BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap Up Part 1
Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we restart? We're already a bit late, and we do have a guest coming in later.

Alright. May I have a report from staff on the number of ALAC members at this meeting? We are planning to hold votes. So, I need the number of ALAC members and whether all five regions are represented.

Alright. We have ten ALAC members and all five regions represented, so we're in a position to hold votes. None of the votes are critical, so all of them can be completed sometime after this meeting if necessary so that we have a full set of ALAC members voting. But the rules require a quorum to start anyway.

Thank you for attending the first wrap-up session of ICANN 63. The first item on our agenda is approval of a number of actions. The very first item that we are looking for approval on is the ALAC Rules of Procedure and associated documents. As a result of the discussion we had the other day, there have been a number of changes. The only functional change in the Rules of Procedure are a footnote added on page one. If we can display the marked-up Rules of Procedure, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would like to give a motion of order. I would like to postpone this discussion and this vote until we have time, not during a meeting where

we are going from one meeting to another, to have time to read again the last version of the document and I suggest that we do that in a subsequent call. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there general support for that? We'll take a vote on whether we should postpone or not. We did give the full 21 days notice. There have not been any substantive changes that I'm aware of since the last version was distributed about ten days ago. But Sebastian if you'd like we will take a vote first on whether to proceed. Sebastian, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, that's okay. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We have a question on the table for whether we should proceed with this vote or not at this point. To be clear, what the votes would be if we continue is there are two votes initially on the two sections to the board's selection procedure that we need to decide on. One is related to abstentions and the second is related to a clarification of the rules associated with RALO petitions. If we go that far, those two votes will determine whether certain changes are made or not.

The only other change from the last distributed version other than correcting one or two typos is addition of the footnote in relation to ALS European individual members or individual members from Europe, and

we can display that if we whish but it's not relevant if we're not going to go forward. The only change other than corrections to the email guide is as we discussed yesterday, whenever it was, a few days ago, the change of the ALAC-ExCom mailing list to ALT-plus and the inclusion of a new mailing list ALAC Members. There are no other changes from what was distributed about a week and a half ago. Tijani would like to speak before we take the vote.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. What I understood from last session, you said we will make a vote about whether we change the articles related to the board selection or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But what you are proposing is not that. You are proposing whether we keep the old version of the petition or we change it. So, it's not what we decided on. First, we will see if it is necessary or if it is adequate to change articles related to the board selection member.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because the two issues are different, I decided to hold two different votes, one on the abstention and one on the change to the petition process. The net effect is the same. We are deciding whether to keep the current version, or in one case add a new line and in the other case

replace the section. How is that different from what you thought was going to happen?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, if I may, my point was since the BMSPC proposed several things and you said that some things are to be changed, but it is not time to do it now. We have to do it prior to the next round of selection. So, why we change only the petition and the second point was the abstention, and we keep the others? I propose that we don't touch anything regarding the board selection and we do it immediately after.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you don't want to change anything, then you would vote no in both of the two preliminary votes and then nothing changes. The reason that those were included … They're included for two different reasons. The abstention one was included because it was brought to my attention that we have a rule elsewhere in the procedure that we must have of abstention on all votes.

So, I felt it was important to have clarity on the chair votes where traditionally we have not had an abstention, that there is an abstention or there is not an abstention. So, that's why that was in. That was simply brought to my attention. I had not realized, although it is our practice most of the time to have an abstention and as Sébastien has occasionally pointed out, we haven't always done that I thought we needed clarity. So, it was a clarification.

The clarification could also say we will not have abstention on these votes. Maybe I put the wrong option in as the default, but that's why that one was added.

The other one was put in because it was a clarification of how the process should be carried out. The other changes that were in the BMSPC report were functional changes of how we do things. An example was a RALO chair must take a directed vote, was one of the examples. There were several others, and I can't even remember what they are. But they were markedly different from what we decided when we first set the rules. So those I thought needed a real substantive discussion which could not be held in these 21 days.

So that was the difference of why reference to one was included and then the other ones were not. If I errored, then let's reject them both, and it's easy. But that was the rationale for why one was included, and the other ones were not because I believed they were a clarification of existing rules, not a change in existing rules.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, if you don't mind, my point was I understand what you say. We discussed it. It is right 100%. But what I wanted to say since we have to discuss other changes regarding the selection of the board member why do we have change now two small things? Let's do them…

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't have to. They are both going to be voted on. If this group does not want to make those changes, they will not be made. I don't know

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 63
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

how else to do it. It was proposed and no one along the way, in the last three weeks, no one has said I suggest we take them out altogether.

So, I'm not sure how else to proceed other than to proceed on what we said we were going to do, and honestly, I don't feel it's fair to leave Maureen with these things hanging in the air, most of which are simply clarifications of how she needs to run the ALAC.

But in any case, we are running out of time. We had a separate session to discuss this to try to make sure this was just the vote. But we now have a recommendation which was not made during the previous session to not hold the vote at all. I would like to call a vote of the ALAC to decide whether we proceed with the amendments to the Rules of Procedure or shelve them all together and Maureen can take it up under her term at some time in the future. And I'm not quite sure about the protocol for whether you can go ahead with these changes or have to start from scratch. I suspect we could just go ahead. So, is the vote clear?

Is there anyone that wants to abstain from the decision of whether to proceed with the vote right now? Sébastien wants to speak.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Alan, you spent five minutes explaining your point of view. I don't want to explain my point of view. I want to have the vote, but I want to be sure that everybody here understands that we are doing a small step, but we have a lot to do and why we don't do one all together and I stop here. Whatever you vote we will follow. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone need any further understanding of why Sébastien would like to delay? He would like to delay since there are apparently other more substantive changes. This was announced and indicated as a change to change the rules to correspond to what we were doing or to clarify things which had been a cause for some level of confusion in the past.

There was no intent of changing substantive things that needed great debate. That is why we were proceeding and why I try to do it before Maureen had to take responsibility for it and I did this with Maureen's full knowledge. I'm not trying to slip something through before she got here. So, the rationale was clarifications and fixes, not substantive changes. May I proceed?

Who would like to abstain from the decision on whether to proceed with a vote? I'm looking for ALAC members. And please can staff note which ALAC members are in the room in case we have to get other people for any of these votes? I see no abstentions.

Who would like to delay the vote to sometime in the future at which point other more substantive issues can be included in the single vote? Does Sébastien want to speak? Or that's your vote? Thank you.

I see Sébastien only indicating he would like to delay the vote.

Can we have a show of hands or cards for those who want to continue with this vote? Please keep them up long enough for staff to record.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is the hand of Seun Ojedeji.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where is the hand of Tijani since we already exhausted the other two options? We'll go back with the other two options if you want. We know how Seun is voting. How is Tijani voting?

You can put Seun's hand down. We'll record it. And Tijani is voting. Tijani did not abstain or vote no, so I'm a little bit confused. Whether we proceed with the vote. Okay. Tijani has two hands.

Staff recording? Notice we do have some people who were not in the room when we did the initial count. Thank you very much. The vote will proceed.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can I put it down?

ALAN GREENBERG: You can put it down. We'll do this first. The first decision is whether to keep the RALO petition provision, paragraph 19.9 the same. Now in both the current version and the following ones 19.9.2, 19.9.3 are not changed. I just included them on that sheet for clarity. That is the whole section of rules associated with the petition process. So, the change is either in the single paragraph 19.9.1 or the multiple paragraph 19.9.1 sections one, two and three, I think. You all should have received that

in your email late last night. Are there any questions or discussions about this? The vote is going to be do we keep the current version or replace it with the new version.

I see no questions or discussion. Then I'll call the vote. How many people would like to … And I'm not going to make it a yes/no. I'm going to specify how many people want to keep the current version of 19.9.1?

Well first I'll ask, is there anyone who wants to abstain from this vote? Sorry, I should've asked that first. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not exactly an abstention. I don't say that we don't have to change it. I need to change it but I'm not okay with the change you are proposing, and it is not the only point. We have a lot of other changes to be done regarding the process of the selection of the director. I don't see why we are changing this point with the second point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was included because I believed it was a clarification, as did Maureen, as opposed to a functional change. That may have been an error on our part in which case I would strongly suggest you vote against the change. Leave it as is and then we'll fix it in some … You will fix it in some future time. So, is there anyone wishes to abstain from the decision? I see no one.

Is there anyone who wishes to keep the current version? Tijani, you don't want to keep the current version? I thought that's what you were arguing for.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. I said it should be changed but not in the way you are proposing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I would suggest you keep the current version and change it another way. It makes no sense to change it one way and then reverse it later.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Since I don't agree that we change it at all. We change all the process at all…

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I thought this is what we had decided on the other day. At this point, we have one person voting against the change. We had no abstentions. Can I have a show of hands for those who want to make the change? And we should be recording not only counts but who, please. Are we done?

We can lower your hands. Just to make sure that staff can do a full count, can we have a show of hands of those who choose not to vote? I believe is Tijani is one and Sébastien is the other and Ricardo. Just so we have a count. All the numbers should add up to all the ALAC

members here. That's not something … We normally ask for a count but doing it as a double check You may speak.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA   Thank you very much. The BMSPC you worked don't make a report, and the report was sent to the list and to the chair of the ALAC. I find it not understandable that those recommendations are not discussed. They weren't discussed at all, and we are now changing small parts of the process. I find it something that as if you are ignoring those people who worked on something. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe the BMSPC report was distributed to the ALAC and I…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA   Nobody objected.

ALAN GREENBERG: We've never discussed it, and it needs to be discussed prior to the next process. I will give you my apologies for never getting to it. There was not a deliberate attempt to suppress it, and I will make a strong recommendation to offer my support to the extent she needs it for the next chair to make sure it is addressed.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA   Because the change you are doing regarding the petition is different from the proposal of the BMSPC. That means that you are changing

something despite the recommendation of the BMSPC and the BMSPC report wasn't discussed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree, and I should have, and perhaps you should've reminded me when there was still adequate time in my chairmanship. I'll take full responsibility that notwithstanding. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Although I do realize that the BMSPC report was written and provided in effect it was … I can actually remember that it was not a totally unanimous agreement of the report. So, I mean there needs to be some discussion, and I think that … But with regards to this, it was a clarification because there was confusion. So, the change has only been made, as Alan said. to clarify the confusion that was it and so that's why it does not cover all the changes, but it clarifies this particular instance.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA   Thank you, Maureen, for that. You were a member of the BMSPC, and I have the record of all the exchange about it when we discussed these recommendations, and I can show you. It was Seun who has some reservation on some points, and we sorted that. And know we have a report that was agreed by the BMSPC. I wouldn't send it if it wasn't agreed by the BMSPC.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can have a substantive discussion on this. We do have someone coming in soon, and we do have some other things we have to do first. I'll refrain from giving my personal view on it. I do have some significant problems with it because it was recommending changes that were going against the overall community in its original decision.

The next change. Can we scroll down, please? The next page.

Next change is very simple. Do we add this line or not? As has been pointed out there is an overall provision saying we must have an abstain on all votes. The practice has been on these votes not to have an abstain. I acknowledge the fact that I probably should have provided an option to the community on this one because the right answer may well be there should be a new 19.11.8 and it should say there should not be an abstain. It's too late to do that now. I do wish someone had said that a week ago, but they didn't, I didn't. My recommendation would be to reject this change and fix it as soon as possible even if you have to do a rule of procedure change of one line in it to get it the right way. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I will read the comment of Seun – not the comment, the recommendation of Seun for me to vote. He said, "I am against including abstain since we won't treat such vote as an abstain."

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear. There was discussion in the email exchange. Our normal voting rules say we ignore the abstains and then look at the

yeses and noes or whatever the options are. The voting procedure in much of the rest of ICANN takes yes and no and treats abstain as a no because they're looking for how many yeses are there out of the total mass.

We unlike the board, unlike the GNSO, ignore abstain. The rest of the vote for the board explicitly says how many people voted for a candidate because it was felt at that time that it was important for a candidate to have significant support if they're going to be put onto the board. When you combine these two things, we end up with an abstain being treated as a no which was not the intent.

As I said, my recommendation if I could change what I had written, which I can't, I would've said there should not be an abstain. We can't do that right now, but I would recommend make no changes and as soon as possible since this is not a structural change, even if it's a one-line rule of procedure change I would recommend changing it to no abstain at some time later.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA   Alan, I am sorry. I forgot to raise my hand for Seun for the petition. He's okay with the change, but he has some recommendation. "I am fine with the petition change. For further suggestion, that line that encourages RALO leaders to consent with their members in such decision." And he added he wants, "A line to be added to suggest that the RALO consent with their members, although should not be mandatory and when a RALO is sending their decision it should be logged on the Wiki whether they consented or not."

ALAN GREENBERG: And my response to Seun was I don't disagree, but it was too late in the process to introduce that because that came after the discussion, we had within the ALAC the other day. I don't disagree with the intent, but at this point, we have to accept or reject it, that decision was already made. Sorry, I didn't mention that because it really came after the discussion. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Unfortunately … Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: … So people can speak in their own language. It's not you. It's other people who aren't ready.

ALBERTO SOTO: Unfortunately, I don't agree with the addition suggested by Seun because we represent ALAC, ALAC chair or ALAC members. We do have the obligation to consult with the members, because otherwise in every single paragraph we should look for confirmation.

ALAN GREENBERG: This was something regarding the chair's decision. The chair, not ALAC members. And we're not discussing it right now. Seun is free to propose it as we go forward. It's not on the table right now.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

What is on the table right now is, do we add the requirement for there to be an abstention vote? You have my thoughts that I believe this was an error, and I will vote against it, but I believe it should be corrected as soon as possible. But we have to take a vote at this point. Is there anyone who wants to abstain from this vote? Hadia wants to speak.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The abstain usually is not a yes or a no. It's just to see if you have a quorum. So, abstain, usually that's the role of the abstain. So, we are treating it differently. ICANN is treating it differently.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, in normal ALAC votes, we compare only the yeses and the nos. The only impact of abstain is there has to be enough … Is it made for a quorum that were there enough votes? The normal ALAC votes treats yeses versus noes ignoring abstains. Not the case in most of ICANN but that doesn't matter. That was just a point of information.

This vote, in the vote for chair, the requirement is not yeses versus noes, but how many yeses there are and that has the effect of treating an abstain as a no. So, the question is, do we put this requirement to have an abstain in or not?

Chair's recommendation for whatever that is worth, and I wrote the words is to reject it. I would like to know how many people care to abstain from this discussion? Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I don't understand. How does it have the effect of being counted as a no?

ALAN GREENBERG: Because the requirement in some other section, which I don't have in front of me, says to win the board seat election you have to have the votes of the majority of those who are casting a vote. So, it is only counting the ones who support the candidate. That means if you say abstain or support the other candidate it's not a yes for the candidate, so it has the effect of supporting the losing candidate or not supporting the winning candidate in any case.

We're not changing that rule right now. I'd like to continue with the vote if I may. Would anyone like to abstain from this vote? Would anyone like to support the change? Would anyone like to reject the change?

If you have two hands, Tijani you may use them at the same time. Staff tell me when we have the sufficient count. Tijani is the only one allowed to raise two hands. Some of us are getting old and our hands are heavy.

And for the record, you may lower your hand. Thank you. And for the record is there anyone other than Sébastien who choose not to vote? Thank you very much. This change is rejected. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. May I ask you please not to give your recommendation before the vote because you are influencing the vote. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was trying to. It was a dumb thing I wrote.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't think this is fair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I will not do that in any future votes I hold after today. Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible – French]. I will switch to English, no problem. We see that we were not really ready even if we vote all together through the same voice because there were still some discussion. But I wanted to explain my decision not to participate in the vote. Nothing with the previous way I was thinking not to enter the vote it's that since the beginning and it's now a long time ago, 2009, 2010, I have decided not to participate to any vote regarding the rules of procedure link with a member of the board as the beginning of those ropes. Because I was willing to be candidate at that time and since then I think I don't want to participate in these votes. That's my explanation for the vote. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sébastien and I'll make a similar comment to one I made to Tatiana yesterday who explained why she did certain things because she felt it was ethical. Thank you for being ethical.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [French].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. May we display page one of the marked-up rules of procedure? Other than a correction to a section in which had a replication of its own number in the text the only change … I'm sorry not the first. The first page of the text and if we could blow it up to some extent that would be appreciated. The only change other than a typo correction is … Scroll to the right a little bit so we can see. Notice after ALS on about the seventh line is a footnote.

So that's when it's making a reference to individual users unaffiliated with an ALS. And scroll down to the bottom please for the footnote. Thank you.

"The RALO in the European region has chosen to group its individual members together in an ALS, the EURALO Individuals Association, but for the purposes of these rules of procedure these individuals are deemed to be unaffiliated."

So that simply clarifies it a little. We refer to them as unaffiliated. Technically they are affiliated because they are part of an ALS, but we are treating them as if they were not affiliated. I believe that covers the gap that, I don't remember who noticed it but correctly noticed it, and I think that covers it. For those that are not familiar with legal language, "deemed to be," means it may not be the case but we're pretending, and we treat it that way from a legal point of view. Other than that,

everything is exactly the same way as it was discussed and displayed the other day.

I would like to call a vote of the ALAC. Who would like to abstain from the vote to adopt all of these changes? I see no … Ricardo, please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Did you say who wants to abstain on the [total] rules of procedure but one of the changes is the one that we just reject and one of the changes is the one we just approved, as I understand. So, when we say yes or not the rules of procedure that will be where will not include the one that we just rejected.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me restate it. Thank you, Ricardo. You are correct. We are voting on the amended Rules of Procedure as modified by the previous two votes. So 19.9.1 now has been changed and 19 point something point something is not there. Anyone wishes to abstain from this vote? I see no hands.

Is there anyone who wishes to vote against the changes? We note Tijani.

I'd like a show of hands or cards for those who which to support the changes?

Tijani, is that one hand or two? Oh, sorry. Of course, it's only one hand. Sorry, it's been a long week already. And lower your hands. Is there

anyone other than Sébastien who has chosen to not vote in this vote? Thank you all.

The next decision is the ratification of the joint ALAC-GAC statement, as previously distributed, subject to any minor changes that the GAC may add. Now, there has been one suggestion already made in the third paragraph where we say in the joint statement, "The ALAC and the GAC also asked ICANN to produce."

Kavouss suggested that we use slightly stronger language than who asked and I on my own behalf yesterday said I support that. I didn't hear any objection from anyone else. I have not received any messages so far on other changes from the GAC. There may well be one or two typo things. If I believe that any other changes are anything other than minor clarifications or grammar, I will bring this back to the attention of the ALAC as quickly as I can and hopefully by the second wrap-up session. But I'd like to hold a vote subject to any further changes that are non-trivial. I see Evin, and I will state the vote and then we'll go to Evin. Do we ratify this statement? Evin, please go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. This Evin for the record speaking on behalf of Dev Anand Teelucksingh. He has a comment. Similarly unaffiliated individual members once accepted by a RALO in accordance with its own rules is a member of that RALO. There needs to be consideration for individual members to be accepted members of the At-Large Community in a similar equitable manner how ALSes are accepted to be members of At-Large. However, this can be further discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you and it will be further discussed in the At-Large improvements. I believe that was the discussion we had the other day that we are not in a position to change it unilaterally but there was a strong desire to document the current situation in our current rules, so we not pretend individuals did not exist.

Back to the ALAC GAC statement. Is there anyone who would like to abstain from voting on this statement?

Just to reiterate again to remind people we had a joint statement with the GAC a year ago. The reaction from ICANN Org and the board was ITI covers it. We believe ITI does not cover it. We're looking for a lot simpler things such as one-page simple statements of what major acts ICANN is looking at or asking for comment on is about … Not that it covers everything, but it at least tells people in language they can understand what it is we are doing.

Instructions for executive summaries. And I'll give you as an example in an executive summary I wrote a few weeks ago the decision was to delete from it all the explanatory stuff about history on the assumption that everyone knows what WHOIS is and the history of it. That means someone reading it who's fresh doesn't understand the perspective. I think we need some clear direction as to what we should be doing. So, I personally support this statement. It is short. It is very clear, and I hope not possible to misunderstand although I don't doubt people's ability to misunderstand things.

I saw no abstains. Is there anyone who would like to reject having this joint statement?

Can I have a show of hands of those who support this joint statement subject to the minor changes as I indicated? We note Sébastien in the back row.

Andrei, are you trying to speak or you still voting?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: No, I'm still voting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I take it that passed, and we'll make sure to get votes from anyone who hasn't voted.

Next item on the list is Maureen is proposing that a number of working groups within the ALAC be moved under the subcommittee of Outreach and Engagement. Maureen, would you like to, to the extent that you remember them, identify which groups we're talking about? Tijani has his hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just a remark regarding the vote we just had. When we voted on the point that Alan wants to reject it, he started by the abstention and then who wants it to be voted on and then who rejected and for all the others where he wanted us to vote for the other was abstain and then against

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I thought I did that one abstain, reject and accept.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Only for the abstention.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we … Counting all the up hands at the end. I'm pretty sure I did abstain, no and accept in all cases. Tijani, I'm getting old, maybe I didn't, but that's the way I remember it right now.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think now that I actually got those three streams of things with the organizational activities, the CPWG relating to policy activities and outreach and engagement, which is a subcommittee, the outreach and engagement will be the umbrella organization that will look after capacity building, social media, the Technology Taskforce, those types of outreach, engagement type activities. There are probably other working groups that I haven't … Things like metrics and that will actually come under organization.

So, there are working groups that will stay with organization, but under outreach and engagement, there are those ones and probably some

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 63
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

others that I've forgotten. But you'll understand why they are actually incorporated within that subcommittee. Tijani? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I didn't invent this, so of course, I'm against … No. One of the problems I've had, and we have had, is although we've had these other committees and some of them on occasion produce monthly or regular reports, some may not have done it as well, the ALAC rarely got a chance to talk about them.

As you'll see … Well, I'll say it right now. Cherine is due in ten minutes. Therefore, the 30-minute session on reports is probably going to get significantly reduced, and we'll have a moment in a minute to decide whether we defer to the next meeting or cancel it as we often have on these meetings when we run out of time. I think this is a marvelous thing because it means these things will be going back to a group of people who will actually take the time to discuss them and look at the results. So, I think great idea.

Now, I know Tijani said I shouldn't announce what I think about things ahead of time, but I really have to comment. I think it's a great idea. Tijani and then Bartlett … I'm not sure the order came up. We're going to have to make it really concise because Cherine is due now in about eight minutes. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. With the risk not to agree with my boss, I don't see the merit of putting altogether those working groups and under one single

EN

group because each group is doing its work, and if you put it under another group the responsibility will be different and there might be a conflict between the head of the working group and the head of the subcommittee, and this is something that I don't want to see, really. And also, perhaps the work will not be done as it should be done because the working group chair will not feel the full responsibility since there is another one who is responsible.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [off mic].

ALAN GREENBERG: Within our time limit, certainly.

MAUREEN HILYARD: The whole purpose of the outreach engagement subcommittee and being that umbrella group as Alan just said that each of the working groups actually reports back to the … Under that umbrella group within there, so there's always a reporting back.

At the moment what I think I was actually finding which is why I've actually provided it this way is that there wasn't ever any reporting back. So, the outreach and engagement are responsible and knew as the ALAC … You and Ricardo who are in charge of that umbrella group are the ones who will be responsible for reporting back to the ALAC about outreach and engagement activities which includes those

working groups that you will be meeting and getting reports back. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, if this group does not feel comfortable about this at this point, this vote can be deferred. I would prefer not to defeat it but rather defer it if there is really a high level of discomfort.

Certainly, if I were chair under this new format and I heard that one of the subgroups was being told by the chair of the subcommittee you can't do something without the support of all the other regional people in that group, I would have a problem with that. I don't think a chair should be taking that kind of unilateral action. But if people feel that they're going to be subject to that kind of subservience, then you may want to think more carefully about it. But I think that's a management problem at the time, not a structural problem. Bartlett?

BARTLETT MORGAN: I support the move, but I can't make sense of the Technology Taskforce in that fair market as outlined, but in general I support the move.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was surprised at that one too, but again it's a judgment call. Evin?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. We have one comment and two questions from Judith Hellerstein in the chat. The first comment is, "Can you list all these

working groups that will be merged under the outreach and engagement subcommittee," which was answered.

The first question is, "The technology task force is not about outreach, it is on technical issues and does not fit within O&E." Second is, "But it reduces the ability to meet at an ICANN meeting to merge the groups."

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Having been involved in scheduling ICANN meetings for the longest time, if we feel the need that a subgroup needs to meet there's no restriction just because it happens to be grouped somewhere or other. So, I don't think that one is an issue. Maureen, do you have any other comments?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. The way that the groups have been organized at the moment isn't set in stone, so we can certainly discuss that later under my watch.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have Sébastien and Ricardo, and I would like to go to a vote or a recommendation not to hold a vote, but we do need to proceed. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I have decided since the beginning of this proposal by Maureen let's give a try to the proposal of Maureen. It's a new way of doing. I can disagree with part of them. I agree with other

parts. But I think she comes with a proposal, let's try it. I want to be sure that we use the right word. If I understand, it's not a merge of the working group, it's a "chapeau" in French. It's an umbrella in English. It's something that will help to coordinate, and therefore I think it's a good move. I will argue … The problem we may face in one of this umbrella group is that the group under them or coordinated by them are not working at all and that will be another issue. But I think it's an interesting move. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. Things can fail in all sorts of ways. They can choose not to do anything because someone else will probably do it or they can choose to be controlled or allow themselves to be controlled. There is no end to the way things can fail if they don't work.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: In the policy group there is no meeting of the groups, but I think in this other one it will work as a working group. Therefore, it will be another beast we are creating then. It's interesting to see the differences and what is the best way to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree. Evin and then Ricardo.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. This is Evin. Speaking two comments. The first from Judith. She says, "At the TTF we are recruiting groups outside of the ALAC into our group and not sure we will have the ability to do this."

And second comment from Seun Ojedeji. He says, "I also don't see the merit of putting them under a group. Does it mean they now report to the umbrella group? What is the goal of really putting them under one umbrella? I think there needs to be more clarity and I will support differing as I am just hearing this now and I even may not have heard if I was not online."

And one more question from Judith, "Such as NPOC or other GAC members."

ALAN GREENBERG: Having more experience than … Sorry, Maureen. Your name disappeared for a moment. Cherine, if we may beg your something. We'll just finish up one item we're working on.

CHERINE CHALABY: Can I come back in five minutes?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I just want to make one comment, and then we'll stop what we're doing and continue in a moment. Nothing under our current … He really wants to come back in five minutes? Alright.

Nothing in our current rule stops us having members from another part of the organization. There is no such rule, and I would not think there would be any such rule just because the organizational structure has changed. I'll let you answer any of the other questions. Weren't there other questions?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, nothing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing. Okay. Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Basically, what I understand from what Maureen is proposing, this is an umbrella. This is not a merge of any group. This is an umbrella, and it's a management thing. It's not that the groups that actually exist are no longer existing. We aren't going to change anything there. It's just to put someone responsible for the group. That's what I understand. It's nothing else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Someone who will pay attention as opposed to the ALAC that has not put much focus on that in the past. Future ALAC could do it in a different way, but this is what Maureen is asking for.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: It's a management thing. It's nothing else. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I don't know if it's Alfredo or Eduardo. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, if it's a management thing, you can take all the working groups and put other groups that are not related. I mean, the outreach and engagement group what does that have to do with a TTF other than Slack and these other tools? That's what I was wondering. Maybe you might want to merge TTF into social media. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may try to interpret. I came in the beginning of this meeting and said, "Maureen, which groups are you merging?" And I put her on the spot because I felt we had to be somewhat specific and that's the list she came up with, I presume with some prior thought, but I surprised her with the question, I must admit.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And I did say the composition of the groupings is not set in stone. So, it's very adaptable, but with the Technology Taskforce, there was so many sort of like outreach type, engagement type sort of aspects of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Communication is engagement. Either of new people or old people. So, I think it's reasonable. Maureen has already said if it doesn't seem to make sense, then we'll change it.

Alberto wants to speak. Alberto does not want to speak. I'm not quite sure what Alberto is saying right now.

I would like to adjourn this part of the meeting. That is, come back to it later and welcome Cherine Chalaby.

CHERINE CHALABY: Really appreciate you having me here today. It's always a pleasure to be with the ALAC, and I know where your heart is, and your mind is as to the end users. This has always been something very important to me.

I want to start really by extending my appreciation to Alan for his outstanding chairmanship of the ALAC over I think four years, right? And the key activities that you have undertaken not only within the ALAC and on behalf of the ALAC but also the interest you have shown on probably almost every important issue ICANN was faced with over the past few years. You were very vocal and active in the transition. You were very vocal and active in WS2. You were very vocal and active in EPDP. And really, you're an ideal community member. I have to say that.

The only thing you're not ideal with is the number of statements, advice that you've sent to the board. There are too many, Alan. You kept me busy for four years. Maureen, I need a break, frankly.

Joking aside, you led and submitted the board almost 100 pieces of advice and statements from the ALAC in your time, and we're very grateful for that. So, you don't need to respond to my joke. Honestly, it was a joke.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am going to respond.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Go now before I proceed.

ALAN GREENBERG: We work very hard at all levels within ICANN as you just implied for me. It's not just me. It's other people to contribute to the various actions we have. There are some people who believe we should be making more statements to the board and I believe in my four years we've done two I think – no, three maybe. Someone on your staff has decided that all of our other statements that we make to anyone else in the organization be copied to the board. That's your decision.

CHERINE CHALABY: It was meant to be as a joke, but now I feel it has passed beyond the joke. I'm going to withdraw that statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cherine, before you started, we went through a number of iterations with Steve as to whether those other statements should even be seen by the board and various decisions were made and then countered at unknown levels of the organization. It's some level of humor for me, so I don't treat it too seriously.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Thank God for that. Past that stage. Alright. But going back to really I think on behalf of the board I want to extend our appreciation. You have really tremendously made a major contribution, and I sincerely hope you continue to do so. I've enjoyed very much our one on one which is at every ICANN board meeting. I reach out to Alan and Alan reaches out, and we have a nice informal breakfast, and we talk, and general things and I think that is very valuable for me in my position to be able to get a feel of what's happening in the community. And Alan not only gives me the feel of what's happening within ALAC but also across all our activities. You've been very generous with your advice and very forthcoming, and I really appreciate that. So, I want to wish you all the best, and we need you. Don't disappear. I'm sure you won't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for your kind words.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. And to Maureen, I really want to welcome you. I already feel that we have a close and open rapport. Maureen took me through the organization structure and it's very impressive, the change you're trying to make. I think every chair is different and every chair brings with them new ideas and thoughts that we must always embrace. You are starting with absolutely the right ideas and looking forward to a very, very close relationship with the board and we will continue on the path that Alan has set. Very grateful and welcome.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cherine, may I take one moment?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mentioned our one-on-ones and the ones you will continue with Maureen. Most people around here don't know anything about these because they're conducted at 7:00 in the morning before anyone else shows up typically.

But I will point out that the meetings with the chair of the board are the only meetings that I, as chair, ever have with a senior ICANN person with no request for what is the agenda going to be, no other people in the room taking notes and listening to what I'm saying or listening to what Cherine is saying back for that matter and same was true for Steve and I am eternally grateful for the openness and flexibility in doing that. It's an exchange which is unparalleled in any other discuss that's ever held in ICANN at my level or that I'm aware of. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Alan, and I have to say I benefited from that tremendously, particularly with your experience and your history and your knowledge of ICANN almost since its inception, so thank you very much. And as you said it

was just friendly informal meeting. No notes, no agenda. Just two friends meeting together and having breakfast and I really appreciated those. Thank you very much.

I don't know if you want me to talk about something specific or take questions. I'm really at your…

ALAN GREENBERG: Despite urgings from our staff, we have not prepared anything for you and left it open for you to talk things that are important or for that matter if there's time for anyone else to raise an issue that they think needs to go right to the top. I know you don't have a lot of time but tell us what the timing is.

CHERINE CHALABY: What is the time available for you? What's your plan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have until 15:00 which is another 13 minutes.

CHERINE CHALABY: Right, okay. Well I think … I don't know how many of you were at the opening ceremony, but I did hopefully connect with the community about the priorities and the direction we're taking. Happy to take any questions on those.

We also sent a blog before coming here about the FY19 priorities of the board. This is something new. We did it last year for the first time where

the board communicates all its priorities for the year to the community, and I think a lot of people find it helpful. We do it in the form of a blog, usually a week before the annual general meeting. I don't know how many people read blogs and if you haven't read it, that means we haven't communicated well, and maybe we'll have to have a different means of communicating the board's priority.

I think as part of becoming more transparent, the community must know what the board is doing in terms of its activities and its terms of its own individual priorities because we cannot have priorities which are going in one direction and the community going in another direction. So, we believe we set out our priorities based on what we hear are the priorities of the community, and we try to align our priorities with that. So, if you haven't got them, maybe Alan you let me know later or Maureen that we didn't get them, or they don't read these blogs, so we'll find a different way of communicating.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [off mic].

ALAN GREENBERG: It does get distributed. My suggestion is going to be staff to actually cut and paste the blog into an email because every time you have to click on something you take an option not to do it if you're rushed. But other than that, I think a fair number of people do look at it. I will note we did have a discussion in prep for the board meeting among other things your comments at the opening session were discussed and it was noted

that it took some nerve or something to mention in an open public meeting that maybe the multi-stakeholder model is not perfect and needs to be thought about. I for one thank you for it because it needs to be talked about even if it indicates we are not perfect.

CHERINE CHALABY: And this is no criticism of the multi-stakeholder model. This has served us well. It gives us part of our legitimacy in addition to our mission. That's the way we conduct our business. This is how we bring the community together, and we discuss, and we have to cherish that. But like anything it's growing and it's now 20 years old and we need to have, I believe, the will and the courage to look at it and say what works, what doesn't work so that we change, modify and let it meet our needs for the next 20 years because we need it and it's part of DNA. So that's very essential we talk up our multi-stakeholder model, not talk it down. But when we talk it up, we should have the courage to say, well, maybe change this and this or do this and this so that it serves us well in the next 20 years of our evolution.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've got three people with hands up, and I'm not sure the order, but I'll say Tijani, Alberto and Eduardo, and John. We have less than ten minutes left, so judge your time accordingly. Alberto first, Tijani, Eduardo, Satish. Sorry, when you only put the white part of the card up, I can't see who it is. And John. But please keep it short.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. I did read the blog, and I was at the opening ceremony, and I believe that was okay because you are showing transparency in such a way.

My concern is this. ICANN is no longer a teenager, and we need to have changes. Not only because it is maturing but because of the external changes. My concern – and I will have to see the modifications within the multi-stakeholder model, but my concern is that might affect the bottom-up system which is fundamental for our activity and for our relationship with our end users. That is a vital importance for us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments and then I'll give Cherine an opportunity. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cherine. I really appreciate your thinking about evolving things, and you're right that the multi-stakeholder model should be not reconsidered. We still want it, and we don't want to get rid of it, but it should be perhaps thought, so that perhaps in the future it will be more adequate for the situation. But generally, when we have this kind of thing to do, we constitute a group to a cross-community group to think about it. How shall you proceed to have this thinking effort?

ALAN GREENBERG: Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you. Thanks very much, Cherine for being with us today. During your talk on the inaugural session, you mentioned that you're looking for a new vision for ICANN and a new strategy. I'd like to know what the overall [inaudible] of this new vision, very brief of course, and whether the At-Large or the end user's role in ICANN is going to change in any way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you, Cherine, for being here with us today, and I just have one brief question, and that would be could you provide any insight or comment with respect to the board's forthcoming action on auction proceeds tomorrow? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Thank you. Early on today, we talked about the new GTLDs and a new round or so forth. However, much of it was discussed in relation to ICANN's financial wellbeing. I think we need to more look at the market, the end user, is there a demand and need for that and that comes to the multi-stakeholder model.

Multi-stakeholder, we have multi-stakeholders. We have suppliers, we have buyers, end users, GNSO as contract parties and so forth. Well, are these different stakeholders the same, have the same weight? In what I

see here at ICANN they seem to have the same weight. Maybe the suppliers that contracted the party has more, but however that should not be the case because the ultimate criteria is the market, is the end user. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just comment for Cherine's benefit. Kaili is our only resident economist on the panel. That's not sarcasm. That's reality. And we have no more hands, so it's yours.

CHERINE CHALABY: Alberto, your question about do the changes affect the bottom-up system. In my view absolutely not. Because if we lose that, we lose the system and the system is a bottom-up.

And the board doesn't have a solution. This is too early. The board has listened over the last seven months as part of the strategic planning exercise, and the board heard the community saying this an issue we would like to address.

So, our intent is around about May, June next year is we're going to come up with a consultation paper. Not proposing any solution. Just merely asking the community about its view. It'll be a series of questions about various things and then seek the community's view on that. So, if we lose the bottom-up, we lose the model, so I think this is inherent in it, right? So, I would not worry about that.

But things that are coming up now that we're beginning to hear, for example, should we put a time limit on PDPs? Interesting. Or is it open-ended forever and some of them never reach a conclusion?

So, we're hearing community members say maybe part of the questionnaire ought to be should we put a time limit on PDP? Another thing, for example, on cross-community working groups and PDP, what is the role of the chair? Is it just facilitator or someone we can empower to make us reach consensus? So, that's another question.

Another question is about people who participate in PDPs. Are they individuals or are they representing their own personal needs or they representative of a bigger interest group?

Another question that is coming out is sometimes in work groups or working groups the voice of an individual is equal to the voice of the next and the next and the next and the next. And we can go on forever and ever and ever. When do we stop? Are people protecting their own patch or they're really acting in the corrective interest of the community? Those are the kind of questions.

Others say we need a cultural change in the way we make decisions, that when you participate in a cross-community working group or a PDP, or you give advice, it is not about you personally. It is not about your personal interest. It's about the interest of either your [inaudible] interest group or the collective interest overall. We need to arrive at a system that helps us make decisions rather than just embark and launch things and let them roll from one year to another to another to another.

And in some cases, not reaching a decision is seen as a success even though it might waste a lot of money and a number of years. These are not my opinions. This is what we hear. So those are the sort of questions.

We want the system to lead to some results. And we want everybody to be heard. We can't ignore anybody. But we want everybody to be heard, but at the same time, we do not want to have polarized position and extreme position with their ability to block progress and capture what's going on and paralyze things. This is what we're hearing, and we want to hear more and more, and then we'll all have the time to respond to the consultation paper.

Tijani, you mentioned the group. I don't think our thinking is advanced yet. I mean, this is so early stage. The only thing we have in mind at the moment is coming up with a consultation paper, and then we'll see where we go. But I took your point and noted that. Thank you.

In terms of the … Do we have time or can I carry on with the question? We have a minute to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have two more minutes until I'm told you have to leave so you do whatever you want to at this point.

CHERINE CHALABY: Do I have to leave right now or five more minutes? Okay. Right.

The vision statement. The current vision was written in 2014-2015, that time, and I was part of that team. It was designed primarily and aimed at the transition. It had inside it if you read it, it says we want to become an independent organization.

At that time, we had a contract with the United States government. So, we had independence in mind. We want to be global. We were US-centric. And it has inside it also three or four sentences that provided and assured legitimacy past the transition.

For example, we said inside the vision statement that we will coordinate a multi-stakeholder model for the whole world just to say we remain multi-stakeholder model. We will continue to serve the unique identifiers so limiting … So, it was really targeted to let's get the transition and let's provide legitimacy. I think all of us, the community, have reasonably achieved much of those themes and where we are today almost … Remember this is a vision for the year FY21 to 25, and we began early in the process. So, you don't want to change a vision frequently, but this was written in 2014 and by the time we reach 2021 the world would have changed.

Through the strategic plan, you have all come up with five main areas where you want ICANN to focus on. One is security, and there's a great concern about fragmentation of the Internet and preserving the single Internet. Two is about governance, and we spoke about the governance model. Three is about the unique identifier system and the impact of new technology on that. Four is the geo-political pressures that are causing legislation and control by governments and causing potentially fragmentation. And finally, financial stability. Does ICANN have sufficient funds and money to invest in newer technology and invest in the increasing needs of the community?

If you look at all of those trends, they are really pointing us towards working and collaborating with others in championing that single open Internet and protect it and preserve it from fragmentation.

What the board is saying is we're not going to change our mission. We're not going to go outside our remit, but we want to renew our focus and say when we wake up every day it isn't just about the identifiers. It is a wider vision about preserving that single global Internet. Because if this goes and the whole fragmentation goes the game is different completely and we believe we should do that. I think the technical community is very supportive of that. We checked with our colleagues in the RIRs and the ITFs and others, and they also have the same vision. So, we're all together focusing on that vision of keeping and protecting that single Internet. So that's really the overarching vision.

But if you look at our mission statement, it's very clearly written in the bylaws a couple of lines about the identifiers, and then you have two pages that describe how we're going to fulfill that mission. We're proposing this overarching statement, and we're going to produce not two pages but half a page in the draft strategic plan that hopefully will be able to issue before December, how we will fulfill that, for example, and we would like comments on that. This is not a top-down this is just … We think this is what the trends are telling us, what the community is telling us. I think we need something to reinvigorate, renew our purpose collectively and make us look into the future with a new focus and a new lens.

On the auction proceeds … What a difficult question but I'll answer it. So, there is a shortage of $68 million in the reserve fund at the moment. We have sent two consultation papers already. One to ask the community what do you think should be the level of the reserve fund. By in large the agreed collectively … There is nowhere unanimity in anything this community does but I think the collective agreement should be 12 months of operating expenses. That means roughly around $140 million mark. If you look at where it is today from the $140 it leaves $68 million short. There are only four areas where you can go and get money. One is can you increase fees, and we send the consultation paper on that and a resounding no, no, no, no, no, except Alan Greenberg who said you might want to consider it. At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg didn't independently say that.

CHERINE CHALABY: I apologize profoundly. It's on behalf of At-Large. I agree with you. Sorry. Thank you, Sébastien. Sébastien always keeps me on the straight line, and I like that.

The second one is there is the new gTLD. From the current round, there is about $70 million left overs. Many people say dispose of this money, do something with it, do this, and we kept on saying, well, the risk is not over. We have big litigations to concern, and I think it would lack credibility if we went and when we say, "No, no, no to everybody than

to say oh but the board is happy to take some of it and put it in the reserve fund." I think that lacks credibility. So, we're not going to touch that.

It leaves two places: the auction proceeds and ICANN org. Those are the two options left to us. We have socialized over the last year together with the CCWG working group on auction proceeds and in the consultation paper that it is reasonable to take some of the auction proceeds out and put it in the reserve fund equivalent to the money we all spent on the transition. That's $36 million.

So, I think there is general acceptance to that. It leaves you with $32 million, and I think the board believes that ICANN Org has to also participate equally, and the pain has to be shared equally. I believe our intent is for ICANN Org to make a contribution reasonably roughly equal to what the auction proceed money is so that it's fairly equal.

But we can't expect them to do it in a couple of years because that means it's going to have a major impact on community activities. I think what we're going to ask ICANN Org is to over the next maybe seven, eight years, every year make a contribution of $4 million or something of that [inaudible]. And do it in a way that it doesn't impair our ability to fulfill our mission. That is very essential. And the community to be able to function and volunteers to attend meetings and so on and so forth.

It is difficult, but Goran is committed. They will help. We haven't finalized exactly the numbers, but we're working on, and hopefully, by tomorrow morning, we intend to pass a resolution if I can get board

agreement. If I can't then, we'll have to do it another day. But I feel reasonably confident that we are going in the right direction. I hope I answered your question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You did.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: By the way, while you're looking at your notes, I thought the suggestion yesterday to borrow the money from the action funds and repay to that was inspired because the auction funds are not going to use up all the money in the next four years. There is no way we can spend that much money. And I thought that was a really inspired way to get our reserve fund up to date without impacting anything.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. It was inspiring, but we resisted it [at the end]. A lot of discussion taking from one place because some other people suggested taking from the new gTLD leftovers and repay it as well. I think it's much simpler and we have found a solution that actually will satisfy the needs of the community, and I hope you will agree with it. Thank you very much.

Finally, the new gTLD. That question about market economics and is there a need for a new round and what are the criteria. This is a very very difficult question for me to answer and for the board to answer at this point and time and the reason for that is going back to your bottom-up process.

The community is thinking bottom-up in coming up with a recommendation about the new round. It is not right I think at this stage for the board to interject and say, "Forget all this. We're not going to do it." Or, "We're going to do it by this and this date and so on and so forth."

But I do agree with you that there are lessons learned from the previous round about market economics. There is perhaps more need for things like brands, things like IDNs and so on than a more general round.

So, we are waiting to see what the recommendation is going to be. My understanding is there are dependencies. So, for example, the CCTRT review that looked at lessons learned, we're waiting for this to finish apparently, and the PDP is waiting for the board to approve this recommendation for them to proceed further. That's what I understand. Our colleagues at SSAC and others are looking at important issues such as name collisions and others. So, there are some outstanding technical issues that they're working on.

What the board doesn't want to do is find ourselves in the same position we were in the previous or the current round that is still there where the Applicant Guidebook was good but had some areas that were not completely flushed out, and the board then was faced with some of these gaps that needed resolution, and when we tried to resolve them

we were accused, the board, as making policy and then we said, "No, this is implementation." I remember the whole debate about policy and implantation and policy.

So, we had to create something called the new gTLD program committee, and that new gTLD program committee was making decisions on behalf of the board. I sincerely hope we don't have to do this again, that the new Applicant Guidebook will be flushed out enough with everything that we have learned from the past included in this one so that the process is much simpler and does not need the board to intervene as much as we did in the previous. Nor for the ALAC to send us a lot of … And it's not a criticism, but you had to do what you had to do because you saw weaknesses and you had to advise the board. So hopefully this will continue, but the level of intensity and the gaps should be much narrower going forward. I know I haven't answered your question. This is the only one I know. I've dodged the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the only thing you could do at this point. Cherine, thank you very much for joining us, for taking an extra 15 minutes over and above what you had originally predicated and said you could do. We really appreciate it. We will…well, I won't see you again in this seat, but we continue to look forward to meeting with you on various occasions and thank you very much. We will adjourn for 15 minutes, and I'll let Cherine reply.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you all. Thank you very much. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll adjourn for 15 minutes to give the technical staff and interpretation staff a break. We are very very late, and we have a lot of things to cover, and we're going to be skipping some things so please be ready to return to start speaking in exactly 15 minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]