spend at least three to five hour per week on sub-group work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? I think we are done.

The next session is we have the cross-community session on Next Generation registration services. That is at 3:00, now, in room Hall A. If staff can give directions as to where Hall A is, and Gisella has some other comments which she wants to make. Oh, she's just going to tell us where Hall A is.

GISELLA GRUBER: Your mic. Just for those attending the next session in Hall H, if you go all the way to the end of this corridor, right to the other side of the building, it will be two flights of stairs up. Or there is a lift just left of the stairs. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I thought I effectively adjourned when I turned it over to you. We are adjourned.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. And just to remind, the cross-community sessions are now in Hall A, up on the second level. And for the next At-Large session, we have the EURALO General Assembly here at 8:00 AM tomorrow morning, running through to 10:30.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]