SAN JUAN – ALAC & Regional Leaders: Work Session, Part 2
Saturday, March 10, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	This is the ICANN 61 ALAC and Regional Leaders Work Session, Part 2. On the 10th of March 2018 from 10:30 to 12:00 in room 102, ABC.
YESIM NAZLAR:	Hi Benedetta, this is Yesim, can you hear me well?
BENEDETTA ROSSI:	Yes, I can, thank you. Can you hear me?
YESIM NAZLAR:	Benedetta, can you hear me well? This is Yesim, doing an audio check.
ALAN GREENBERG:	We are 10 minutes late, please take your seats immediately. [AUDIO BREAK]
BENEDETTA ROSSI:	Yesim, I can hear you, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: On the other hand, if you think that budgets and finance is not important, you don't have to take your seat. We can just cancel the session and say we accept the budget as presented. [AUDIO BREAK]

Welcome to Work Session 2 of the ALAC and At-Large Regional Leaders. This session will be focused, the first part of the session, for an hour or 50 minutes now, will be focused on ICANN finance issues, both the proposed fiscal year, 19 Plan and Budget, and the additional budget request process, and we note that the budget and plan is out for comment right now, so comments are welcome.

Becky will be giving I think a very brief overview to start with and clarifying some of the things that have been misrepresented, and I'll start off by saying one of them; the additional budget request, the envelope is $300,000; the part that was a line item in the budget for $215,000 is the travel part only. The other part doesn't show up anywhere, but we're told it is there. And do we have Benedetta online?

We have Benedetta Rossi who is one of the key people with responsibility for the additional budget requests, and she is online remotely. And I will turn it over to Becky.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Alan. Good morning everyone, good afternoon, good day. This is Becky Nash from ICANN org. finance team and I'm happy to be here to present an overview of the FY19 operating plan and budget process, and the FY19SO and AC additional budget request process, so if we could go to the next slide, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, could we put the slides up on the right-hand screen?

BECKY NASH: This slide is just our agenda, where again, we have the two topics here, and my colleague Benedetta is on the line as well. And we've left the last half of the hour for question and answer and general discussion. Next slide, please?

For this first section I'm going to cover the FY19 planning highlights, and this first slide is the timeline highlights. We like to inform the community that the overall planning cycle for a fiscal year operating plan and budget is approximately 12 months long, and that's just due to the fact that currently at ICANN due to the bylaws and the empowered community process, we do have processes that start with the PTI operating

plan and budget, then we have what's called the IANA budget, and then we move into the total consolidated ICANN operating plan and budget. So, on this slide, I'm just highlighting that the current status is that we are here in Puerto Rico for ICANN 61 and we have just closed the public comment period for the FY19 operating plan and budget. The public comment period ran for approximately 45 days and was closed on the 8th of March.

The next key highlight is that here, during the ICANN meeting, we have two public sessions to discuss public comments with all of the community, and that sessions here during this week are replacing what we previously called, "Calls to Clarify," and to hear exactly what the comments were, so we're looking forward to a new format and a new forum, and that will be later in this week.

Following those sessions in our time here engaging with yourselves in the community at ICANN 61, we then have the report on public comments which will be published online on the 12th of April.

And then the next key milestone that we're highlighting on this slide is that we then progress towards the steps that reach the final adoption, which will be by the ICANN board anticipated on or around the 31st of May.

We highlight that that last step is in order to permit time for the empowered community period prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year, and as you can see on this very busy slide, but on the right-hand side, the next fiscal year does start, which is FY19 on July 1st, 2018. Next slide, please?

For the FY19 operating plan and budget process, we prepared a different set of documents that were just providing a highlight on this slide, so the documents were structured into 6 different documents; a few of them were the same type of document that we had in the prior set of documents, and then we added a few new documents just to make it easier for the community members to read and learn about specific areas of the operating plan and budget that they were most interested in.

So, the two areas that were new in this document structure were; document number 3, where we have the FY19 Key Projects and Activities, and that gave highlights on key projects and activities for FY19. And we would like to hear comments just about whether these documents were useful in helping all community members read about our operating plan and budget. And then document number 4; it was separated out to have the Operating Plan, and prior the first section of that we summarized what we called, "6 Modules or Work Planned for FY19."

And this was so that community members again could review in-depth information about the operating plan on activities that were most interesting for them. And then we still had the remaining Operating Plan, full Operating Plan in section 2 of document 4. And then we also had the 5-year Operating Plan update for FY19, and similar to last year we had document number 6 which are the detailed Excel spreadsheets that many community members have asked for in the past. Next slides.

For this next slide, we're providing an overview of the draft, FY19 Budget and Summary. On this slide, we are presenting ICANN operations, so this is ICANN operations with the funding, cash expenses, and then excess and deficit. This provides the FY17 actuals, FY18 adopted budget, FY18 forecast, and then the draft FY19 budget.

What I'd like to highlight here in the funding; we can see that the trend for funding for draft FY19 budget is very similar to the latest forecast for FY18 that we've identified, so, and very similar to historical trend for FY17 actuals. So the draft FY19 budget; we have funding of $138,000,000, as compared to the latest forecast of approximately 135,000,000, which is also very similar to our FY17 actuals for funding.

What we are highlighting here is that the FY18 adopted budget has a higher funding expectation that we are now seeing, that

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

the forecast is much lower than the FY18 opted budget, and that's just due to the recent trends in the transactions and the subscriptions for the registries and registrars.

For cash expenses for our draft FY19 budget, we have cash expenses of $138,000,000, what we'd like to highlight is that ICANN has a balanced budget; that is our mandate for a non-profit, is to have funding equal to cash expenses, and that is how we've arrived at a balanced budget.

We'd just like to highlight that in the FY18 forecast, we are expecting cash expenses to be $137,000,000 and that is due to the fact that we have funding from FY17 savings that was authorized by the board for the ITI project in FY18 forecast. Next slide, please?

This next slide provides the text highlights, so I'll just run through those quickly, again, the FY19 budget is balanced, where funding equals operations expenses. Bullet number 2; funding increases at a slower rate, meaning that the funding of $138,000,000 is 2.6% above the FY18 forecast of $135,000,000. So, we are reflecting slower growth in the funding, as all the new gTLDs are now delegated, and this is based on the trends that we're now seeing currently in FY18.

ICANN Operations; operations expenses are stable year on year, and the personnel expenses offset by cost reductions in FY19, so that we can show that the FY19 net expense of $133.5 is compared to the FY18 forecast of $133.3, and both of these figures exclude contingency amounts, so you can really see that we are trending very stably. The headcount trends that we're reflecting in the FY19 Operating Plan and Budget, we are showing the total ICANN headcount in FY19 is growing at a slower pace. The end of period headcount for FY19 is expected to be included in the plan as 425 personnel, or 1% higher than the expected headcount at the end of FY18 of 4-21. Next slide, please?

On this next slide we have just some key dates as it pertains to the FY19 timeline. We like to first start off indicating that the SO and AC additional budget request submissions were all received by the due date at the end of January, and that process timing was similar to the prior year, even though our whole planning cycle was a little bit different this year.

As we indicated, the ICANN public comment period just ended on the 8th of March, and again, we did maintain approximately 7 weeks of public comment timeline. During the public comment timeline, we did receive some clarifying questions that were responded to and published on our website or on the public

comment page on the 12th of February. And then, of course we're here in Puerto Rico at ICANN 61 and we do have 2 public sessions and we will be engaging with various communities while we are here.

The next milestone I highlighted was the 12th of April, which is when the ICANN org. report on public comment will be published, and the next two dates are that the ICANN proposed operating plan and budget will be presented or sent to the board for review on or around the 15th of May, and again, that is to meet the expected 45 days prior to the next fiscal year, and that's per the bylaws, the timing that we should submit to the board the proposed operating plan and budget.

And I will just make a point that similar to last year, we will be publishing that document back on our website so that everybody in the community can see the document that is being sent to the board. That is a new step that we started last year, and we believe that it's a key step in our mission of transparency and accountability to submit to the community the document that will be forwarded along to the board on or around the 15th of May.

And then we expect the board to have a board meeting and adopt the ICANN Operating Plan or Budget on or around the 31st of May. And again, that is to allow for the power community

review period well before the July 1ˢᵗ, beginning of the new fiscal year. Next slide, please?

Thank you. So, this section is where we are outlining the SO and AC additional budget request process. So, the steps that have taken place as it pertains to this process, is that similar to last year we launched the process on the finance community website at the beginning of December, and that's where we had for December 2017, we had the documents that outlie the process, the principles, and the templates. And that was all opened early December.

And then we had the due dates for the submissions at the end of January, and again that was similar timing to last year, and we received those comments, logged them, and posted them on the website. And so, our next step is here at ICANN 61 for consultations on the additional budget requests, and then we move into steps related to the evaluations.

And so, the timing is that the evaluations of each request go through a diligent process by an assessment team to evaluate; do the requests meet the principles and also the timing of the requests, etcetera. And then the next two steps after that would be recommendations to the ICANN management, and also to the board finance committee of the requests, and then finally the requests are sent to the ICANN board.

Again, the same timing the draft operating plan and budget that is submitted to the board of ICANN for adoption, so that key date is the 15th of May, and again the expected timing for the board adoption of the entire operating plan and budget including the SO and AC additional budget requests is at the end of May. That timing should be between the 25th and the 31st of May.

So, this gives an overview of the process of which several significant steps have taken place, and at this time I will pause just to see if there are any questions on the process, and then I'd also like to let my colleague, Benedetta, provide some commentary about the process.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have two people, well, we have a lot more people in the queue right now. We have many people in the queue; I am first, first a clarification question; can you tell us exactly when the sessions, the finance sessions are this week? Tell us by the end of the session if you could look it up, or unless you know exactly?

BECKY NASH: I will let you know at the end of the sessions exactly the timing; I do have it listed here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have two very brief questions; at least one contracted party, a rather large registrar, has said that your best estimates and low estimates for revenue are something they would kill for, that they're not seeing anything near that. Were these created in consultation with your larger contracted parties, or if not, how were they done?

That's one question, and the second question is, maybe defer to Benedetta, but; given that there's an envelope in the draft budget which may or may not change in the final budget, can I presume that when you look at the requests you sort of prioritize them and then decide what the cutoff is to see which ones are actually approved when you find out what the real envelope will be?

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Alan, for those two questions. I will comment on the first one regarding the funding, and then I will let Benedetta come in and discuss about the additional budget request evaluation phase.

As it relates to the draft FY19 budget for funding, ICANN takes a very conservative view of looking at historical trends as it relates to the contracted parties that ICANN invoices, so during the first

quarter of FY18, at the end of the first quarter we had our first quarterly billing cycle, and at that time we then did a review of the historical trends for funding and at that point prepared the forecast as it relates to FY19. So that uses a rolling historical trend rather than any kind of consultation; we're not in the business of consulting per se, and that we looking historically and are very conservative in looking at historical trends. I hope that answers the question on funding.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next question is online from Daniel Nanghaka and the questions is; what are the projection of the funding sources—sorry, this I think—what are the projections for funding sources since the operating expenses seem to be growing? I think that question is asking; are you looking at other opportunities for funding other than the existing registrar/registry ones?

BECKY NASH: Thank you for the question. ICANN sources of funding do come from the sources of the contracted parties, which would be the registries and registrars, and then as noted in the operating plan and budget and in our quarterly stakeholder calls, we do have voluntary contributions that come from the ccTLDs, and then we

have a small amount of other income as it relates to sponsorships for sponsors at either ICANN meetings, you know, that we invoice for the services or events. But those are the sources of funding that we have, and I'm not aware of any plans for any other types of revenue or funding for ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, next we have Sebastien. Oh, next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan, Tijani speaking. Becky, you spoke about and you have in the draft, you have the budget of IANA of PTI, and you have beside the budget of ICANN something called, "IANA budget," apart from IANA. I understand why; I know why, but I think that in the future if you have to put all together on the same budget, because they all concern IANA, thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you Tijani, this is Becky Nash. Just to highlight; the PTI operating plan and budget, that is a budget that is prepared by PTI and is submitted to the PTI board for adoption. Once the PTI board adopts that budget, it is submitted to ICANN and becomes what's called the "ICANN Budget," and the ICANN Budget is essentially the PTI separate legal entity budget plus some

expenses that are budgeted and spent by ICANN as the IANA functions operator, and that is mostly the RZMA expenses.

We then are required to have that particular document or operating plan and budget also approved by the ICANN board. On our timeline, it's noted that the ICANN board does adopt the IANA budget well in advance of the ICANN budget, and that was one of the points made by the CCWG for the transition, was to have that approval done well before the ICANN budget for the safety and security of the IANA functions.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have just passed the period by which the community could veto it. John Laprise?

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. Thank you, Becky, for coming and speaking with us today. One question; looking at the process on the screen, I note the evaluation is by the assessment team. Could you shed some light onto what criteria the assessment team is using to evaluate?

BECKY NASH:	Thank you for question. At this point I'd actually like to introduce Benedetta who can speak on that. So, she's on the line, and Benedetta if you can hear us?
ALAN GREENBERG:	We have one more question for you first.
BECKY NASH:	Okay, thank you Benedetta, I think I'll take one more question on finance and then we'll turn it over, if we could wait for your question and have Benedetta comment on that? Thank you.
JOHN LAPRISE:	Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	And we're closing the queue on Becky right now, we'll re-open it at the end. Xavier?
XAVIER CALVEZ:	Thank you Alan, thank you Becky, welcome to Puerto Rico. Just to remind, just a quick question; what's the budget or the cost of the PTI IANA function, what's the budget on that only, and then what's the budget of ICANN org., the cost of ICANN org.?

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your question. The PTI Operating Plan and Budget on a standalone basis is approximately $10,000,000. And then from the total IANA budget is just close to rounding at $11,000,000, so it's just a small additional part. And then if you want to compare to overall ICANN, we do consolidate PTI into ICANN operations where we arrive at the $138,000,000 total combined ICANN operations and PTI and IANA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And I skipped Hadia, I apologize. So, we'll go back to Hadia and then we'll go on to Benedetta.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Actually, I want to thank you of course for your presentation, but through the presentation you went through the documents that were provided by the ICANN board, and the process, and we know of course that the comments period closed on the 8th of March, and by this point, all of those who are interested actually in the budget are aware of the documents and the process, so I know, but I maybe expected that through the presentation you would highlight more the logic behind the budget, and I think Alan's question was actually related to that.

So, I expected to hear from your presentation more about the logic behind the budget rather than the documents that are there and the process that most of us are already aware of.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your comment. Yes, I acknowledge your question or your comment there. I did provide some summary slides on the actual budgeted figures, I don't know if that was helpful or not to look at the trend from FY17, the FY18 forecast, and the FY19 budget. We just like to highlight that funding and the expenses are stabilizing, and that you can really see the trends on that slide for the FY19 budget.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I meant by the logic for example; if you decide to cut from one part and not from the other; so, what's the logic behind that? So, for us as a community, in order to agree or disagree, or even have some comments, constructive comments, because obviously any community member will try to say, "My part is the most important, and don't cut from it."

And that would—but in order to have a constructive comment, in order to say if those cuts seem logical to us or not, we have to understand the logic behind it, and that's I think what's missing. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your comment, and I acknowledge your comment, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's go to Benedetta now.

YESIM NAZLAR: Benedetta, this is Yesim speaking, can you hear us?

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Yes, I can hear, can you hear me?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, perfect, thank you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much for having me join your session today. I'm ready to answer any questions about the additional budget request process, as much as possible obviously, so let me know what questions you may have, and I'll answer them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Benedetta, it's Alan speaking. We already have one on the queue, and that is; you're in the position of having to decide which—you know, you and your colleagues—which items on the additional budget request to approve and which to not approve, however, the funding envelope in the current draft budget is $300K, we don't know what it's going to be in the final one, so I'd like to understand what your processes are to allow you to have a variable moving line because you're going to be announcing your results either just before or in the same timeline as the next budget version comes out. And since there's been such a radical cut this year, I'd like to be optimistic and say it's going to be readjusted up, and how do you handle that? Thank you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much Alan. Well, for the moment we're reviewing obviously all of the 55 requests based on the envelope that we received from the finance team, but if that were to change, obviously the team would go back and review the requests once again, taking into account any changes to the envelope.

Obviously for the moment all we can do is focus on the envelope that we currently have and draft the recommendations for the recommendations comprised of the executive team who then

submits them to the board for their final review. But obviously if that changes, then we'll have to review them again. I hope that answers your question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Partially; the change in envelope could have two implications. One is; that you fund more projects, and the other is; you go back and give more money to the ones you funded, but perhaps not as well as you would have if you had more money, so I guess we just want reassurance that that will be considered, and it won't be prejudiced by what the level is set now if it does change?

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Yes, that's correct Alan; that's exactly what we would do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan, It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, I'm actually caring for the overall budget and not the ABR, so when you come back to the overall budget I'd like to speak please, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Humberto, same, or not?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: It's relating to—no, it's a different point. No, no, it's not the budget; he's not trying to talk about the general budget.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. Hi Benedetta, thank you for taking the time to speak with us. I would just like to know; what is the actual criteria the team uses to evaluate requests? Thank you very much.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much for the question. I'm sorry, I seem to have lost audio at the moment, is anyone speaking?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, John asked a question, but I was talking with an open mic at the same time, you might not have heard it. John, why don't you restate your question?

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. Thank you, Benedetta. What are the criteria that the evaluations team uses to evaluate which projects to fund and which not to? Thank you.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thank you very much for the question, I heard it now. Well, we have principles for the additional budget requests, which are posted on the finance wiki, where each request is also posted, so that's the first operative guideline for the review of each received request. And additionally, to that, so the first step is always been making sure that each request meets the criteria on the additional budget request principle.

And then, after we've reviewed that, we obviously have to check that each request—we try to group requests together to make sure that all the requests are coherent, so if there's an answer that is for example, "No," for something, we need to make sure that it's consistent across the board and it's not, "No," from one community and, "Yes," for another one for a very similar request.

And then it's obviously based also on resources, which can be in terms of financial resources, so we try to evaluate how much each request would cost and see if we can make that as part of the additional budget request envelope, as well as staff

resources assigned for that specific request. So, then we partner with whoever the implementer would be from the ICANN org perspective to see if there will be something that their team will be able to carry out throughout the fiscal year. I hope that answers your question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, is your question for Benedetta, or general overall? Any more questions specifically related to additional budget requests?

Then we'll go back to the regular queue and there may well be ABR issues that are brought up, so the floor is open for everything right now. We have a queue so far of Olivier, Humberto, Me, and Tijani. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I wanted to pick up on the question that Hadia Elminiawi started, which was the process by which the budget was established. Year on year, it's been a very peaceful sailing in recent years when basically the budget would continue just growing by a little bit and so on.

And I assumed that the budget would then be just more of a financial standard account in exercise where you just add your 2 or 3%, whatever it is, and is all run by the chief financial officer and ICANN staff in finance.

When we now come to having to cut budgets, and we are seeing that some of the ICANN activities have been cut drastically more than other ICANN activities, and when we have to look at the whole financing of ICANN as an overall budget including staff, including hiring of all sorts of resources etcetera; the whole project basically, list, where does that decision come from? Does this come from ICANN staff? Does it come from Xavier? Does it come from the CEO? Does it come from the CFO? The COO? Does it come from the chair of the board, of the board finance committee?

Because, when we are here commenting on the budget, we're obviously commenting back, and we're told, "Well the community are the final people that will actually agree to the budget." The thing is; when you make a comment, if you don't know who to make the comment to, you might be completely out of place in actually aiming your points and making your points.

One of the concerns that we have in this community is that a significant part of the budget seems to have affected all the

outreach or the engagement of the community side of things, and another part of the budget seems to have been completely put aside with some discrepancies also when we are being told that there is no additional staff, that staff salaries have effectively kept to a—the increase has been kept to a minimum of 2%, that, and I would assume, that there would also be a freeze on bonuses and things like that, and yet, you look at the numbers and it seems that the weight of the salaries is more than 56% of the ICANN budget if I understand correctly, perhaps even more than that.

The additional budget requests and the fellowship in all that is a tiny little percentage and is being completely slashed out. I think I have made my point; but who makes that decision, how does it work? Thank you?

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your comment, this is Becky Nash. The budgeting process starts with primarily community engagement, and then a collection of information across all of the departments, and all of the department managers and then all levels of the organization, so I think similar to many other companies, it's more of a bottoms up process where we then engage and provide information on the process, and then our assumptions on the budget development process, and then it's a budget that

is developed and reviewed, and then sent to the public for public comment.

So just to answer your question; it's not one person in the organization. In general, our finance team, we help facilitate the collection of data, but we don't make decisions across all of the groups; it's a very collaborative decision across all of the departments and then all of the executive team, and then the CEO and then the board. So, when you do have any suggestions or comments, first of all; we encourage participation through the public comment period and fortunately I believe we did receive many comments, and we really look forward to responding and engaging on those comments.

But then also, if you have specific questions during the public comment period related to clarifying questions, where we can't really give an opinion, but we don't want anybody not to understand the documents or the details, we really encourage people, the community, to ask questions that will help them review the documents better, and then on the last slide here we definitely have our planning e-mail address where that would be one way to ask financial questions.

But then we also have other types of communication mechanisms, so I don't want you to feel that it has to be one person; we share all information across the organization so that

any way that you'd like to comment, I also do know that the webinars that we provided right after the publication we got lots of really good questions in those webinars, that we also submitted as clarifying questions on behalf of the participants. So, there are areas in which to have collaboration and we are listening to all those comments.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, if I may sort of recap, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, just very briefly; who made that decision? Or is that an overall—

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, can I cut you off; my question is going to be very similar, and I think I'll follow up on the same thing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have 6 more, 7 more minutes to this session, we have a speaker queue, we will cut the timer down to 1 minute for speakers and responses and the next person in the queue is Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto Carrasco; I will speak in Spanish. I will give you time for you to set up your headsets. I am of the opinion, as I've heard many times in these meetings that ICANN is a family, so we should think about economy as a big family when both parents work, and one is out of a job, the family has to make a decision about which expenses to cut.

If we have several children in this family, there may be, according to parents' children that are more talented than others, so parents might decide not to cut, let's say, football classes for one of the children because he is talented and do away with the piano lessons for a not so talented child.

So, to summarize my question I'd like to say that when you set up a budget for any organization or a family you have to make political considerations. By political I mean not financial considerations and At-Large has destination of end users care and these are not necessarily financial considerations. So, I think that decisions have to be made with fairness, and with this I conclude. I will say that this is not being taken into consideration by ICANN at this present time, thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your comment. As we launched the annual operating plan and budget cycle we acknowledged that we had

slowing growth of our funding, and that we needed to work together with the community for prioritization and cost containment, and we also acknowledged that the budget and plans are achievable but that it takes everyone's participation and contribution.

So, it is a series of prioritizations, and I certainly think that as your comment has indicated, it is a family or a community and there are prioritizations that take place. What I recommend is, again, as the community has done, is submit public comments that definitely provide valuable feedback and then continue to engage with us and participate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out Becky was brave enough to come and speak to us. Let's not treat it as if these were her personal decisions. Except for Cheryl, who believes they were your personal decisions.

To follow up a little bit on what Olivier was saying; I'd like to think that in your bottom-up process where you went around to all the operational people, that the ALAC people didn't say, "They won't mind if you cut, crop and cut the ABR by 50%." So, the decision process is still far from clear.

I've spent a large part of my career working on contracts, and I learned very early that whoever holds the pen in writing the contract writes the first draft. Then you have to convince them to make a change, and we're in the position of you—not you, personally—wrote the first draft, and now we have to fight for a change and that process is currently very skewed, and again, it's nothing you can address for this current budget, but I think going forward it's really a question of who makes the decisions, and I don't need an answer to that; I just think it's a good topic going forward. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. As you said Becky, the problem you are experiencing now is a slow grow of the funding, it is not a decrease of the funding; it is slow growth. What we—how to address this is to make a slow growth of expenses, not decrease the expenses, isn't it? So, this is one point.

A second point; you said it is not a decision, it is a consultation, but you made prioritization, you just said you have made prioritizations, excuse me, you had your priorities. So, the way you address those priorities is what we are asking for. And a question, and I really want to understand it; we don't have new projects in this fiscal year, we don't have huge projects, what

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

explains the growth of the headcounts and the personnel expenses? Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your comment, Tijani. The process of prioritization again is what we consider a bottoms up and with community consultation. Again, whenever there is a slow growth of funding, as in this case, we really did need to focus on prioritization with the community, and then cost containment.

Just to answer your question as it relates to the personnel; as noted in some of the comments, personnel is one of the largest expense categories for ICANN and throughout fiscal year 18, there have been personnel that have been added throughout the year, so a portion of what we see in FY19 is those particular positions; it's the full year of those positions.

All of the positions or employees at ICANN work for the mission and the community, so that's how we get our work done for the community is through the resources that we have. And again, throughout the operating plan and budget we have noted that we have an impact of the full year of positions added in 18, we have a moderate amount of positions added throughout 19, and then as you indicated, we did implement in the operating plan

and budget a slower then trend or market for compensation increases. So, I hope that answers your question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. We are out of time right now. I do want to disagree with Tijani one thing; in a steady state or slowly increasing budget you do have to make cuts because there are always some new things that you have to fund. We have no choice but to implement GDPR.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I didn't say that we don't have to cut, but I am saying that it is not a priority to decrease the expenses; you have to manage the expenses so that we are stabilized.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're going to have to cut it at this point. We do have another session at this point that we don't want to run too far into. Sebastien, you put your card up after we cut the queue, is there something you'd want to do with it, very short?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I just wanted to raise—Becky, nothing against you and Waudi, your presentation, but first of all, if ICANN, whoever, decides to

decrease a number of participants to any of the activity, then I hope that we will see that as the staff is supposed to support those people, they will need to be a decrease of the staff also, because for the moment I see an increase in one way and a decrease in the other way.

And the second point, just to let you know, when I was on a boat and we pass the bar of 100, I say, "It's now time to stop hiring more people," and I was pushed in the corner and say, "It's not your job." It's not by job; but today I think we are over too much people hired by ICANN and not taking care enough to empty people. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. We'll call this session to an end, and we'll reconvene with ATLAS in a moment. I'd like to thank Becky and thank Benedetta for coming here. Given how well it is known about a certain level of dissatisfaction, there is a certain amount of bravery involved and I thank Becky for coming here and actually smiling. [AUDIO BREAK]

And if I could ask Olivier and Cheryl, unless you'd like to do it from where you're sitting, that's fine with me. I will introduce and seed the floor to somebody.

The next session is on ATLAS III; what we are looking at is a brief review of where we are in timings and to come to some level of closure for what the main objectives for the meeting are and who our attendees will be at this meeting. Clearly as we already discussed we've had a lot of comments in the press which were not necessarily representative of what we're going to do, but at some point, we do have to say what we are going to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record here. I think because of the nature as Olivier settles, I'd like to just start off by asking Olivier to give a very brief process of where we have come from in terms of our planning to date of ATLAS III, recognizing that many of us around, actually a few of us around this table, Sebastien of course is included here, fought very long and hard to even get the initial ATLAS when we didn't even know there was going to be a need to put a number on the end of it, started in the first place, and we have reaped the benefit of the success of that initial ATLAS meeting back in Mexico, and of course built on that with our work in London.

But we find, as ever, the likelihood of considerable community pushback for expenditure to be made in what is seen for example from contracted parties as an unnecessary bit of fluff. So, we do need to be smart about this, we need to make sure

that we have well-established and monster-ably fair and reasonable planning, and that's what we'd like to start to talk about, START to talk about briefly today. So, with that, I believe Olivier is settled, and I'm going to stop my mic and we'll just play handball with this and see what we can get out of it. Over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and thanks for giving us some background to the process of where we are today. Quite a few years ago we put together a table of At-Large summits and general assemblies because we felt it was an uphill struggle to be able to get those financed by coming in front of the board and in front of ICANN finance and saying, "Well this year we need to fund a general assembly, this year we need to fund another general assembly," and suddenly turning up with, "Oh, this year, we need to fund an At-Large summit."

The board actually asked us for a process, although there is not a multi-year budget at ICANN; it doesn't exist, there is a process by which you can strategically forecast what expenses you are going to have next year and the after it etcetera. And so, we produced such a document a couple of years ago under the impression that every five years we would need an At-Large Summit, and within those five years each one of the regions

would have at least one face-to-face funded general assembly. Some of the regions have held general assemblies that were not funded, that just had the people who travelled by other means face-to-face and others attending the multi.

We went through the whole process, and in theory, looking at the strict rotor of the strict rotation, of general assemblies and summits, we would have been set for an at-large summit in Coby, which is an extremely expensive location, first thing, and secondly it's a little hard for us to forecast because it's been very vast going through these five years, including all of the other processes that we've had, so it was decided that perhaps we might wish to ease the pressure, especially in light of this year's current budget restraints and look at the meeting after Coby, or one of the meetings after Coby and the one that was seen as being a suitable location, not only because it's very accessible but also because the cost of the logistics in that location are actually eased, is the location in what I believe will be Montreal, it would be Montreal. So that actually has the other, I could say, advantage in that way that it wouldn't be part of the FY19 but the FY20 budget.

Now, that said, of course we've all heard that the FY19 budget is being squeezed, and there are no reasons for us to believe that the FY20 budget might not be subjected to the same pressure.

What I mean by this is that it might well be that we are told, "I'm sorry, there's no money in the FY20 budget for an At-Large Summit."

That would be a bit of a problem because not only now have we passed the 5-year cycle, but we would be passing the 6-year cycle and then we've got these general assemblies that start turning up again. So, we have to make sure of several things. The first is that we put together a very strong budget, and a very strong case for an At-Large Summit to take place. I think that a few years ago we might have felt that once we had agreed with the board that we would have that cycle of general assemblies and At-Large Summits; it was a given that when we had a year when an At-Large Summit came up we would get that funding; it would be nearly automatic.

The board would be ready for it, and we'd proceed forward with it. I must say that if it wasn't for Sebastien, for ATLAS II and maybe some lobbying by several members of people who are here as well, it was not an easy task to get that funding. I think that we also have to thank Steve Cocker for having also put his foot down on this one, and whilst I have absolutely no concern about the current chair regarding an At-Large Summit, I do have concerns about one additional element that has come into play now, and that's the fact that with the community powers, the

community also has to agree to the budget. The board might say, "Okay, we're convinced," but if the community says, "No," then we're back to square one.

Now what does that mean? That means that not only do we have to convince the board, but we also have to convince the community, and one of the biggest critics of the At-Large community regarding funding and spending of money and sending people around in travel and so on, is the fact that we don't have very strong metrics should I say on both attendance, what I think in some companies you would call return on investment.

And I know that this is a term that here raises a whole lot of hair and going, "Well, we're not product, we're people, and you can't just put metrics on return on investment," and so on. But we do have to be a lot more careful for this proposal to make sure that the people that travel are going to be people that will not only benefit from the trip, benefit by being more engaged, but also that will also make sure that ICANN benefits from their presence.

So, it's a two-way interaction, and it's something that the committee, the small committee that we've put together I think is pretty clear on, and we're working now with staff to try and define those metrics and get those metrics actually prepared. But one thing is sure though; with the current growth of At-Large

structures that we have around the world, it would be not only very expensive, but also I would imagine quite silly to think that we can actually decently get a group of 250, 300 people to work efficiently, which means that not everyone, not every single At-Large structure that we've signed up in the past number of years will be able to travel. That's bound to not please some people, it's bound to perhaps please other people who say, "Well, I think it's absolutely normal that we only get the people that are really engaged."

So, the whole fact that we had before where it was one travel slot per ALS, that thing is gone and it's gone perhaps from our point of view Sebastien, but there is one problem; it's that we have metrics from the second At-Large summit, and the whole thing of saying, "Well, if you are going to have everyone with ALS will have one seat," I do think there has to be some meritocracy involved in looking at whether that last seat which was used will actually be a seat that was used properly, rather than used for touristic purposes.

Because one of the problems is that the tourists are seen by everyone else; but the work that we do often is not, and that's a real concern. Now we can say, "Oh no, we don't want any of this, it's going to be one travel, one trip for ALS," then it will be no trip for anyone, that's my personal view, and I think I should

open the floor now seeing all of the cards that are coming up. So, I'll start with—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I start by saying, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, I think what we might do is clear a few things in terms of our agenda. Is there anyone around the table who wishes to speak in terms of the timing is concerned about raising a question about the proposal for it to be in Montreal. Does anyone want to—okay, so perhaps we could deal with that first and then go to the attendees, if we just split those two topics up, that's all I wanted to do. Thank you, Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl, and am I dealing with the queue or is someone else running the queue? Okay, excellent, so I think is it Alan next?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm first on the queue and I have two parts; one is the timing and the other is attendees. Maureen is keeping the queue and we'll keep two separate queues so if you can replicate my name on the second queue and as we go through each person they can decide which side of the queue they're on.

In terms of timing; we always said five years, but it was always an approximate number, and I have no concern at all about whether the fact that it's slipped into the next fiscal year. But, at this point it is going to be conditional on funding, we cannot wait until the fiscal year 20 funding is firm to do the planning, so we will need very firm commitment this year that this is going to have to go forward, which is why it showed up in this year's budget comment, in exactly the way it did, and why we're having the discussion right now by Heidi in a briefing of the board a few minutes ago raised the issue of ATLAS.

We have a fair amount of support, we have a fair amount of naysayers; that's life. But we will have to go forward but I'm not at all concerned about the timing. I'm more worried about the timing of the GA's, which we're then going to look for funding for and we have funded those out of the ABR's and that's not going to be possible if the envelope is collapsed the way it is now.

So, there's all sorts of problems ahead, but the board has accepted our plan. They could always reject it again, but at this point the board has accepted it and we are going forward under the assumption that it will go forward, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Maureen, should I let you check the next person in the queue please?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: Sebastien Bacholett takes the floor. The first thing, I think that before we shoot ourselves in the foot and that we start doing auto censorship before anyone asks us to go backwards, we need to think that the basic idea for this summit is not only to have the people who deserve it can participate and have a trip every five years, but also for the new people to participate.

And what was not understood by the team who made the revision on ATLAS, on At-Large sorry, the At-Large revision; we need to come out of our original silo when it comes to ALS and therefore it's good to have this opportunity every five years to meet. It cannot be just people from such and such region who already have the habit of meeting so my next question is to make sure that we can figure out if we have the budget, and if we can have the budget for one person per ALS, and if not, we have to find solutions but before we said there was not going to be a budget for one person per ALS, we need to find out if it's interesting and useful to have one person per ALS, that they are new or old timers.

Another thing I'd like you to do, and I think it was not done, I know that we elected co-chairs, and since then what happened? The working group was created, members left, so sorry, but I did not vote for three co-chairs that would be one working group. I don't think that those three co-chairs are the only people who actually act for ATLAS III so if you are interested, I will give you a report of my activities when it comes to this issue of ATLAS III around the world, if you are interested, thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Olivier Capin-Leblond speaking, in response to your point with regards to the working group in itself, it might have been that during my summary of what we've done it looks as if we've done more than what we actually have done. The group has had a couple of calls, or just a few e-mail exchanges, but a working group as such, or an ATLAS III preparation working group as such, to my understanding, has not had a full set of calls etcetera, the process is still very much at the moment one step at a time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if I may intervene; I don't believe the working group as such has been convened or membership has been selected yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so that's even more back than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: That has not happened; it needs to happen quickly, but it has not happened at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So maybe in response to what Sebastien is saying, is there any objection to us creating the working group? I mean, I don't know if any of my—I haven't discussed with any of the other co-chairs, so I don't know if Cheryl or Eduardo, or Maureen would be…?

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that that's something that we need to do, probably not at this meeting, but very shortly afterwards we do need a decision. At this meeting would be good if we could find the time to do it, of how we select the people, is it one per ALO, two per ALO, one ALAC member, one whatever the methodology needs to be determined pretty soon.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I've got the list; the next speaker is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Alberto Soto, I agree with my friend Sebastien, we don't have this discussion amongst ourselves, but I would say that I asked for the floor before he did.

When we started talking about ATLAS, ATLAS Coby, ATLAS Montreal, I commented this with LACRALO because our metrics were ready three years ago. For different reasons there were delays and right now it's open to public comment.

I believe it will be a contribution because the 54 ALSes in our region, many of them are fully inactive and the metrics that we are suggesting, and I hope there will be approved in the next few days, will set forth minimum requirements where there are two or one actually, which is an ALSes which does not need the metrics in the previous year, in the year previous to the summit, won't be able to travel, won't be able to ask for the slot etcetera.

It won't either be able to ask for a slot in crop, nor to any trip paid for by ICANN. That will bring about an important reduction in the number of requests, and we do this for two reasons; because we want the right people to travel, and in our last meeting I met in London, or I saw in London, that there were many members of ALSes who are tourists; they never participate in our meetings and we are going to require participants to

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

submit a report as if it were any other trip paid for by ICANN, thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LABLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto. It's Olivier speaking, and I gather the metrics have to be ALAC or At-Large metrics; they are not RALO metrics, but I guess the two can work together.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto, the metrics are for the LACRALO.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LABLOND: Humberto, did you want to comment?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Humberto speaking for the record. Just to clarify; this is part of the mediation process we have ongoing in LACRALO and one of the items, we made a commitment to prepare the metrics, which were kindly suggested by Alberto Soto and delivered by our working group on governance, and this will be analyzed during the mediation meeting to be held Wednesday and Thursday next week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLONDE: Just as—to maybe fuel the discussion a little more, I've just been told, so we have 223 At-Large structures at the moment. The number of slots, the potential number of slots might be limited to between 120 and 150, so that's a huge reduction. Well, if you want to speak you'll have to go in the queue. So next…

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Tijani, but excuse me, we have ten minutes left in this session; one-minute timer, including responses.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan for this restriction.

ALAN GREENBERG: My pleasure.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. First of all; I don't disagree with having it in Montreal; it is not a problem at all. I don't think we have to discuss this issue at all. Second point; I hate to disagree with Sebastien, but there is a point I'm saying that if you want your request to be accepted, you have to ask for what is possible, we don't have to wait for the others to tell us, "No, it is not possible." We have to do it ourselves.

This issue of metrics, or of criteria, we spoke about it since I came in ICANN, and we never manage to have something because people always say, "No, I am a volunteer, I don't have to commit." And this is wrong, and this is why we are here now today.

ALAN GREENBERG: The queue is now closed.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani, next is, now I've got Satish, Sarah, Alan, and then Sebastien. Okay, so next is Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you Olivier, Satish Babu for the record. I think the RALO's have a very important role to play in this decision when you are going to cut down the number of seats. I actually do not think this is an unreasonable cut, and I think we are far overdue in housekeeping and keeping our own houses in order.

I think as far as inactive ALS is concerned, we are now working on the process of weeding out several of our inactive ALSes. I think every RALO should do this in a transparent manner so that the whole community sees this whole process, so we have a lot of work to do ourselves, thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Satish, next is Sarah Kiden.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you very much, this is Sarah Kiden for the record. I wanted to find out about the process for getting Visas to Montreal, because I know at least London was not that easy. Well, I don't know if that matters.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sarah, it's Olivier speaking. Perhaps you can check that with At-Large staff later on, and it might be that we don't go to Montreal; I don't know, we'll see.

ALAN GREENBERG: Our last experience with Canada was not good, but that was many years ago, let's be optimistic.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Alan, I believe it's Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much; a couple of points. Number one; I think it's really important that we use consistent rules across the five

RALO's, so they may or not be the same ones that RALO's are comfortable using for their own purposes, but we do need consistency.

In light of the At-Large review, if we do not use this kind of meeting, and that will go for GA's in the future, to bring good workers who can benefit from the meeting, good perspective workers, and one of the biggest challenges on RALO's is going to be to identify the perspective workers. We don't have metrics for them, but they look really good. And it's, in my mind, it's really clear that does not necessarily map to the voting representative of an ALS who may or may not be active, typically not.

Our experience in the past to bringing these people to meetings is; it does not change their performance or behavior one iota going out after, so I think we have to be very careful. But we may well want to take, for new ALSes that we don't have experience, we may want to bring some percentage of those just because we think that they're good candidates. Hopefully by then we will have gotten better at selecting ALSes.

And remember when going forward, we might well have an ALS with three really active workers in it, so we have to factor in that. We are in a world where we're looking at individuals, whether

they are individual members, unaffiliated, or from ALSes, we have to make use of them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. It's Olivier speaking, and you just mentioned, you spoke of ALSes but of course we are talking about individual members as well, and there's an increasing number of individual members.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are looking at individuals who might be individual, unaffiliated members, or they may be individuals who belong to an ALS; but are active in their own right.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Alan. And just to remember, this is just a proposal. Next is Sebastien Bacholett.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Tijani, I closed the queue, but if we still have time, if everyone is quick enough, Tijani can speak.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLETT: Thank you. Olivier, you were asking this question earlier; who decides on the budget? Now, I would like to know who put a number on the amount of participants, representatives, of At-Large to a summit? Who decided that number? If that person can come and talk to us, they can come to us.

I have not seen anything about the processes, the process, the decision, and here there is no transparency, so I think our objective should be that we have 1 representative per ALS and then we can decide if this ALS works or not, we can talk about it, but our goal should be that we have one ALS in each country, therefore we should have 1 representative per ALS coming to a summit.

Olivier Capin-Leblond, this is a suggestion; 120, 150, those are the suggested numbers, the decision will be taken by the whole assembly, so now we know your position, I am asking from the others, so they can defend their position and maybe we can find a right middle. Tijani will have to speak next rapidly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Shortly; I would like to comment to the comment of Alan about Satish's' intervention. Satish didn't say that the RALO should select who will—he said the RALO should be involved in the process; means that the criteria will be, of course, the criteria for

everyone, but how to apply it inside the region the RALO should be heavily involved, thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani, and quickly Ali Al Meshal?

ALI AL MESHAL: Ali Al Meshal for the record. If I understand right, there is no guarantee or confirmation of the ATLAS III in Montreal, so this is not a place, all the effort and time that will take from all the groups that will be working on shaping the meeting itself on ATLAS too might be useless at the end, and this is a volunteer work, which is time consuming and a huge effort needed to be put in place, so if we don't have a confirmation or a guarantee then why do we have to work on it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll address that. That's why we're having this conversation now, a year and a half before Montreal. If we are going to put the work into it, if meeting staff are to reserve rooms for us, and we're talking about both meeting groups and sleeping rooms, that decision has to be made soon, that's why we're having this discussion right now so we can provide the information and a request, because although the board has agreed that we will

have an ATLAS roughly every 5 years, and GA's in between, we still have to give them the specifics of what we're asking for so they can figure out how to fund it.

ALI AL MESHAL: Sorry, do you have a define of, "Soon?"

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I do not have a define for, "Soon." I would say if it's not done in 6 months, it's not going to happen. That's my personal number, but that's why we're here. And yes, we are investing this time and it might prove to be nothing, but unless we do that it's not going to happen.

I think we really have to stop now. We will try to find a bit more time to continue the discussion as we go forward in the week. Pardon me? I didn't realize there was still anyone in the queue.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: But I thought I was running this; you have coaches.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will let you finish your part, so I can close off the meeting.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Let me let the other coaches speak, then Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And this is the beginning of a conversation, but it's a conversation we now need to formalize and to create a structure to have soon. The "soon" being in a number of months, okay? Thank you.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl, any other coaches? Maureen, did you wish to say…no? And Eduardo, did you wish to say anything as one of the coaches?

EDUARDO ALVAREZ: No, no, I don't have any comments. First, I came late to the discussion, so I don't want to repeat anything.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. So, it's Olivier speaking, and before closing this short section, I believe we have one action item coming out of this meeting, so let's test this out. So, Hello Siri! No, Hello Alexa! No, Hello, Staff! Action item; is that the way we said it? Create, or start off the process for creating the—or, staff is to start off the process for creating the ATLAS III working

group.   Or, call for membership.   Well, you know, the whole process is call for membership etcetera, etcetera.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we need to find in this week to decide on what is the size of the group, and where do we get the people from, and then call for membership. That has to be done this week, not by staff, but by us.

OLIVIER CAPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so let's get Alan to lead this call for—well, it's an ALAC thing, isn't it?   So, Alan to lead the process for creating the ATLAS III working group. Thank you, and back to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll take one of the breaks and allocate it to having that discussion. We reconvene at 1:30 sharp to talk about the information transparency initiative, and the followed by GSE. I will not be here and between Maureen and Bastian, they will be leading the session. I hope you have a good productive talk, and I'll see you again to reconvene when we reconvene once more again after that for working group updates I think.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And if I may offer my apologies, while the PDP work is going on in GNSO, I'll be absent. And with the GAC meeting later this afternoon, I will make the second part of the NCUC ALAC outreach however and see you all at 5:00 for the PDP process discussion, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018