

ABU DHABI – ALAC & Regional Leaders Wrap Up Part 1
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's Wednesday, November 1st 2017 in Hall B Section A, the ALAC for the ALAC and Regional Leaders Wrap Up Part 1, 15:15 to 16:45.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are now seven minutes beyond the official starting time. Can everyone please take their seats? Side conversations should go outside.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And you can tell us twice.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's good to see how quickly people move when I speak. Have we started the recording? I would like to call the meeting to order. This is the Part 1 of the ALAC Regional Leaders Wrap Up session for Abu Dhabi. The first part of our agenda is ALAC actions, and we have three – can we have the door closed, please? Thank you.

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.

We have three items to discuss today. The first is the selection methodology – or, actually, the selection group – for the ALAC IGF attendee. The second is the ratification or decision on the core team for ATLAS III.

And the third one is acceptance of the ALAC-GAC joint statement. It was sent around on e-mail, there are printed copies. We're going to do that one third to allow people to scan it if they haven't done so already. If anyone wants a printed copy and doesn't have one, please ask staff for one quickly.

Alright, the first item is the selection of the ALAC member. Let me go into a little bit of history on that. When we put in the special budget requests, we asked for funding for additional people for the IGF not directly associated with projects, with workshops.

We received approval to fund two people, one selected by Outreach and Engagement – and that has already happened – and one selected by ALAC. The specific wording in the approval statement was it should be an ALAC member, and an ALAC member obviously at the time of IGF which is a month and a half from now.

Now, as someone has pointed out, probably we should have done the selection a while ago on the call, but we didn't for various reasons and we have to do it now. We have put a call out and asked for people to express interest, and I believe the

deadline is next Wednesday or Thursday, around about then. We then have to do a selection using the Selection Committee, and then a ratification by the ALAC.

That's going to get us close to the middle of November, and we're trying to buy as many days as possible because travel arrangements have to be made and for some people, there are visa issues. So we're trying to get as many days as possible to go through that to make sure that we don't select someone and then find they can't actually go, which would be a real shame.

We have, at this point, I think two options. The Selection Committee is composed of the ALT. In the case of NARALO or North America, since I'm the Chair of the committee, we have asked for another person to be identified between the other two ALAC members. And that process is ongoing right now among the other two ALAC members. Javier, unfortunately, is not here, so it's being done remotely.

So that half of the committee is going to be in place. The other half of the committee is selected by the RALOs. We have two choices at this point: we can either use the existing RALO people and just carry them over from one year to the next for a couple of days to allow the selection to be done very quickly.

Once we know who the RALO people are, we can send out a Doodle to schedule the meeting. If we don't know who the RALO

people are until we know who they are, we can't do that. So it's really a question of how quickly can the RALOs name their people so that we can get a Doodle out. The selection really has to be done about the end of next week, so we're talking very tight timing. I don't much care either way.

In the case of NARALO, we have to appoint a new person anyway because the previous person was John Laprise and he's now on the ALAC, so he doesn't count from this context. We don't want two ALAC people on the Selection Committee. That would violate the principle that we started with. It was nothing personal.

So I don't much care which way we go. If all the RALOs tell me you can give me a name by the end of today, it's fine. But I haven't had that commitment, so I guess I'd like to hear from the RALO Chairs as to how quickly you can name someone. And at that point, we have a quick decision to make.

I see we have two speakers: Eduardo and Tijani. I think Tijani was first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. First of all, I would like to tell you that I sent an e-mail regarding this very subject and I was a little bit very clear and not diplomatic, saying that Alan didn't want

the selection to be done here. This is what I understood, and Alan understood that it is more or less saying that he's lying. I never ever think – not say, think – that he's lying. It is not my values. I cannot do that. So I would like to apologize if he understood that.

But what I wanted to say is that during all the discussion, through the list and in the sessions, he made it clear that here, it will not be a selection. This is what I said but, unfortunately, he understood otherwise, and I apologize if it is understood like this.

Now, coming back to the subject. Alan gave us two solutions: the first one is to have the new ALT plus the old RALO members; and the second, to have the new ALT and the new RALO members. In my point of view, the first solution is breaking the rules. The second solution isn't. So if we have to break the rules, we have to break it for all – for the two parts of the committee. It means that if we want to bring the new ALT, we have to bring new people.

But there is another solution that he didn't mention, which is to use the actual sitting committee. Even if it a little bit after the meeting, it's not a problem. Keep the same committee and we are within the rules. We don't have any problem with the rules in this case. So keep the same committee to make this very

selection. It's a few days after this meeting. So in my point of view, if we want to break the rules, we have to break it for all. If we want to keep the rules, we have to keep it for all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I would like to respond first. I have a real problem – and I'll admit it – when someone writes something and tries to say what the reason is for me saying something. And to be clear, the reason why I didn't believe we could do a selection here is that we're talking about a meeting of about two days before the Christmas holidays for many people and I didn't think it was reasonable while people are away from home to commit to going away without at least consulting their family and giving them a few days to decide whether they wanted to be away from their family at that time.

So that's the reason I believe we could not make the selection here. It has nothing to do with doing it quickly or slowly, or anything else.

The only issue with using the old committee as such, is in one case, one of the former members of the committee is no longer an ALAC member – and moreover, is a Board member. And I'm not at all sure León would feel comfortable acting in that capacity. So I don't believe we can use the exact old group. So we have to make some change or select a whole new group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I don't have eyes in the back of my head. I didn't even know he was here.

León, if we keep the old selection committee, do you feel comfortable participating in it to select an ALAC member to go to the IGF in your new capacity as a Board member? Because it would be done after the end of this week.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Sorry, I couldn't hear.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have to select someone who will go to the IGF as one of the ALAC members to go to the IGF. We are funded for that. The selection will be done by the Selection Committee. Tijani is suggesting that it be done by the old selection committee, of which you are a member. Do you feel comfortable doing that given that you, at the time that decision will be made, will be a Board member?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan. No, I wouldn't feel comfortable being a Board member and being part of the Selection Committee. I think that that would not be appropriate, so I would definitely –

Thank you, Alan. The answer is no, I would not feel comfortable being a Board member already and having to vote on selecting an ALAC member to attend the IGF.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had Eduardo, and then Seun.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I think my comment is moot because it's going a different way. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun. And I'd really like to think this shouldn't be a crucial decision. We just need to go one way or another and make a decision. We have two other more important decisions to make, and we have a guest coming in in a few minutes.

GÖRAN MARBY: Who is that?

[laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a guest who's already here. Shall we defer these decisions and go on to our next part?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. May I introduce our president and CEO, Göran Marby?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. I'm sorry, I was five minutes late. I've been five minutes late all morning, and I don't seem to be able to catch up. And I'm Swedish. I hate to be late. So, I'm really sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hate to tell you this. It's afternoon already.

GÖRAN MARBY: Sorry?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's afternoon now.

[laughter]

GÖRAN MARBY: Oh, shit. In which time zone? Before I came in, Rinalia sent me an e-mail with a link.

RINALIA ABUD RAHIM: [Right now?]

GÖRAN MARBY: No, you sent me earlier with a link of an anniversary book you made.

RINALIA ABUD RAHIM: Oh, yes, the APRALO [inaudible]

GÖRAN MARBY: The APRALO book. I looked it through.

RINALIA ABUD RAHIM: That was last night.

GÖRAN MARBY: Yes. No, I got it –

HOLLY RAICHE: She sent it last night [when I was there].

GÖRAN MARBY: I thought it was fantastic.

HOLLY RAICHE: It was – is.

GÖRAN MARBY: I liked that one. A lot of pictures. [Also of Rinalia.] I like the initiative. I think that was a great thing.

Anyway, I always come to you with speaking points, but I also know that you usually would like to ask me questions. Some of you I've met and you asked me questions.

So, "Questions for Göran." You don't have any hard questions for me? Thank you, Sébastien.

"One of the challenges of ICANN as it relates to public interest and –"

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible]

GÖRAN MARBY: May I ask someone to translate the first question to me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: To Swedish?

HOLLY RAICHE: To Swenglish.

GÖRAN MARBY: To Swenglish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone remember who posed it? Go for it.

JOHN LAPRISE: So this is about the battle between multilateralism and multistakeholderism, and where ICANN fits into that, specifically with respect to the public interests. So, multilateral being just intergovernmental versus multistakeholder, which is broader than just governmental.

GÖRAN MARBY: How long of time do I have?

ALAN GREENBERG: 30 seconds.

GÖRAN MARBY: I don't think there are any challenges.

[laughter]

GÖRAN MARBY: First of all, I'm looking forward to do sort of definition of public interest. I make my life very simple. I have to make my life simple. I don't understand the world if it's too complicated. And I often receive questions about why I have this job. Sometimes, people think it's challenging. I actually don't think so. I think I have the best job in the world.

But personally, I do this work because – I've said this before, so I'm going to repeat myself – I happen to believe that Internet is important. ICANN is not the Internet, but I'm very proud to be part of something that contributes to the Internet, because I basically think – and I say this internally – I happen to think that our collective job is to make the world a little bit of a better place. That's what I'm doing. Is that public interest?

It's the underlying thought that connecting people through this gigantic network makes life better. It's going to be problematic

and we're going to have a lot of things done wrong, but in the end if we connect people, it's going to make the world a better place. I don't know if that's –

So what are the challenges for that? I think there are a lot of challenges. One of the big challenges for me and us – and I'm repeating myself, but I think it's important – is that we build the global network of networks which we provide [to].

On the other hand now, when we have the next billion, 1.5 billion users, they're going to be very much different from the ones we have. I always call – and I say to myself that these are the elite we have. Many people are living in cities, functioning systems who can afford to buy, they have English as a language – as a conceptual understanding of English. And now we are meeting this global network with local history, local culture, different languages. And I think that is something that I think is a big thing for us to go forward. How do we maintain the global network of networks with respect of local?

I don't have the answer to that, but working together with you – we talk about local scripts; we talk about many things. But that balance has to be discussed. But that's one of the challenges. I can run up many of them.

When it comes to the sort of intergovernmental versus the ICANN version, remember that you have actually created

something very unique. There is nothing like ICANN around the world. There are many other organizations where people talk but in the end of this process, there is a function – the IANA functions – that actually makes things change. And that’s an obligation and a responsibility we have. And we sometimes seem to forget that, that in this ecosystem where we work together and you make the policies for that, we can actually change things.

But what we’re seeing right now is not the sort of debate that ICANN as an institution should change into something else. What I see – and I don’t know how many times I’ve said this this week – is that one of the big challenges now is that, for good reasons, legislative politicians around the world have realized that Internet is sort of here to stay and it has an effect on people in their countries.

And rightfully so in many countries, they now ask the question, “What is good and what is bad?” And they come into this, often with a very good notion. I’ve said this repeatedly, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

So we see many – not the discussion who should sort of run us, but more of a local parliaments who come up with suggestions that are made for good. But sometimes those suggestions, because they’re based on a lack of understanding how this

system works, could have an effect on our ability to make policies.

GDPR is an example which I've said a couple of times. Not because I'm validating GDPR as either good or bad, but it's really one of the first times – and remember, my history is 18 months. Has it been that long? Time flies when you enjoy things. I understand that this is one of the first times, really, where legislation has a direct [input] on our ability to make policies. I think we're going to see more of that.

And I was in this room a couple of hours ago, and I sort of repeat myself, is that we need to figure out a way of handling that within this community. We need to figure out a way how to – we're not a political organization. We are a technical organization. We should not be political. That's my – I actually told you what I think. But that's what I think.

But we should be able to be in the room where things like this are discussed, at least to make sure that there is an understanding how this system works so that even if you do something for good intentions, there is a balance between that and how the system works.

And I have many examples of that. We had a session this morning which I think was a very good one. I don't know if you know about GDPR and WHOIS, and I won't talk about it, but –

anyone? But the [uses] of WHOIS: it's used by intellectual property; it's used by police forces; or mediation of abuse. So the increased privacy in the WHOIS system could lead, potentially, to a lack of potential mitigation of abuse because that's where you get your information. So not everything is crystal clear. Not everything is sort like, "We really know how to do this." And this is why the ICANN community is so important to do those balances.

ICANN Organization is 400 people, so we can't be everywhere and we can't say everything. We can't send people in, and I can't afford to hire more people. So how do we, together in the community with the different constituencies, come together and become champions of something that we don't know what the threat is? And often, sort of what we're doing is for good reasons: to increase privacy, to increase stability, to increase – are good measures. But they can be done the wrong way.

So I think that, for me, it's sort of a bigger thing than internal question [inaudible]. When I get the question, "Why do you like the multistakeholder model?" – and I heard so many explanations. I think the reason why the multistakeholder model is important for what we do is because Internet hits every aspect of your life. Anything from education, banking, social media – and I understand, also, love life.

And then again, I've said this joke many times – I've been happily married for 21 years, so I don't know. But, actually, those aspects have to come into play when we discuss the issues we are talking about. And therefore, the multistakeholder model is important because if we do this right, we will have people from different parts of the world, different paths in life, different history, different background, different languages, and different interests and agendas.

We have to sort of figure out a way of encompassing all of that in the ICANN tent. I don't even know if I've answered the question, but I wanted to say this anyway. Was I close to answering the question, John?

ALAN GREENBERG: You have to have been, because we're running out of time otherwise.

JOHN LAPRISE: Then I will defer to the Chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do want to note –

GÖRAN MARBY: You can also say yes to make my life –

ALAN GREENBERG: I do want to note that David Olive is also with us. I hadn't seen him before.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

GÖRAN MARBY: What am I doing to enhance and maintain trust in the ICANN process? Which process are we talking about?

ALAN GREENBERG: Any one you like.

GÖRAN MARBY: I came in when the Transition was happening, and together with the Board and together with my staff, we started talking about what is transparency, what is accountability, and what is responsibility to act? Because it's actually all linked together.

We often talk about transparency as one thing and then we talk about sort of accountability. We put that together. But it also means that on the other end of that, we have a responsibility to do something. So we have spent quite a lot of time to try to figure out how those three things act together.

On the transparency, I've seen that we try to increase it. We have the CEO report. I hope you can come to the session tomorrow when ICANN Organization staff executives sit down. You can ask any question. We launched new indicators online on the web. We're working on an open data initiative. The Board has now open sessions, partly. So we're doing a lot of things to increase the sort of transparency of what we do.

We're also trying to work out who's responsible for what. One of the reasons why I suddenly started talking about ICANN Organization – (I know, Sébastien) the Board and the community – was to make the roles a little bit clearer so I can say to my team, “We're there to facilitate the discussion. We're not there to participate in them.” The Board makes the decision. The Board instructs me. And the community is where the policies are set and so on because that's a part of the clarity.

A big example of that is also the manual and flowchart project that we now released. I hope you had a look. We showed it in Johannesburg where we, for the first time, actually write down how the processes should be. These are the processes you decided. These are the manuals for it. This is how it works. I'm not allowed to call it by name anymore. We used to call it “habububub” and I'm not allowed to do that anymore, so I didn't say that.

So I think we've done a fair amount of things with this. We tried to do that. And we're also coming to the point where we have to ask ourselves, "What's the next step?" We will continue to do the work, because we also have to figure out a way, together I think, how to be efficient. Are the policy working processes actually working? Are we making the decisions in the right place?

And sometimes – and I know my American friends don't really like when I say this, but the answer to part of the multistakeholder model is actually what I would call bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is not always negative. We always think that things are going to be slow and boring, so let's call it ICANN bureaucracy because we might be slow sometimes, but we're definitely not boring.

Because what we talk about has to create credibility. So you know how I make decisions, when I make decisions, where you can expect decisions, so we can take in the last thing, the responsibility to act. Because with accountability, it actually takes the mandate you have to –

When you see something that doesn't work with what's in your mandate, you have to make a decision about it. You also have to stand up and take criticism for your decision. But if you don't do that as well – what's the accountability and what is transparency if nobody actually acts on the other end? So I think this is a

journey rather than anything else. And you're the one who, in the end, is going to measure if I do it right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Holly, if you're going to speak you have to use your microphone.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I change the third question slightly? So often, you hear about, “All ICANN should be is about names and numbers, and what the hell do we have to do with Internet governance?” I also hear exactly the opposite, which is that we should be involved. Where’s the line between what ICANN is and does, and where it’s involved?

GÖRAN MARBY: I actually stopped using the word “Internet governance.” Very simple reason. Many years ago when I sort of came into this one, I had a definition of what I thought was Internet governance. And then I realized over time, as always, it changes. I know there is a written down definition, but there are words that seem to evolve over time into something else.

It’s also a language thing. Actually, in Swedish, that means something else than it does sort of in English. I understand that

French is – Sébastien, I did study French for four years. That's why I will never speak it – because I'm too respectful of the actual language.

So words are important. And there are other words. If I say words like “net neutrality” or “privacy,” what does it actually mean? So I don't use that word. But one of the things that I thought about in Copenhagen –

I don't know if you went to the open session with the Board, one of the open ones. There were many newcomers coming up to the microphone, and they asked a lot of good questions. And we sort of gave what I would say the “gray-bearded answers” sometimes: “It's not in our mission...It's not how we do things...In 1882, we decided this in the 150th ICANN meeting...” or something.

And then it suddenly dawned on me that whatever we do today could be – I'm not saying we should, but everything we do today can be changed by you. So I should actually ask you that question. What do you think that we should do in terms of however we relate to Internet governance? Maybe that has to change. Maybe we have to evolve. The world is changing. The Internet today is not what it was five years ago. It's not going to be the same in the next five years.

HOLLY RAICHE: Your answer to the previous question, which is essentially that there's a new environment and suddenly we're actually dealing with laws that impact and how do we do it, means there's a different answer.

GÖRAN MARBY: I see all of you here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, we would like to give David a few minutes to say anything if he chooses, so let's try to keep questions and answers quick.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Alan. I know that internet governance is this big thing, this big word and stuff. And through monitoring your movement across ICANN – because people monitor your movement across ICANN – I've noticed that you don't quite like the term itself, "Internet governance." And I agree with you, it's one of these terms that everyone uses so loosely.

"Internet administration," though, is something which I think might fit the bill a little bit more because ICANN does administer the numbers, the names. It administers a part of the Internet. And so, "Internet administration" is perhaps what other

organizations out there might be interested in. So that was one thing.

Secondly, why do we need to keep track of our environment in Internet administration? Well, in any S.W.O.T. – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (and any past analysis) – as one would have in a commercial environment, you need to be well aware of your environment to be able to evolve in it. So that’s why I would say there is a business reason for it. And although we are not a business, any organization needs to be aware of the environment that it evolves in. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Can't we have a session in the next ICANN meeting? We can discuss alternatives words for that. I think that’s going to be really interesting. I will buy the popcorn.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Should we start a PDP on this, perhaps? Or a cross-community working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let’s not.

GÖRAN MARBY: A cross-community working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: David, do you have anything you'd like to share with us?

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, and thank you Alan and members here for this opportunity. The annual general meeting is a time of change and transition, and so we also would like to thank those outgoing leaders for their service and dedication to your work here with the At-Large community – and welcome those new incoming members and leaders. So thank you very much for that.

I would just draw your attention to two things. One, you may have seen – though maybe have not read – the policy update. This is the hopefully easier to read version of what's happening in the various SOs and ACs on policy development. We've had over 3,000 downloads of this, so I'm glad to hear of that.

And of the 350 sessions, I'd like to release the statistic that of about over 150 of those sessions are from the SO and the AC, your work, to give an indication of the activity and the intensity of your involvement and participation in the policy work and the advice work of the various SOs and ACs.

So with that, I want to thank you for that opportunity, and for the opportunity to share the forum with our president and CEO, Göran Marby. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any last comments?

GÖRAN MARBY: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: In that case, I would like to present you with a badge which we do expect you to wear. It says, “I speak At-Large.”

[applause]

GÖRAN MARBY: For the record, I will put it just under the “I love ICANN” badge.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Excellent.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: What is your other one there?

GÖRAN MARBY: “I speak Swenglish” and “I speak Ikea.” My team has lots of fun with me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. I actually got touched by that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're very welcome. Thank you for joining us.

Alright, back on decisions. We did have a speaker list of Seun. Do you still want to speak on the issue? This is the issue of making a decision – hopefully a quick decision; I don't much care which way it is – of which subgroup of which committee do we use to do the selection.

Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Two things I want to comment: the first one is that I think we should, in future, just be more prudent with timing. We've been discussing this on the mailing list for some time and [inaudible] just initiated the process even before we got to this meeting.

Secondly, I don't see the big deal in using the current one, even if John –

ALAN GREENBERG: León.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Is not on the list. I don't think it's going to be significant issue. Is there any reason why we must replace John? And if John can recuse himself, would that address the issue? I think it's by consensus, not by voting. Do they votes in the discussions?

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, I'm trying to remember who the other member was from North America. Does anyone remember who is the RALO person from North America? I should know it, but my mind has gone completely blank. Will someone please look the AASC sheet up?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's right here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What's the question?

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's Javier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Javier. So if we go with the current people, we end up with two ALAC members representing North America instead of a RALO and an ALAC. If people don't care, we can go with it. So we can go with nine people. León is absent and the other nine, which includes from North America two ALAC members – I don't much care.

Remember, if any of the ALAC members apply –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What is that discussion?

ALAN GREENBERG: – they will be recused from the discussion. I don't know who's going to be applying. We are not going to attempt to replace them. They will just be recused.

Evin would like to say something.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Alan, sorry. Just to note, Javier is here in the AC room, so he is present.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It doesn't alter the discussion. Thank you, though. Welcome, Javier. Good to have you here with us.

We have a proposal to use the current group, ignoring the fact there would be potentially two ALAC members if neither of them are applying. And we'll be missing one from LACRALO. If people are happy with that configuration, I'm delighted to say yes, let's go with it.

Consensus of the ALAC? Any objections? I see no objections. I'm assuming Javier is not going to object, but I'm not in the Adobe Connect room. So can someone please confirm that he hasn't objected?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No objection.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Alright, we have a decision. We're going to go with, essentially, the old group minus whoever can't be there, and we'll make a decision. If I could ask staff to send out a Doodle immediately for either the very end of next week or the very beginning of the week after. Done, thank you.

Next point is the oversight group for ATLAS III, which we are hoping will be held in Kobe, Japan, subject to budget and such.

But we are presuming it will be held somewhere in 2019. At least we're certainly optimistic it will be. And I have suggested that the group be composed of Maureen as one of the Vice Chairs, Olivier as the past Chair and a significant contributor to the last ATLAS, and Eduardo who essentially put the whole program together last time. Any discussion? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Alan. So yes, we have three Chairs effectively because Eduardo was the Chair of the Organizing Committee at the time. We need a lot more volunteers to help with that. You put three Chairs next to each other and they'll just sit there. So you need people to sit in those chairs and to get moving. So this is a call to everyone that we're going to have to start moving earlier –

ALAN GREENBERG: You can't make the call. You haven't been appointed yet.

[laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, but I'm rallying troops. I'm not going to be a Chair without having someone around.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll consider that if we appoint you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there any further discussion?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sébastien has raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I totally support that. I just want to make a slight difference in what you present us last day. I would like to suggest that the name you just give us will be the three Co-Chairs of this group. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm delighted to have that. If they really revolt and say they want different titles, we'll consider it. But I'm quite happy with that if

they are. Any further discussion? Does anyone disagree with the decision? Then we have consensus. Thank you.

Last one [applause] – okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible][nothing yet].

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, now that you're appointed as a Co-Chair, would you like to give the speech that we're going to need a lot of real workers? Because otherwise, we just have three managers managing each other.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I need to confer with my other Co-Chairs before being able to make any decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm going to do this on mic. [applauding] Should we give them a 15-minute break to confer? No.

Last item on our decision agenda is the joint ALAC-GAC statement. Now, the draft you were presented with three days ago, I think – which I will point out almost everyone said yes to, with a number of suggested amendments. I will quite Yrjö in

describing that draft, and I think his words were close to, “What do you expect from a document written by a Finn and a German-speaking Swiss?” And, yeah.

However, those same two people did an unbelievable job of rewriting it and adjusting it yesterday. They sent it to me for cleanup and I had remarkably little to do, except someone seems to love putting two spaces between words instead of one. I did correct those. I made a couple of other small corrections, and I think it is a marvelous statement. It’s clean.

Remember, one of the things we’re asking – and I noted this during meeting with the GAC – for clear, easy to read documents. The version we had then was not clear and easy to read, and was a very poor example of what we’re asking for. This one, I think, is pretty good.

So I don't know to what extent people have had a chance to read it yet, but I'd like to know to what extent you feel comfortable in approving it. The GAC will not likely approve it until tomorrow, but I'd like to be able to say we have approved it and it's now up to them.

We have a speaker list of Olivier and Sébastien.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

And Evan, too.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Evan. We'll go in that order, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And Hadia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I have a question with regards to the discussions that took place during the GAC-ALAC meeting on whether the statements should be in the GAC communique or whether this is a joint statement from the ALAC and the GAC, and to what extent that statement would have the power of a GAC communique action.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll say what was said yesterday, and Yrjö can perhaps give us more up to date information. It was pointed out that if we call it –

The version you saw yesterday had the word “statement” at the beginning and “advice” at the bottom. So clearly, one of those had to change so they would match. If we call it advice, as I guess Kavouss had pointed out, under the new rules, advice has to have rationales. It now pretty much has to say, “How is this

aligned with the mission?” And although it is aligned with the mission, it's a lot of extra work that we will have to do.

We decided yesterday that we would call it a statement, but that doesn't prohibit the GAC, should they choose, including something in their communique as advice in relation to it. And we could do something similar, should we choose. So this is a statement, but it could be pointed to an advice. And we may well choose to do that. We could actually add that as a fourth decision right now, should we choose – if the GAC endorses it.

Next, we have Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just to say that I've read the document and I've put some French issue within. As we received it on a PDF, the question of the space between two words, [we were not] very able to do it, but there are some other typos that I sent.

My main concern is that when we ask ICANN, we ask something that is so vague that nothing will happen, that maybe we need to do a little bit more wordsmithing on what is ICANN [at the] second line of the document. And I already sent my comments to Alan and I give them to Yrjö, and you have everything. But for your question, I support this document and I think it's a good improvement. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll note that the best editing always seems to come from people for whom English is not the first language, maybe because they pay more attention than the rest of us do. But thank you, Sébastien. Next, we have Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Bonjour. No – you don't want to hear my French. One question about the intended audience – and this may just be a matter that I'm not familiar with – so the very first sentence says, "Ask ICANN..." Isn't that a bit too broad an ask? I mean ICANN is everything. It's the community and everything. Is this not really a direction to staff of ICANN? Because it's essentially asking an administrative task in terms of sorting things out, creating content, arranging content. So I'm just wondering about the intended audience of this.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're referring to the second incarnation of ICANN in that sentence?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suspect under today’s terminology, it should be ICANN Organization, although we are asking for probably some level of volunteer cooperation in the second bullet. But I'm not quite sure. I'm happy to leave it vague, but if anyone feels – we can certainly –

Yrjö, can you point it out to Thomas that perhaps the second one should be ICANN Organization? And I'm willing to go with it either way.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, just as a follow-up. My Latin is awful, so could someone tell me what inter alia means?

ALAN GREENBERG: “Among other things.” It’s always nice to splatter a smatter of Latin around.

Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So I support the document. I just wanted to point out a very small typo. So maybe later I can send it to you, or I just say

it now. Okay, it's the second page, third paragraph. It reads, "For a non-expert stakeholder who wants be..." It should be, "who wants to be an informed participant..." Yes.

YRJÖ LANSPIRUO: Yes.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: There is a missing "to."

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Proving my point. We have John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: I support the document. I think the document's power comes from the fact that it's being sent by the GAC and ALAC, so I'm less concerned about the specificity of the language. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I did misspeak yesterday, I think – at least someone did – that this is the first joint ALAC-GAC statement. We were reminded by one of the GAC members, and then it was confirmed after, that we did do one before. None of us can remember what it was about, but we think Evan wrote the ALAC part.

And I vaguely remember Evan huddled in a room with some GAC members one afternoon, but I don't know the details. And perhaps we don't need them right now, but if you would like to remind us in three words, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No. Huddled sort of describes it well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you remember the topic though?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The last one I was involved with was on applicant support.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Definitely, that was a huddle.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further discussion? Silvia would like to discuss it, according to that card.

GISELLA GRUBER: We didn't do the introduction when we started but, please, this is a wrap-up session of the ALAC and the regional leaders. We will refer back to the transcript or to the recording, and I haven't heard many names until now so it will be “Man, woman, man, woman.” So if we do need it, please do every time you take the microphone, state your names. We have the interpretation here, and then they can identify you on the language channels. Thank you. That was my input.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. In general, I believe the name does show up just prior to the person speaking, so it's an exercise for the reader.

Does anyone object to the adoption of this as an ALAC statement? Would anyone like to abstain? Then by consensus, we have adopted it. Thank you.

Do we want to discuss –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Point of order.

ALAN GREENBERG: Who are you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. I'm Chair of the EURALO, European At-Large Organization. Have you checked whether there is quorum in the room before doing a consensus call – a quorum of ALAC members?

ALAN GREENBERG: I am presuming staff has checked. Would we like to count? Any ALAC members [seeing your hand], if you think you're an ALAC member now on this current ALAC, please put up your hand.

Evan is not an ALAC member.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Garth's spot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan has a proxy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you have Garth's proxy? I don't believe, technically, you are –

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, I was allocated to come here in Garth's spot. I do not have a written proxy in my hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm afraid that does not make you an ALAC member for the purposes of a decision.

Do we have at least –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to put you out of your trouble, yes, I've counted. There are more than nine ALAC members. Please proceed. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We do take attendance to these meetings and the attendance, I believe, would show that. Would anyone like to propose that, should the statement be issued jointly that we send advice to the Board, that we are treating this as advice? We have Tijani shaking his head yes, saying Tijani would like to propose this.

We have a speaker list. Yrjö and Andrei, I believe.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Just for your information, the GAC communique is still being drafted by the drafting session where I was just a couple of hours ago. This was included in the advice section of the GAC communique. Actually, there was as reference to this under the GAC meeting's section, that is to say GAC met with the ALAC, and this was the result [of that.] And then in the advice section, there

was also pretty much the same language as we have here in the statement as an advice to the Board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. So chances are, the GAC will treat it as advice. We have a proposal on the table for us to also treat it as advice. The next speaker is Andrei.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you. It would be nice to have advice, as well, because of the GAC. But what concerns me is that the [form] of this document is kind of directing ICANN personnel to do a certain job by the meaning of the text. So we're not giving advice to the personnel of ICANN, we can give advice to the AC and SO, right? This is my logic.

ALAN GREENBERG: We would treat this as advice to the Board, that the Board request ICANN Organization to implement this.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Then it's clear. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what, effectively, we would be doing.

Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And just to remind you, if there are any changes to this text, if it's a joint statement, the same changes should be done to the text that the GAC would be voting on or adopting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm presuming that we are approving this in principle, subject to the final editing that will have to be done. We've already had several people identify typos and, clearly, our intent is not to deliberately submit something with typos.

Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just a question. So if it becomes an advice from both, then that second thing that says a "joint statement" will be a "joint advice"? Or that's just a [typo]–

ALAN GREENBERG: No, the advice says, "Please treat the statement as advice." Heidi said that perhaps we should talk to ICANN Comms about this, and my answer to Heidi was that I assume that if we issued the statement and treat it as advice, there's going to be lots of

discussion. The Board does treat advice rather seriously these days.

Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. In view of what Yrjö has just said, which changes what I was going to say, I think it would be tactical and tactful to wait a day and see what exactly the GAC says in its final communique. The draft may change. Overhearing the GAC discussion, we know that there are some GAC members, for good reasons, who don't want to create precedent for joint advices. I would just wait so that when you transmit it to the Board from ALAC, you can clearly reference exactly what your partner in this affair has done with the GAC communique.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, we are approving this as a joint statement. It has no meaning unless the GAC approves it as a statement also. So that's implicit in our approval. It is subject to final editing, which implies no major substance changes. If there are major substance changes, we are going to have to somehow reconsider it, in perhaps an unreasonable timeframe.

And then our choice whether to treat it as advice once it is an issued statement is ours alone. We can choose to give it as

advice or not, as can they. So I phrase this that if we are issuing it as a statement, do we want to also treat it as advice? And that was the question I've put up for discussion, and we had –

Evan, did you still want to speak? No.

Any further discussion? I'm taking a straw poll. Does everyone feel comfortable in making a decision at this point? That is, if it is issued as a joint statement, then we will also flag it as advice with the appropriate words around it.

Olivier, you wish to speak. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Not strictly speaking on your question, which I believe is a particularly important question and I think that ALAC members have to think about this quite carefully, but with regards to calling it a joint statement: you might wish, in the motion, to adopt the statement to have a fallback option if the GAC does not approve this particular statement, and make this a statement of the ALAC rather than a joint statement of the GAC and the ALAC. Otherwise, you fall back to nothing and then you don't have a statement at all. If that is your wish, of course.

ALAN GREENBERG: Looking at it, if the GAC does not do it as a statement, it will depend why they don't do it as a statement. If we don't do it as a statement now but are reserving it for two weeks from now or three weeks from now or the next meeting, then we may want to hold back on it and do something similar so we are in sync. Doing it jointly is what has the power here more than the words themselves. And at this point, I feel somewhat confident that the GAC will adopt it at least as a statement, and Yrjö says probably as advice. But I think we're going to have to let it play out. We're not in control of that.

Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think the GAC will adopt it because I talk about this issue in each and every meeting they have with us or SO and ACs, and they will have to do something. If it's not to adopt this one, they will adopt something and we have to see.

But I am a little bit reluctant to do that on advice. I would really prefer that we do advice on policy with a strong point of view. I am a little bit afraid that if we send that as an advice, what was the last advice we give to the Board? I don't know, but if we send this one, it will be, "Okay, you again talk about process and not about policy."

The perspective from us is a little bit differ for the GAC. The GAC, it's in the communique, can add whatever they want and they are treated by the Board. My advice to ALAC colleagues is not to adopt that as an advice. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Note the GAC communique as a whole is not advice. There is a part of it which is advice if we don't know whether this will be included at all. I believe there's a large amount of power and the implied statement if we do it uniformly and together, so I am willing to treat it as advice. If the GAC treats it as advice, I'm happy to do that. And if we don't want to do it – if the GAC chooses not to do it as advice, then we will also do that.

Yrjö, please.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yes. As I said, it is as advice now in the version of the GAC community. And when that was read out, nobody objected so I'm pretty certain that it will stay there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will point out that this is Thomas' last meeting – last meeting as Chair anyway – and it's something dear to his heart. So I think there's a good chance it will be adopted that way.

So the question I'm putting to the ALAC is: should this be issued as a joint statement and should the GAC treat it as advice, do we also want to treat it as advice? Is there anyone who disagrees and says we should not do this? Abstain? Note, Sébastien has abstained. Should he choose, he may give a reason for abstaining. That can be done offline.

I think we have a consensus of the ALAC that, should it be issued as a joint statement and should the GAC treat it as advice, we will also treat it as advice. Thank you very much.

This part of the meeting is over, and we are now into – oh, dear. What do we have? We have 20 minutes left. That's not bad, actually – on a debrief of this meeting. The meeting isn't over yet, but certainly, the majority of the ALAC parts of this meeting are over. And the subjects that we're looking at are: Was the content well-organized? Did we address the kind of things we should be addressing? And, from my perspective, are we happy with how the meeting flow has gone?

Now, I will say I'm not. I feel that we were too pressed for time too many times. I was shortening the time delays we were doing from two minutes to a minute and a half to one minute. We cut off discussion more than I feel comfortable doing. On the other hand, the only other way around is to allow far more time for these sections, and that means we cover far fewer things.

I think overall, this was a productive meeting. We had a fair amount talking about policy and substance. We did do a bunch of process, but that's part of our business. We are essentially the administrator of At-Large, and I don't think we can avoid it completely.

So, I guess I'd like people's input, and as particular advice for the next meeting. Do we allow far more time and cut off fewer people? But then we cover far fewer subjects.

And I have a speaker list of Sébastien and Tijani.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in French. I would like to ask a question: When are we going to debate and discuss what we retained and what we want to bring to the group: what we talked about in our meeting, who went to other meetings, when are we going to report about it – to really talk about if we're happy about this ICANN meeting? We can do that later on after we are home, but to talk about the substance is quite important and it's more interesting according to me. This is my point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Future meetings, we don't do a debrief but we do spend more time talking about what we've learned here and what people

have done. My personal answer is that I support that completely, but not in lieu of a debrief. A debrief two weeks later isn't the same thing. It's the feelings we have today, I think, that matter. But that's my opinion, not necessarily everyone's. Tijani, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Follow-up, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Personally, I have three things I would like to say about the content, so I'm ready for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I do recommend that in the future, we put less items to discuss so that we can really have a discussion, everyone can express themselves, and we will have a fruitful, if you will, session in this way rather than put more items to discuss and don't finish them because of issue of the time. I think that Sébastien asked that we don't make the debrief, but

we will make another debrief. People who were in another session than ALAC have to come here and tell us what did they see and give a report, more or less.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think I got that. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: I speak in Spanish. I think you're going to hate me for what I'm going to say. We've improved significantly in terms of timing, to be on time with – not so much, but we have improved. I think perhaps we can make better use of our time if we are aware to what everybody says and we do not repeat. We've listened to repetitions and repetitions, and I think it's enough to say, "I just agree with this or that," and I've saved two minutes.

This is just giving time to someone else who can take that time to speak. If we are more aware to what everybody says, it is highly likely that we will be able to have more time. We can devote more time to deal with other issues and have more time for other people to speak. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: A question for Alberto. Why would we hate you for saying that? You may get a lot of applause.

[applause]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, my appropriate answer was, “I agree.”

Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Keeping in Spanish, I'm new in this and you will probably see this differently from – I would see this differently from what people have seen lately, but I do feel that in some of the meetings we didn't really have time to properly discuss certain issues. And I think this is what happens with those of us who come here to discuss issues on a face-to-face basis. And what happened in some meetings is – we just had a presentation of a group that presented something that they could have sent by e-mail and that we could have just exchanged a couple of e-mails with this group in particular.

So, I think we should balance these a little bit more and try to come here to give this discussion and maybe with the rest of the groups with which we do not have a discussion but actually there's just a presentation. Then we can just use the Internet to send that presentation.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We're in an interesting quandary. We do a survey before each meeting and we ask people, "Who do you want to hear from? Do you want to hear from someone or another? Do you want to present?" And we've cut down the number of presenters significantly. There were a number of other groups we haven't seen in several years who would be at every meeting and, to be honest, often saying the same thing. And we're doing much better now.

So I take what Ricardo is saying to heart, but next time when we do a survey, think about that. And if everyone says they want to see GSE here, we will ask GSE again, and so on and so forth. So when you do those surveys, it actually has impact. We do actually try to look at it and see if it makes any sense.

Now, to be honest, occasionally we ignore what the surveys say. For this meeting, I believe the survey said we wanted to see MSSI, the group that oversees reviews. And I think we made a unilateral staff decision, an executive decision, that we're not going to. But in general, we do try to follow it. So just think about it as we go forward.

Ricardo, did you want to follow on? Please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Sorry, and I have found something that I have been thinking for the last two days. In the poll to ask for some of the meetings, questions, was a poll in the Internet. So once the poll was on, it was only in some place for the one who takes the poll, but I didn't take the notes for that. I don't know if we can make the polls in another way so we can take note ourselves of what the questions were for the poll.

ALAN GREENBERG: So you're asking that we shouldn't necessarily only do a Big Pulse or whatever survey we used, but use other methods as well?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes, for example e-mail or something because it doesn't leave a trace of what was put on the poll for the person who submits the poll.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It's interesting. We go back and forth on these kind of things. I'm very much a primitive person, and I like doing things in e-mail because then everyone has records and we can keep track. Other people seem to want to use specialized polling tools, but that does make it more difficult afterwards to go back. I'm quite flexible; I don't much care. But I also like simple tools.

But remember, we were instructed by the At-Large Review to stop using e-mail. Do remember that. We're ignoring it, but we were told that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, we need to get with the times.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: TTF is asking us to use Slack. I think it's a very good tool. And it's a real improvement over whatever it is – Skype that we're using, and e-mail and all those things. So maybe we can choose to use it finally.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's why we have technology people telling us what to do. But just to be clear, every time we make a recommendation to change a tool, someone says no – and usually for connectivity reasons. So we have to be just a little bit careful.

We have about eight minutes left in the session. Does anyone else have any further things to say about the debrief? What do we do differently? I'm hearing “fewer topics” and “try to allow more time” – I see Seun's hand is up – and “be more careful about who we invite and perhaps [inaudible].”

We can do a lot of this prior to an ICANN meeting with webinars and seminars and things like that. The problem is when we do it, we get very poor attendance. So one way or another, we have to decide what methodology we're using and then live with it.

We have Seun and then Sébastien, and then I'll probably call it close to an end at that point. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Two things. The first one, I think we should try as much as possible to get administrative stuff done on the lists. I think we could have just come here to some of the [administrative] [inaudible] just come here to endorse and move on. So I personally don't support Snapchat – was it Snapchat or what? I'm an e-mail person, so I prefer communications by mail. I would not prefer to do Adobe Connect as you all know. And even my [inaudible] is not good. So as much mail as possible, I would prefer that.

Please consider that for those of us who don't have connectivity. So if we don't participate, let it not be that because we don't want to. It's just because of connectivity. So if you want us to participate, for me personally, I would like to suggest that most of our discussions are done on the mailing list. That is how I can respond promptly.

The second thing is in terms of the timing – this is to the Chair, actually – I’d like to say that it could be a coincidence; it could be unintentional, definitely. But I think when one person – if somebody is just speaking for the first time, I don’t think it’s at that time that you should put a timer on that person. Try to give that person some leverage of opportunity to speak for extra minutes or seconds, especially if others have been speaking and taking more time. I've actually been on your radar for a couple of times, so I thought I should say it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. In terms of tools, we are not making decisions here on which tools to use. In terms of speaking times, I think that’s a discussion we can have on the list. Normally, I have tried to not put timers on until we start getting to the point where we’re going to run out of time and a long speaker queue. We can use other methodology. We can certainly make proposals on that.

We have a speaker queue right now of Sébastien and Cheryl.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I am not a writing person and I don’t like the exchange on mail. I have too much mail and it’s even the case in French. It’s not just a question of language. But I think that when Alan says a webinar is not well-attended, we had a presentation

at the TTF, the Technical Taskforce, that we can record it and listen to it after even on our phone.

The way we need to think about it, it's not so much that we are all at the same time listening to the same thing, but we need to listen and we need to come here all together face-to-face to discuss about this issue. And that will be a good change. And when Glenn does an eBook – and I am sure he can do a video, a webinar, whatever, recorded – it can be read, looked at by everybody before the meeting, and I think it would help not to have a classroom style of meeting during all the week. I am really bored with that. We need to stop with that. We need to find another way to interact.

And by the way, I want to thank [Evan] for the only – I'm not talking about APRALO training, but it was the only ALAC session where there was a little bit of fun. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have about four minutes left. Yes, and there is a break between. If we run over, we will run over. And currently, we have Cheryl and Tijani in the list, and I will give a last change for any more – and John. And the speaker queue is closed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I put my hand up when Seun was speaking, but it is interesting because it goes to complement some of what Sébastien was saying. I felt the need to put on my somewhat extended historical – or hysterical, depending on your point of view – Asia Pacific hat where we have gone over several years with the challenges of cultures that do not like working in e-mail. For the permanent record, we will not get some cultures to put to the equivalent of pen to paper, for a whole lot of very good reasons.

So what I'm saying is that you have a diversity of needs, you have a diversity of comfort zones, and you really need to look for solutions that are diversified. So, as we do in a number of the PDP processes – outside of the insular little world of ALAC and At-Large, but in the rest of ICANN – you do things by a number of ways. You do use the list and you do use the Adobe Connect, and you do use Skype channels, and you do use Slack channels, and you do use whatever works for the people who are involved at the time.

So I just want to encourage you to not be too narrow on finding the perfect-fits-most or one-size-fits-all, but set up where you've got principles and practices that allow more diversification.

For example, you'll find now – thanks very much to the captioning [pilot] that came out of this very room – huge

benefits for low bandwidth where you've got the ability to not log into Adobe at all, just into the captioning section. There's a bunch of ways of doing this, so don't just focus on what works for you. Listen to what may work for many. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Finishing just as the timer hit zero. Thank you.

Tijani.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have an internal clock.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Very short. Sébastien, you are proposing that we do webinars just to make reports, to give information, and then the discussion will be here face-to-face. Isn't it? If it is the case, why do webinars? Why not distribute documents? And that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: John.

JOHN LAPRISE: As an incoming ALAC member, I think it's incumbent upon, at least me, to be prepped when I come to a meeting. And I would

really like to ask my fellow ALAC members that if we pursue this idea of providing information ahead of the meeting to deal with the administrivia so we don't have to deal with it face-to-face, that we all actually commit to doing the work – reading all the documents, watching the webinars, whatever – beforehand, and do the prep work necessary so that we can be more productive in the meetings. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, John. I'll note this is a brand new ALAC coming in. There's some overlap with old people, some new people. And I don't really want to predict the behavior of the incoming group based on the behavior of past groups. But we do have a fair amount of experience saying that no matter how many webinars we send, how many documents we send out, people ignore them all and don't do their homework. I'd like to think maybe this new group will be different and we'll give it a try.

Any further comments before we break? The next session which starts in, in theory, 15 minutes I believe is a wrap-up session with reports from various people and a number of Chairs' announcements and a number of staff announcements, actually. And Seun would like to speak first.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, just a quick one. In response to –

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm told the schedule I'm working on is out of date, so I don't have a clue what we're doing next. Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI. Yes, it's in response to Cheryl. My intention is not to deny any other person their access. It's just for me to mention what works for me. And I thought we are deciding on which platform we want to focus on, so that is why I'm saying that mailing list works for me. And others can also use whatever it is that works for them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, a few people started talking about technology options. That's not the discussions we're having today. Now, I'm told I'm working on an out of date schedule. What –

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible] for the next session.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the next –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Look at your wiki. You've got Evan speaking first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. I'm told the agenda for the next session is incorrect. When we start the next session, I will have looked at the agenda by then. We reconvene in 13 minutes, and I think we'll reconvene even if the room is empty.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, and over to Ariel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Over to Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: We have two quick group photos to take. One is for the ALAC members for the coming term starting from this AGM, and then the other is for the ALT. So, we have a photographer waiting outside to take these two group photos.

ALAN GREENBERG: In other words, no one do anything other than go out to the photo.

ARIEL LIANG: [inaudible] liaisons included in the ALT photo shoot.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]