ABU DHABI – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 6
Sunday, October 29, 2017 – 09:00 to 10:15 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

| | |
|---|---|
| UNKNOWN SPEAKER: | It is Sunday October 29th, 2017, in Hall B Section A, ALAC for the ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session Part 6, 09:00 to 10:15. |
| HEIDI ULLRICH: | Hello everyone, if we could please get seated, I think we'll be starting soon.  Just come around the table if you could, and a reminder to everyone, when we do begin the session to please state your name for the record and transcription purposes, thanks very much. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you all for being here and for generally populating this group, and being here on time, it's a delight, it's very unusual, and I hope it's the start of a trend.  We have a pretty packed schedule.  The schedule this morning is somewhat unusual; we had a constraint added into us at the very last moment and that is the board has scheduled an open board meeting from 9 to 10, which meant no board members are available here.  Based on |

other availability, we really could not reschedule the visit from our board members to any other session.

In theory, there is a break at 10:15, I believe, that's the official break. We may have a break at 9:45, where there probably will not be coffee, on the other hand the 9:30 session discussion may run over, so we may or may not have a break. If you feel the need to get out to go out for something, then pick your time. Whether we will have a break or not will depend on how long the second part of today's session goes, but we will be starting with Rinalia and the other board members on time.

First item on our agenda today is ATLAS 3. ATLAS stands for At-Large Summit; the first one was held in 2009 in Mexico City and the second one in 2014 in London. We are hoping the next one will be held in Kobe, Japan in March of 2019. You noticed that last little phrase after Japan, subject to funding.

Several years ago, we spent a large amount of effort in building a multi-year plan to predict and presumably finance the ATLAS meetings in addition to the general assemblies that we have in between ATLAS meetings. ICANN formally does not have a multi-year budgeting process, but it does have a multi-year planning process. This particular proposal was used as a, in theory, a model for future implementations where there are funds required periodically but not annually to attempt to

budget them over multiple years and carry the funds forward so to speak or backward, to fund these larger expenses that come periodically.

It was approved by the board, by the Board Finance Committee and the Board.  It is less clear that they actually implemented it, in other words to put the money in the back pocket so they would have it; and of course, we're in a situation as you probably have heard, and if not, if you listen to the CEO you will hear it, we are in a situation where there are continually demands for increased expenses and our revenue is not going up particularly fast.

All of this we're talking about is subject to funding and it's not a done deal, but we will be working hard to do it.  That being said, we are going ahead with the planning on the assumption that it is held in this timeframe.  Somewhere along the way, it's conceivable we'll put on the brakes, but this is where we're going at this point.

Next slide, please.  One of the critical issues that we have to look at is who comes to these meetings.  For the first ATLAS it was pretty simple, we were really just getting started with ALSes and RALO's, and we invited all of our ALSes.  The second one, we basically did the same, clearly with a larger number we always have some amount of fallout but the plan was overall the same.

This time around, we're looking at a very different situation. First of all, we are going to have to commit moderately early to the number of slots we have. We are predicting we will have 225 to 250 slots that might be cut back and it is possible we will have fewer slots than we have ALSes.

The other thing we have to consider is in parallel with ATLAS planning, we are at this point still trying to sell our view of how the At-Large Review should be addressed, and within that is our commitment that we are going to significantly increase focus on individuals as opposed to ALSes, and we are going to increase focus on members of ALSes.

The concept of we will simply ask our representative to come, who may or may not be the active worker in an ALS, or that we will ask as North America does right now, one person to come on behalf of all of the individual members, that might not be the right model if we have a lot active people that are either individual members within ALSes or individual members outside of ALSes.

It's reasonably clear that we cannot sell our vision of the At-Large Review Implementation and in parallel implement something completely different as part of the ATLAS planning. The two are going to have to be in sync as both of them are evolving. To be clear, the concept of one person per ALS and it's

probably the formal voting representative, is likely not to be the model that we're going to end up using. That's going to be subject to significant community discussion over the next little while.

Essentially, we're going to have to decide what are the criteria for attendance, and we will have a deadline about a year from now; assuming Kobe goes ahead, we will have a deadline of just about a year from now, from actually listing the individual names, because that's when travel will be initiated for the March meeting.

Before we go ahead, questions, comments? This is a radical change and I'm not pretending otherwise, but I don't see we have much choice. We have two speakers at this point, Olivier and Sebastien, in that order.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:   Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Good morning, everyone. I totally support the points that you are making, Alan, and I think that we also need to, in parallel with this, not only get all of the data of the ATLAS 2 participation, since we are aware that participation from some people wasn't that great, but at the same time, I do think that

we also need to probably start tracking participation in our community in its various ways.

Let's not start a discussion and debate about what is participation, we've got future calls and meetings that we can do that with, but I'm particularly concerned about the fact that we are growing at a very great rate and it's absolutely sure that we will have more At-Large structures than slots, so something will have to be done.

I do not see us being able to ask for more slots than the numbers that you've asked here, for two reasons. The first one being of course the cost, the second one being the logistical issue. The larger the group, the larger the rooms will be and we are probably going to be space constrained and that's not our choice, it's ICANN's choice. If a larger venue has to be booked, that's not just the cost of ATLAS 2, it's an entirely new thing and in the current times I don't think that would too well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    And indeed, as I said, the whole funding is subject to approval at this point and the larger it gets, the more likely it will be that it will be a problem associated with it. We have a long speaker list, right now I will close it. The next person is Sebastien.

ICANN 60 ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:     Sebastien speaking.  Thank you very much.  I'd like to draw your attention on what you're suggesting here because it means that ultimately there will be a few people who will be deciding who's entitled to come and who's not, and I'm not sure that is the best model that we should be working with.  I think we should entitle our ALSes, including the European ALS that groups individual members, and we should provide them with the necessary tools for them to choose because if there is a small group choosing for 150 people or for 250 people, anything goes.

I'm not sure the fact that there is a recommendation from the review saying that we should help individuals become members, and that is not more important than making sure that ALSes continue to work.  I mean sure, we can go down to the individual level within ALSes, but we cannot change the entire structure, otherwise we could change the entire structure and then have individuals in the organization, but if our structure has ALSes and we should make them accountable, ask them for certain requirements, certain participation levels and then decide who will be representing them in that structure, but it would be up to them to choose.

Then of course there's people who are very active who may not be the representative of the ALS.  Out of the 250 potential ALSes

that we will be having by then, there is always a certain number of people who are not able to attend or that duck, and who could be replaced by those who are very active. But I don't think we should start to try finding a solution or a committee that's going to choose for everyone, that's not feasible and it's not healthy. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think we said that a committee will choose for everyone. I think we'll decide on some criteria overall and I presume the RALO's will be involved within each of their own groups, but there is no way that we can ignore the direction to individual members and individual ALS members, and at the same time not ask the Board not to recommend that we follow the items' direct implementation. We are in conflict.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I really think that even if you involve the RALO's, the RALO will be the same thing that if it's at a global level, we need just to explain to the ALS that they need to make a good choice of who will represent them and not [inaudible] to this thing. I really think that you can't take the review as an argument to change the way the At-Large was built; if not, we have to change At-

ALAN GREENBERG:     Sorry, the queue is closed at this point.  Thank you for your opinion, Sebastien.  Next, we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA:     Thank you.  Tijani speaking.  I agree on the fact that we don't have the right to fund people who are not active at all.  I also agree on the fact that active persons should be funded, even if they don't have any position.  I don't agree that we consider more the individual members than the ALSes, it should be something balanced.

Another thing, you spoke about the review, I agree with you, but we have to apply that for everything, not only for this very point, for the other points.  My great concern is that the record, we have to get the record of participation.  I ask it several times about the record of participation in those meetings, people are funded for those meetings.  Some are doing very well and some sometimes don't show up.  We need to know who is doing what during those meetings.

This is one of the main elements of assessment. We need also to have the record of participation of people in the monthly calls of every RALO and any other activities in ALAC and in At-Large. Those are the basis of any evaluation in the future for participation in the summit. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Next, we have Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Satish for the record. First of all, we are happy that ATLAS 3 is being held or most probably being held in Asia/Pacific, which is our home region. I have this point about the latest quotas between At-Large Structures and individual members which I think will be a necessary consequence of the At-Large Review.

Now, I would tend to support Sebastien in saying that this should not undermine the very basis of the At-Large or the ALAC's -- the systems that we've been following so far. We have to be sensitive to that issue. I would also request for some regional flexibility in the criteria of assessment as to how we should short list our potential participants.

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

I also see that the ATLAS Review will be clear only in the next few months, so we would request for sufficient notice for discussions of these criteria in our regional leadership so that we can come back with our comments on this. I would especially request regional flexibility. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point that one of the other things we do have to decide is how we portion the slots over the regions. If we are not using, and that's not decided, ALSes as the sole measure, then the ALS ratio may not be the right one. It's a major decision we are going to have to go to. Next, we have Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Good morning to you all. I think the second point is going to influence a lot the first one. With respect to LACRALO, it's been too long that metrics have been ready and even though they have been dealt with, if they are approve as such they are criteria to either come or to attend the general meetings that we are discussing, this is so because we have some 54 ALSes and less than 20 of them are active. We've already said here in ALAC that we should establish criteria, perhaps not in ALAC but within the RALO's, for attendance.

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

In the last meeting in London, there were people who never attended a LACRALO meeting and they were very much a tourist in London because they didn't even attend our own sessions. This is something that has to be avoided. I hope that the LACRALO and I insist, I don't know why the metrics are not being treated but the LACRALO metrics are ready. If this is so, then the demands are very few, it's not going to take us more than 20 to 24 hours a year, 24 hours a year is what we are demanding. That's all, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Take it as a given at this point, that we will be reporting attendance at meetings and participation in other groups, just as we will and are recording attendance at these meetings. Yes, we have not done it well. No, we're not going to talk about the details right now.

We do have ATLAS 2 records, we have lots of records from attendance at meetings, they're not always collated and readily available to the people who have to make the decisions; they will be. One way or another, we will get that information. We are five minutes away -- I'm sorry, do you want to speak? Please, go ahead.

| GISELLA GRUBER: | Sorry, Gisella for the record. Just something that is quite important and I don't think people understand with regards to attendance, if you arrive 15 minutes late and we're not aware of the fact that you've arrived 15 minutes late, we track the attendance when people are seated at the beginning of a meeting is when people should be in the room, and if you are running late and you don't let staff known, we can't note it in attendance. |
|---|---|
| | You can't then come and say, "Oh, but I attended that meeting," and it's like, "Well yes, you turned up half an hour late," because otherwise it means staff resource one person to do attendance which is not possible. I'm just going to add that for the RALO meetings, we do have attendance records which we can make readily available, we just need to work on that, so we just need a timeframe. Thank you. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | We will have no choice but to make sure this is being done; whether that needs additional ICANN staff or not, we'll have to work with ICANN on. There is no question that we can avoid it. It's implicite in the ICANN recommendation, in the items recommendations and in our recommendations, that we are tracking these things. We're almost finished this session, we have not gotten through the slides yet. I don't want to delay, not |

talk about the auction funds because it is a critical issue within ICANN.

I would appreciate it if we can go through the rest of these slides. We'll try to find some more time to debate this later but otherwise we're not going to be able to even present the ideas.

Next slide, please. This is the overall projected block schedule, it is subject to discussion so we will not spend a lot of time debating it right now. Gisella, if you can please quickly outline it.

GISELLA GRUBER:    Thank you. Gisella for the record. It will be very brief because since the ATLAS 2 in London, we've now got the new block schedule which has been implemented which means that Meetings Team sends us the block schedule, generally with the cross community sessions on that and then we need to fill the gaps.

The ATLAS 3 will be quite a different scheduling issue, there will no doubt need to be a little group to really work very closely on that because as we know and as I've also seen on chats here, there is always the case when we have meetings that are running parallel with other sessions that are deemed very important to people who are in this room, so it's going to be even more challenging than usual. What we've just put down is

that there are the Plenary's on the first, the second and the last day and that is also on the ATLAS 2 module.

We've also provided for the breakout sessions, so the breakout sessions on the Saturday and we've got rooms for 50 people each for these little breakout sessions and for the Plenary we have provided up to 250 just numbers.  Again, as you can see in these venues, some rooms are bigger and some rooms are smaller, and London was pretty good in that respect, but I'm not quite sure what Kobe is like and we will be discussing this with Meetings Team.  Again, we might need to set up a separate group to work on the scheduling for this.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you.  I'll point out that although we like to do our planning for this kind of thing well ahead of time, we will not know the block schedule for Kobe until much, much later and there are always changes.  If you look at the cross-community groups we have at this meeting, they're really important and I don't think we want to say, "We're holding a meeting that day, tough, we're going to miss them."

We're going to have to be doing last minute work far more than we have in the past because the structure of meetings have become far more rigid than they were before.  It's going to be a

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

challenge, like everything else associated with this.  I don't think we want to spend a lot more time on detail planning, just to know it is going to be a challenge.

Next slide, please.  Possible themes, these were the themes for ATLAS 2, they're likely not to be the same ones.  There's going to be lots of discussion.  I don't think we can or want to settle them at this very moment.  Next slide.  Please go ahead, but very quickly.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    This is Heidi for the record.  Again, there's been some discussion for ATLAS 3 and then we definitely had that for ATLAS 2 where activities that were focused on the participants prior to arriving at the summit.   Some suggestions for ATLAS 3 preparatory activities would be ICANN Learn Courses and you'll see a preview of the new platform this week.  Webinars, eBooks that could provide information about bio's, some of the topics, etc. Podcasts, where we could do that prior to the people arriving.

A set of documents, we also would need to know what you would need staff to gather.  For ATLAS 2 we also had newsletters and we had interviews that were developed prior to people arriving.   These are some of the ideas that we could do in advance.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you.  I see a card up, we're holding questions to the end but we will have very limited time at this point.  Heidi, do you want to just review that, but understand this is our best guess right now, things may change.


HEIDI ULLRICH:     Thank you Alan.  Again, this is just a few steps.  We're going backwards again if we're assuming that it's March 9 through 14. The final prep would need to be likely January/February as the whole Kobe schedule is being finalized.  Depending on when you would want to hold those webinars, all that preparatory activity would be again likely early part of 2019.  Then again, as we've mentioned, absolute drop dead for the travelers to contingency travel would be the 7$^{th}$ of December.

Gisella will be working on that and she'll need to have at least two weeks prior to that, getting all the names.  Then working backwards, develop the schedule of meetings, outreach event, social activities, I see that this would be happening in the beginning of December 2017 all the way through at least June 2018 or beyond a little bit.  That means where we are now and that would indicate that we would likely need to establish an

organizational committee; if not today, we would need to get that call out in next month, November.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In terms of organization, I have asked three people to play your lead roles in this process. Number one, as one of the vice-chairs, Maureen to lead the effort. I would very much appreciate if Olivier as past chair during the last ATLAS and a heavy contributor to the process be involved, and similarly Eduardo, who has played not an insignificant role in both of the previous ATLAS's. That group will have to be fleshed out with a lot more people. I will note that a lot of this work is going to have to be done with implementation of the At-Large Review. This is going to be a busy year.

The last note I'll make is presuming we get funding for this and I'm optimistic we will, but to be honest, it might be a hard sell. We should start thinking about getting sponsors for as much as possible because certainly that has been an essential part of our previous ATLAS's and no doubt will be an essential part of this one.

Anyone who has ideas, I'd like to make it relatively short, we have a number of hands up. We had Ricardo and I don't know what other order; we have Tijani, Olivier and Daniel? I can't see

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:    Sorry, I'll speak in Spanish.    In the slide describing the characteristics of the participants, that is precisely what we were talking about before.    Presumably these people should be already informed, it's the people who are already involved in the ALAC meetings.    Asking them to learn ICANN fundamentals makes no sense.    We shouldn't be talking about the characteristics of future participants.    The participants should be already people with the knowledge, so we should actually be asking additional skills from the people who are going to participate.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you.  Noted, and yes, it was already noted that we do not want to arbitrarily tell people to take courses that make no sense at all for them.  Noted and we will not forget that.  We'll probably make mistakes, but we will try.  Tijani.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA:    Thank you.  I think that we are a little bit helped by the fact that all of us I think have already worked on the hot topics for each

region. This will be very helpful to define the topics that will be addressed at the summit. For example, in AFRALO we have this thing going on, Mohamed is leading it and Daniel is helping him, and it is updated. We will have updated hot topics by region, so we have almost the topics that we want to address.

I don't think the block schedule will be a problem, we will adopt ourselves to the block schedule that will be made for the meeting in general, but the most important thing is to define the topics and define the format, how we will do it, shall we repeat the same thing as the two other summits or will we have another way to do it. This is something that we have to define now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:   Thank you, Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. You have mentioned three people to lead the effort, may I suggest that the RALO chairs be included in this group please, because we really need to have full involvement of the RALO's on this. Secondly, my I also suggest that at least one of the chairs of the outreach and engagement working group be also included in this group because it really is all about outreach and engagement, so we

need to have that link between the wider working group, the RALO's and the ALAC.

Second, in your diagram of timeline to ATLAS 3, and I wanted to say that actually in the previous discussion, we're probably unlikely to make decisions on a case by case basis, saying, "Oh we like these people so they're going, we don't like these people, they're not coming."

I would imagine that any selection criteria would be metrics, would be based on a points system probably and so I would suggest that starting from January 2018 we would already have ready a full set of metrics to track for each one of our ALSes and if we have 250 slots, the 250 highest rated At-Large structures and individuals will travel.  That means we need to start to have the metrics ready by then, so let's say January 2018 start tracking and then by December we'd have the best systems. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you.  To be clear, I'm asking one person to lead the effort and two other people to be in the core group.  What you do to add other people in, I'm not going to second guess you.  I don't think we need to discuss that.   What you're suggesting is completely rational.  Next, we have Daniel.

DANIEL K. NANGHAKA:     Daniel for the record.  My suggestion is the fact that time is not the best allied in this whole process.  Probably the best thing is to have the heads, the chairs of the different respective working groups, including capacity building and outreach engagement just to highlight more emphasis on what Olivier has mentioned.  Yeah. I think that's it for the moment.  Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:     I'm not going to control anything but I would suggest a group of 30 people is probably not the right core group.  You probably want to be a little bit more constrained.  Next, we have Seun.


SEUN OJEDEJI:     Thank you.  This is Seun for the record.  Two things, I just wanted to note that for the metrics, yes, I agree we should have metrics, it has to be global, the metrics has to be standard and used across the board, across the RALO's.

Secondly, I think the idea of sponsorship is something that we are to take seriously and if we are going to take it seriously we are to start as soon as possible.  To source for sponsorship something has to be published somewhere that we are going to have ATLAS 3.  Unless you don't want ALAS to support or to help

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

in sourcing for funding, if ALSes should be involved in looking for sponsors then we have to see it published somewhere to then use that as a way of asking people to sponsor the event. I don't know how it was done in the past but I think we have to publish it somewhere.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, at this point we do not for sure it's going to happen or if it happens, when, so all of that is subject. In the past, I've not been heavily involved with fundraising, but my recollection is not typically done at the ALS level. We're looking for major corporate sponsors.

Remember, we're not asking for sponsors to fund the event, we do ask for sponsors to fund dinners and things like that. The core money we are expecting to come from ICANN and to be honest, there's no way we're going to raise a million and a half dollars to fund this kind of thing, or whatever the number is through any other source. Thank you very much, we will be continuing this discussion. Yes, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have a question, Mr. Chair, do you decided or you are suggesting those three people to decide by ALAC? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have asked those people to participate, if there's an objection in ALAC or we feel we should use some other process, I'm willing to hear that. I think those people were selected based on their prior experience and positions. Evin has her hand up, we'll finish hearing from Sebastien first.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. There's a question in the chat from Daniel Nanghaka: Do ALSes have the mandate to look for sponsorship?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I just answered that. In general, in the past we have not. The organizing committee as it's formed may choose to change that or set some direction. Sebastien, do you want to follow up on what you were asking?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I got my answer, thank you. If you want my point of view, I think it must be a decision of the ALAC. That's not a good way to think about that but if those three people want to be involved and that is open to other, that's great, but I think the way you are presenting it, I don't like that, I think you need to make a proposal to ALAC and the ALAC must decide. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that will be on the agenda at our wrap up meeting, when we do make formal decisions. I wasn't proposing we do not ratify it, I was proposing that I believe these three people are good people based on their experience and positions to take on this responsibility. If the ALAC chooses to say no, then that's the ALAC's responsibility.

Next item, can we have the – I'm not sure there was a document on the auction funds. I will quickly review what I sent out in the email. We have a situation where the current reserve fund has been rather depleted because largely, if not only, because of the IANA transition and accountability expenses. The budgets have also gone up and the reserve fund did not keep track and plus ICANN currently has a comment period out asking the community whether we should have a reserve fund for that matter, and personally I think we would be crazy if we said no, but nevertheless. What level, how many months of funding should that be.

Evin, I see your card, we're not open for questions at this point or comments.

It has been suggested that one possible source to particularly top up the reserve is the auction proceeds. The kind of thing

that has been suggested is some percentage be used,, and since we don't have exactly how much auction proceeds we will have, it might be in the order of $230,000,000 plus whatever we earn as revenue of it sitting in the account, or it could be because of the question over the dot web new TLD, that number could go down. I personally don't think it could down, but it could.

Roughly 60% or 70% of it is due to one particular auction and that one is before the courts at this point, so things could change. Regardless, there will be a number somewhere above $100,000,000 and below $250,000,000 that will be available, and the question is, should any of that money be used and to what level should that money be allocated to replenish the reserve.

We have been asked by Leon as an incoming Board member, "Does ALAC have a position, does At-Large have a position?" I know I've been asked that by individual board members, so this is our first opportunity and not the last one, to have this discussion and I'll take a speaker quque on that. Evin had one thing. Evin, was that on this subject or the previous one?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sorry, it was on the previous one and actually it was in the chat and they didn't use the formal brackets.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can note it and pass it on to me or someone afterwards, and we'll try to answer it. We have a speaker queue starting with Olivier. Leon, do you want to say anything towards this, noting that the session has now officially ended a minute ago, so we're somewhat overtime?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. No, as I spoke with you, I just want to get the feeling of the ALAC and the At-Large community on this issue. I know that this has been discussed in abundance at the special CCWG on auction proceeds, but my feeling is that we should have a position from the ALAC's side, not only with the CCWG but as ALAC we should have a position on this. I think it's of the essence that we have a financially stable and sustainable ICANN, and for that the reserve fund is a key element to achieving that.

But I also think that there needs to be responsible expenditure by ICANN organization. I guess an important part of this is that I believe that yes, there should be a part of the auction proceeds destined to replenish the reserve fund in at least the same amount that was used for the transition, but I also would expect that the organization brought those back plan as to how they will optimize their expenditure and continue replenishing this fund.

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

ALAN GREENBERG: All we have to do is whine back this meeting and decide not to hold ATLAS and we've saved you a million dollars, easy.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Two things, one point first with regards to the reserve fund. During the Cross Community Working Group and IANA Stewardship Transition, there were some discussions regarding the stability of the internet, the stability of IANA, the stability of ICANN, and so the concept of a reserve fund for a post transition IANA, which is now public technical identifiers was heavily supported by Cheryl Landon-Orr, Alan and I when we were on the working group and met with Xavier Calvez, on the phone actually.

Just to let you aware that we have supported this, so it really is up to you whether everyone else supports it or not, but it makes sense due to the fact that if ICANN runs out of money, that's not a good thing and there's always unknown unknowns. For a solid organization makes for also a stability of the internet identifier system, so that's the first one.

The second thing, I have two questions. Is the auction money at the moment $250,000,000, and what is the size of the reserve fund that we're looking at?

ALAN GREENBERG: The auction funds are currently $235,000,000 plus a little bit of revenue. The size of the reserve fund has been previously set at one year's expenditure, there's a public comment open right now asking what it should be.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And what is one year's expenditure?

ALAN GREENBERG: About $130,000,000, I believe. Currently.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So we're looking at about 50% of the auction funds going into the reserve fund.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the questions that I posed was, what percentage, one of the questions that has to be addressed is, what part of it -- we're not necessarily saying fill it up, we're saying use it as part of the top.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: How much is missing at the moment?

ALAN GREENBERG:        A lot, but we don't know what the target is either, so…


OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:  Then, I can't answer the question.


ALAN GREENBERG:        I wasn't asking the question to be answered.  We are going to eat into the next section.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:       We currently have reserve funds on the order of $45,000,000 as I understand it, and of course the aim would be to have these 12 months of operating budget in reserve which accounts for somewhere around $130,000,000, so we would be speaking about maybe a $90,000,000 gap between what it's currently on cash and of course the decided goal to be met.

                       If you consider that the all the transition expenditure amounted to somewhere around $35,000,000, if you replenish that immediately through the auction proceeds, then you will take the reserve fund to somewhere around 70 something million dollars and then you will still have a gap of about $50,000,000 to

$60,000,000, which of course would need a plan to be replenished.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Tijani. I've asked for a one-minute timer at this point.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA:      I agree there has to be a balance in the financial aspect for ICANN and therefore we have to fill the reserve for ICANN; to any level that was discussed today we are really in need a lot of more information so that we can say to what extent we have to fill this box because we do not have the elements. What is the need so we can bring that box to what is the limit that's needed? Is this sufficient or not sufficient for that box? Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Sebastien. You are in the queue. I believe Sebastien was next. Oh fine, the queue is wrong. We'll take Judith next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:  Sebastien speaking. I think there is a number of elements and that is what we're struggling with. Firstly, absolutely, we need the money that are proceeds from the auctions to be used to

replenish the reserve funds so that we can replenish the funds used for the IANA transition.

Secondly, I think we should suggest there be a bit extra that is added to those funds so that we are not running after our limit afterwards and that there will be no threat to our activities either. That brings me to a third point, which is the fact that I am frustrated that we need to reduce the organization's costs, but where? We risk reducing the costs of our activities not the cost of the organization, so we need to be very careful about what we say and how we say it because the organization, the staff, the personal is today in charge of the entire budget and there is no split between the people.

They recruit the people who get funded for traveling, it's always the same budget. The matter here is yes, we need to have fewer staff because 400 people is too much, but we wouldn't want to face a situation where we're reducing costs on us and on users. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:          I'm presuming Judith is next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Judith Hellerstein for the record.  I'm actually one of the active participants in that working group.  I do agree that some part of the reserve budget be replenished but I'm also very interested in trying to get ICANN Finance to actually really take a hold of the budget and do proper planning.

If the IANA transition only used $35,000,000, then the reserves weren't planned for well and it really isn't only the IANA transition that really caused the reserves to be lower, it is not proper planning of the budget and making ICANN be financially responsible.  I don't necessarily think that giving a larger amount --

HEIDI ULLRICH: Time, sorry to interrupt.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Sebastien took more than 30 seconds more.  I don't actually think --

ALAN GREENBERG: We are either going to cut off this discussion all together or people are going to have to be somewhat restrained.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    If you don't put the same rules on everyone than you can't really do timing.  To quickly finish my point is I think that the auction proceeds --

GISELLA GRUBER:    There's no translation, sorry.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:    I think we need a financially sound ICANN and it hasn't been because if it's only the $35,000,000 that used extra, then they weren't planned well to begin with.  But the point is also that the auction proceeds, this is a one-time thing and I think the money should be also allocated substantially to capacity building and training, and that will also get a more engaged ICANN and that we should not waste maybe the only opportunity to do that and to get more of that experience.  I do think there should be money to reserve but I think it should be a lot less and possibly 10%.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you.  We are working a one-minute timer and we will enforce it.  The next speaker I have, and if the order is wrong I apologize, the speaker queue is closed.  At this point, we have Ricardo, Seun, Evin, Hadia, and myself.  Sorry, Ricardo has withdrawn, Seun.

ICANN 60 ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

SEUN OJEDEJI:   Good luck with me for one minute.  This is Seun for the record.  I think it's very important that we take some of the views in terms of ICANN being financially prudent, but I'd also like to reiterate Sebastien's question so that we don't be shooting ourselves in the foot here.  I really would also support up to a 20% move from the auction proceeds to the reserve, but at the same time it has to be clear because I saw the FY18 budget and I think it was around $140,000,000.

It has to be clear what ICANN will not actually be going beyond the $130,000,000, would that be sufficient?  That's one of the questions that I have not really gotten a response on.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:   Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:   My question is to Leon, do you think if some of the money of the auction funds is now used to top ICANN's reserve, could that be only for some time, and when and if ICANN does have the money to top its own funds, then the money could be returned again to the auction funds bucket, do you think that this an option?

LEON SANCHEZ:    Thank you very much, Hadia, I don't know.  I would expect that there is a plan for continuing the replenishment, but I think that this is an option that hasn't yet been discussed.  As you know, and Alan pointed, there is a public comment going on about the reserve fund and I think maybe this comment should go and feed the process so that it is considered properly and analyzed as to the feasibility of it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:    Because I think the answer to this question can actually direct the auction proceeds working group in the way they are putting or implementing the mechanisms.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU:    Thank you.  This question may have already been covered.  Wale Bakare in the chat has asked, "How much is needed to shore up the reserve funds?"

ALAN GREENBERG:      At this point, about $100,000,000 if our budgets stay the same and if the target is one year.  If you want to speak, speak quickly.

WALE BAKARE:         This is Wale Bakare speaking for the record.  As it is the question really be asked by the At-Large should determine how much is in it, maybe the debate should be open on this and to discuss this amount [inaudible] the TLD funds that's needed or maybe the old money is needed to shore up the reserve fund.  I think At-Large should take a position on this, I think that is the better.

ALAN GREENBERG:      That is indeed what we're doing right now or at least starting that position.  Alright, I think I have exhausted everyone in the queue who had asked to be in, with the exception of me.  Just a couple of points to reiterate what I've heard.  As Sebastien pointed out, be careful what you ask for, you may get it.  We started off this meeting talking about a rather significant expensive for ATLAS.  We talked about metrics and I mentioned that that may well include significant staff requirements among other things.

If you look at the At-Large Review Recommendations, there are significant staff implications there.  If we do not top up the reserve from the auction funds, but decide we need a reserve of

a significant amount, that comes out of the operational budget, there is no other source of money. The more we have to replenish the reserve from the operational revenue, the less money we have to spend on other things.

All of these things are tied together, it's not an easy equation, but I think our input has to be given there. I'll note there is a public comment on the reserve itself, not the auction funds, and I think we probably want to think seriously about how we contribute to that. It is a two-edge sword. There's not an infinite amount of money and we are among those who want more. Leon, did you have a final word to say? We are starting to get very tight.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, this is Leon Sanchez again, I just want to thank everyone for their input. I think it's been very useful for me, very lucrative. I definitely encourage us, as At-Large Community, to continue the discussion to feed into the public comment; and as Alan, Sebastien and others have pointed, we need to be creative on how we replenish the fund.

My main takeaway is that we are all in agreement, that we need a financially stable ICANN and for that the reserve fund is a key part. Now, let's do the work on thinking how we can best

replenish it without affecting the operational budget for the community.  Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:    Thank you.  Of course, there is a very easy way, if we simply cut out AC/SO Special Requests every year, we'll replenish the budget in almost no time flat.  Is anyone volunteering that?

The next part of our session is with Rinalia and Khaled; are they here somewhere behind me?  At this point, we have a coffee break, which is scheduled officially at 10:15.  We are saying we're going to run through it but people may feel the need for one reason or another to leave the room for a couple of minutes, don't take it personally, please.  We have allocated 10 minutes for discussion of the At-Large Review, and the rest of the time for freeform discussion with Rinalia and Leon.

Obviously, we can move the boundary between those as we want, but with the understanding that if we spend all of the time in review, we don't have any of the other time left.  And we do have a hard break cause we have another meeting starting at 10:30, and we would sort of like a few people around the table when we start it.  Over to you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:   Thank you.  Good morning, everyone.  It is a pleasure to be back in the ALAC room.  Are we just missing Javier for this meeting, or are we missing other people as well?  It's only Javier who is not here?  Is he in Adobe --

ALAN GREENBERG:   Javier did not make it out of Puerto Rico.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:   But is he on Adobe Connect?

ALAN GREENBERG:   I don't know.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:   I'm missing Javier and I wish that he were here, but I understand the circumstances.  I brought you a gift this morning in the form of my board colleague, Mister Khaled Koubaa, and he's the incoming chair for the committee that I head right now, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee which oversees all reviews in ICANN, the specific reviews as well as the organizational reviews.

We're here to talk to you about the At-Large Review, but I would also like to add another topic, just to make sure that you are

aware about SSR2 Review. That's the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review because I think that's going to be a hot topic this coming week and if you have any questions because the recommendation for pausing the review came from my committee, this would be an opportunity for you to pose that question and for us to also provide some clarification.

Let me just start by indicating where we are regarding the At-Large Review. In September, the committee met and we had the opportunity to listen to the independent examiner present their report, and we also had the opportunity to listen to the leadership of the review working party for the At-Large. Basically, Alan was presenting to hear your point of view. After the presentations were made, the OEC conferred and we basically agreed on how to move forward.

We were not able to make a decision just yet in terms of our recommendations to the board about what to do with the review and what we would like is essentially a document, what we call a mapping document that looks at the underlying issues and the At-Large responses. I believe staff has been in contact with you to tell you what the next steps are and essentially the process will come live in November under Khaled's leadership of the committee itself.

I understand that there is a concern that the mapping document, once it is produced by staff, does not go directly to you but come to the OEC and I wanted to explain why that is the case. Staff has never done this before, in terms of organizational review, and they want to be careful, to make sure that they meet the expectations of the OEC. When the OEC looks at the document for the first time, it is not to make a decision, it is actually just to see what it looks like and what gaps exist.

My full expectation is that it will come back to you to fill in the gaps. You can actually start the work in advance by just looking at your feasibility study and assessment plan, you can actually just look at it and see what possible questions could come up because they're likely to be gaps. When I looked at it, I thought, "Yes there may be some gaps that need to be filled there." I'll give a chance for Khaled to also say a few words right now before you can ask questions.

KHALED KOUBAA:          Thank you, Rinalia. It's always a pleasure for me as well to be back here in the ALAC room. I would also like to emphasis that Leon is part of the OEC Committee which will be two of us with an ALAC background sitting on the OEC Committee and available at your disposal to discuss any issue. I think the

reviews are an important element of our work. This is why we count on you to make our work effective.

I joined Rinalia as well on the fact that the SSR2 is important for us and we are available to discuss any misunderstanding, and explain why the board has made his decisions to pose the review. We already have been reaching out to SO/AC leaders, we discussed it with everyone and we think there is room to find a solution as soon as possible and move on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     We have queue. At this point I believe I'm the only one in it. I guess I want to register an objection to the fact that a board committee is looking at a document about At-Large without us having an opportunity to comment on it and see it. I'm reassured that you say, "Of course you will not make a decision because you're expecting there to be gaps." That doesn't cover the situation where you then look at it and say, "There don't seem to be gaps."

But more important, as staff and you have pointed out, this a trail breaking activity, you've never done something like this before and I think it's really important when we do the first experience of something like this, that we establish a process that is robust and transparency requirements are such that I

don't believe, that's a personal belief, I'm not speaking on behalf of the ALAC, that you should be reviewing a document about us extracted from something we wrote, perhaps very accurately, perhaps not, without us having a chance to at least comment on it ahead of time.

We're not asking to write it, but I can't see any harm in us seeing a copy prior to it going to the committee and being allowed to comment. Thank you. Do you wish to answer or do you want to go see if there are any other speakers?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Sure, let's see if there are any other speakers.

ALAN GREENBERG:     This has never happened before. John, go ahead.

JOHN LAPRISE:     John Laprise for the record. I concur with Alan. We should at least have some sort of sign off situation on the document to say that, "Yes we've seen it, yes it looks copasetic or at least close enough," before it goes on to the next stage. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I note the objections. Let me just say that the members of the committee are not idiots. When they receive a document from staff, it's a document from staff, it is not a document from the At-Large even though it's drawn from the At-Large report, and it's going to go to the At-Large to get your input and also your confirmation that it reflects your views regarding the underlying issues and the actions that should come out of that.

You are not deprived of any kind of opportunity to provide input. If we're talking about a robust process, it is a robust process, you have an opportunity. We have obligations to you, but we also have obligations to staff, to give them the assurance that they are doing the right thing based on our expectations.

Let's be fair to each other. Everybody has the role to play and they have opportunity to do their part, that's all I'm saying. Nobody is disadvantaged by this.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point we have Sebastien and then me back in the queue, and I see other hands going up. Sebastien?

ICANN 60
ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:    Sebastien speaking.  Thank you, I'll be speaking in French.  I'd like us to separate these two subjects.  The At-Large Review on the one hand and then the SSR Review because I'd like to touch upon that, too.  Specifically on the At-Large Review, I think the work that both ALAC and At-Large teams have done was very good and yet they took a lot of time given the difficulty, and even the lack of comprehension that those who did the review and I know them very well so I know they didn't exactly understand what was going on, they made up things that did not reflect our reality and they suggested things that are completely unfeasible or else we're going to change At-Large and ICANN tomorrow morning because four experts came to say we should say so.

In parallel, there was also a review on the ombudsman and there, there were experts working on the matter and it was entirely different in terms of the results we saw based on that review, so we should absolutely consider how we can improve that both in terms of the results we got but also in terms of how much time us, as a community, spent working on those reviews.  Thank you.

KHALED KOUBAA:    Sebastien, actually I think we're absolutely aware of the importance of the At-Large Review.  As a committee, we are

aware of the fact that the work that was done might actually require a bit more reflection from us all.  But I assure you the work that the OEC is doing today is going to focus on the importance of the choice of experts who are to carry out reviews in the future because I think it is necessary that we choose the best so as to have a better effectiveness of the review.

Secondly, I think Rinalia can confirm this, but we have discussed the possibility of having different stages for our work.  First, to work on initial analysis and then a second stage on confirming those issues.  I think in the future -- and I hope we won't have these kinds of issues any more, but we're certainly aware of this issue of the choice of experts.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:       I will speak in Spanish.  Beyond this discussion on when and whether we should have seen a copy of the document, what is the current expectations of the committee on when the review will be ready?  When it will be sent to the board, to the whole board?  What is the current expectation within the board on a final decision or resolution of the At-Large Review?

I'm asking because we are planning to hold, at the beginning of the 2019, an implementation of the ATLAS 3 and we should have the At-Large Review analysis already finalized by that time because there are things that we have to discuss at the At-Large and ALS levels, many things before the ATLAS. The question is, what is the expectation? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you for the question, Ricardo. I will first confirm what Khaled said earlier in terms of based on the lessons learned from the At-Large Review, action has been taken to improve the review process in general for organizational review to split the assessment, to confirm on the problems identified and the recommendations itself. With immediate effect, it went into play with NomCom Review and every other review that comes after that.

Regarding the timeline that Ricardo asked about, I believe Khaled and the OEC will sit down towards the end of November to look at the mapping document and it will come back to the At-Large. I'd expect that you would need a month or two to work on it, and then it would come back to us, and once the OEC has seen it again and if it feels that is has all the information necessary, then it would make the recommendation to the board.

Please note that when the OEC makes a recommendation to the board, the board may agree with our recommendation or it may not, and so that is another set of process and they may be going back and forth. It will take as long as it takes, that's what I've been told when I discuss it with staff. I think it's good that you keep up the pressure, to make sure that OEC does its part, but please also respect that there is a process in place and Khaled will have to deal with that and he will continue to come and meet with you over this issue to make sure that you are well briefed and understand what's going on.

ALAN GREENBERG:            Tijani.

TIJANI BEN-JEMAA:          Thank you. Tijani speaking. When I raised my hand, you didn't speak already about the choice of the examiner. I do think that this is a main point and this is a failure of the review of At-Large. Evin noticed that someone came with an idea and he kept it and they kept it till the end. They never changed anything from the first report till the final report.

That means that they have their idea and they want to implement it, so this is not a review and always they say the reform of At-Large, they never say the review of At-Large. That

means that they are coming to reform, reform At-Large.  This is a very important problem and now I understand that you are really aware, and thank you very much.


ALAN GREENBERG:     The queue is closed I'm afraid.  Next we have Seun.


SEUN OJEDEJI:     Thank you very much, this is Seun for the record.  Thank you for all the information that has been provided.  I just thought I should react to the last comment from Rinalia.  I think yes, we have to respect the process, but I think the uncertainty of when this is going to be concluded is also not going to help us in our own planning.

It should be good that if we can say, "Yes, the process is long but in the next six months we will be done with it, or the process is long and in the next three weeks will be done with it."  That will give us some  level of -- I personally thought coming here will have a clear timeline.


GISELLA GRUBER:     Sorry to interrupt, time is up.

SEUN OJEDEJI:              Oh, there's a one minute timer.  Okay, sorry.  Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you.  Just a couple of final points.  The timing is problematic for us and there's nothing we can do about it now, but I want to note it.  We've come in off of two plus years of the IANA Transition and Accountability where we to a large extent put things on hold.  We delayed the At-Large Review because of those processes, so we then rolled into that.

We have put in an immense amount of work into that process and now we're being told we're going to have yet another phase that we're going to have to put an immense amount of time, coming at just what for many is a holiday season and we are likely to push this well into January before.  Someday we actually have to get back to doing the work why ALAC is here for.  I'm not quite sure when that's going to be.

The effort that has gone into this review is not commensurate no matter how much benefit comes out of it and I think we need to factor that in as we good forward.  Thank you.  Khaled wants to make a final comment.

KHALED KOUBAA:     Final comment is that I want everyone to know that the fact that we are taking more time maybe for us is needed to make the right decision is that because we are completely aware and convinced that this an important issue for us. We don't want to make a decision without being sure that our decision will be helpful for the At-Large and for the ICANN in general.

This is why we are probably taking our time and I can ensure you that the OEC will make it possible to have this done as fast as possible but as Rinalia said, after the OEC Recommendation, there will be a discussion at the board level and the board will be probably asking a few other things. We cannot say that they will accept our recommendation 100% but we will make sure that you will be having more visibility on the timeline. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I just do want to point out the irony that one of the major issues identified by the Review Group was we spent too much time on process. We have five minutes before the SSAC comes in. I know Humberto wanted to speak and I will let him have the floor either on this subject or the SSR Review, but we are time limited.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:   I will be very brief.  I wanted to invite you to the LAC Space Meeting for you to be direct witnesses of how wrong the At-Large Review is.  In Latin America there are concrete examples, we are talking about the RALO leaders function working together with LACNIC, and in our case with [inaudible] NIC Chile.

That is a concrete example of the proposal made by the reviewers which in my view is completely wrong, and you can see it firsthand tomorrow in the LAC Space Meeting how we're been working actually for the benefit of end users measurable with statistics and figures.  That's why I want to invite you to share this experience with us.  Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:   We are almost out of time.  If you'd like to speak, please go ahead.  I will point out, we were going to allocate 10–15 minutes to discuss with our incoming/outgoing board members and have some little bit of a transition discussion and perhaps a little bit more than just a discussion.

We seem to be out of time, so use it as you wish.  Sebastien had a question about SSR if we -- go right ahead.  We will have to take a five-minute break.  Staff needs at least a minute or two to recover and go on to the next session.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is my last meeting with you, as your At-Large Director, in terms of privately one on one, and after this we have a meeting with the board and that's with the public. I just wanted to say thank you, it's been a real pleasure. Although it's not said publicly, I think the relationship that we have is something that's admired by my board colleagues, and it has given me a lot of strength and support, and I just want you to know that. It's been my pleasure, privilege and honor to be your selected director. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will say, I've known Rinalia for about 20 years now and she's done us proud. I am going to try to find a few minutes carving out so we can actually have a little bit more of the discussion we wanted to have with you and Leon. I don't know if we're going to be able to do it, but we'll try. Thank you.

We have a five-minute break and then we'll reconvene with SSAC.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

ICANN 60 ANNUAL GENERAL
ABU DHABI
28 October–3 November 2017