
PANAMA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (6 of 7)

Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 08:30 to 10:15 EST

ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

ALAN GREENBERG: Welcome to Working Session 6 of the ALAC and At-Large Regional Leaders at ICANN 62. Thank you all for being here on time. I think we may be setting a new standard for actually starting pretty close to on-time with a full table. I'm delighted. The first item on our agenda is a very short preparation session for the afternoon session on the CCWG-Accountability. This is a topic we have talked about a near-infinite number of times and this may well be the last one, and Tijani, are you in a position to give us a quick, brief overview of what we're likely to see and what, if anything, is expected of our community at the meeting?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan, Tijani speaking. As you know, the final report has been published since ICANN-61, just after ICANN-61. And the board has some concern about certain recommendations, so we worked with the board to prepare an implementation guidance to address those concerns. And, this took the whole period between ICANN-61 and ICANN-62 and now we have those guidelines to address the concern of the board and also don't touch and don't modify the recommendations because the

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

recommendations have been adopted, have passed the public
lament and normally they are not to be changed.

So, we have the recommendations; we will present this
afternoon the recommendations, the implementation guidance,
and also the concern of the board, and then the next steps; how
things will evolve in the future. Normally we would have to pass
the final report together with the implementation guidance to
the Chartering Organizations, to ratify it and then when it is
ratified by the organizations it will go to the board to be
adopted. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any comments, questions? Okay just to be clear, Sebastien
noted, just to be clear we had an expectation originally that the
report would be at a stage where we could ask for a Chartering
Organization, and we're a Chartering Organization to be clear.
We are not doing that at this meeting, we expect to do it soon
after. But, it is really important for people to get to the point
where they understand what things are. There's about a
hundred recommendations. They are non-trivial.

Our report, our comment on the last final report said that we
basically support everything, but we have a real worry that
altogether this is going to be a heavy demand on the ICANN

organization and on volunteers. If you look at most of the things associated with ACSO-Accountability, it's us that's gonna have to do it. And, the question is, how do we go forward?

So, I don't think there's much chance we're gonna reject the report, we do have an opportunity to make a comment at the same time and I would suspect that we will, we may do that, probably in the same vein, but, again it's really important for all of you to go over that document and if you're gonna vote 'yes', understand what you're accepting. If, that makes everyone decide they don't want to do it, that's fine. We can live with that, I'm not expecting that but it's really important that you take it upon yourself to understand what it is that we have been doing for the last several years and accepting. And, we have Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. So, there's a question floating around and it was just discussed in the room behind me between the CC and the GNSO, is what will happen if -- and it was discussed at the GAC yesterday, what will happen if any Chartering Organization decides to support, I don't know, 98 recommendations but not two and how we will deal with that, that's my first point.

And my second question, now we have I guess a final feedback from the board, not to say that they will adopt it because they I guess they are still questioning some of our proposal, but, what is the the temperature vis-à-vis the board about what we have done in our meeting last Sunday. Because from my point of view we go very, very far to help them to agree with the document and it's one part of my concern. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. My recollection is -- and I can't remember if it was the transition or the accountability, I think accountability, that -- I think the position we took that as long as not more than one ACSO Chartering Organization objects to some part of it, that we would consider it passed. I think we formally decided that but it's a little bit vague in my mind. I don't know if anyone else remembers. I'm assuming that no ACSO is going to reject it, at all, wholeheartedly. They may well object to some aspect of it and I would suspect the board may well in its decision take that kind of thing into effect, into account, into the implementation.

So, we're in an interesting situation in that, and I'm not quite sure if -- I don't think there's been any reaction. The board's initial take was that they identified three or four sections where they believed it was not in the public interest to implement these things. The current bylaws explicitly say the board cannot

determine the public interest without going to a community-based process. So, I think it's an interesting little bit of wording that I'm not quite sure how they justify it. But I'm assuming they could invoke it on particular parts if they choose, if it's in our final report. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Tijani speaking. I will not guess anything, but you said that if that is a rejection from the board or from the Chartering Organizations, this support should go back to the CCWG-Accountability Workstream 2. And in this case, we will be in a very bad situation because we don't have budget for the upcoming period.

So, normally we are finished at the end of the month but if we have work to do after that, we need budget and there is no budget already assigned for that, so, I don't know what could happen, but this is the normal, if you want, next steps if there is a rejection from the board or from Chartering Organizations.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's true, but remember, budget is largely used for travel and staff support so it doesn't mean we can't meet. I don't think they would say you can't have a teleconference, so I'm not sure how onerous that is, if it were to come to that and it's not a 100

percent clear the board would remand it to the CCWG; not clear to me, maybe you know something I don't know. Sebastien, did you want to go back? No? Alright then, we are done with that item. [CROSSTALK] Oh, Olivier, sorry. Alright, go ahead. I didn't see you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I think that we shouldn't be too worried about it. We're not talking about millions or tens of millions of dollars. And on top of there is always this leeway in ICANN's budget to be able to go for any unexpected expenses. Obviously, we'd be better not to have to use those but to me it's a non-issue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comment? Then, the next section is on preparation for the GAC meeting. Can we have the GAC agenda on the display please? The agenda that we will be using at the joint GAC, ALAC meeting. Thank you. We have a long agenda. Historically we have had significant difficulties getting through these agendas with the GAC, that was very different from our last meeting where that was not the case. We had a long agenda and we got through it and I think we even had five -- three minutes left over at the end. I'm not gonna try to predict what's going to

happen this time, but we do have a long agenda and I'd like to go through it on the assumption that we will have time to do it and looking at people to present on our behalf for the items where that's implacable.

Introduction to ALAC is something that I believe Yrjo will be covering, or do you -- or am I supposed to be covering? I don't remember what we discussed. Yrjo has put together an excellent presentation on an overview of the ALAC and At-Large. And Yrjo, do you remember was the intent that you do it or that I do it?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Well, I'm prepared to do it if you want, it's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, did someone just say something?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I said, delegate please Mr. Chair --

ALAN GREENBERG: Delegate. Then I will delegate to Oria to present it and I will be glad to handle any questions that come out based on the

presentation. GDPR one month later. [CROSSTALK] If you want me to hear you, you have to go to the microphone, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: One month later from what, I mean we work too, it's --

ALAN GREENBERG: One month later from May 25th, I mean --

HOLLY RAICHE: May 25th, okay. So, what are you expecting? Are you expecting to basically say there's a temporary sect that in fact the GNSO counsel's working may come up with a charter for the EPDP and there is a discussion as to whether you can roll the axis to terminate any kind of access rules with any specificity into the EPDP, or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Has anyone followed what happened at the GNSO yesterday? Do we know where we are in terms of drafting the charter? [CROSSTALK] Okay, so we're working from -- Oh, John.

JOHN LAPRISE: I was just gonna say that at the final meeting last night the GNSO chair did say that they were making progress, but they don't know if they will have something to pass an agenda item.

ALAN GREENBERG: They were working until at least 7:30. So, they went past that Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN: Yeah, I guess they were supposed to have a meeting this morning there early, but not sure that they yet reached the situation that they will be able to adopt the formal meeting at midday on that issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the summary is that a month later and the world hasn't fallen apart yet. Clearly, a lot of who this information has just completely disappeared and if there is going to be an impact on cyber malware and spam and things like that, which is certainly one of the larger concerns of At-Large, it's gonna happen gradually; will not have happened over night. Our main focus at this point is to understand how we can participate in the EPDP. I've heard a number of suggestions that range from, we, not

likely to get two people on it, we might get one on it, we may just get a liaison which can't vote within the PDP.

The GAC we know has originally asked for five; one per region. I don't, it's not gonna happen. But the question is, exactly what will come out of it. So, I think all we can really do is that quick summary and see if anyone at the GAC has any comments? I can't see a subset of discussion on the subject matter at this point I don't think that's particularly relevant. We have several people; we have Yrjo, Sebastien, and Tijani in that order.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah, thank you. Yrjo Lansipuro. I've been following the discussion on GDPR and who is in the GAC meeting and to say that GAC members are really concerned is an understatement of the year. The -- as you said, they want to have five but they, the idea that was sort of came up yesterday was that they would perhaps get three and two alternatives.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But are they presuming three members with a vote or three liaisons?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah, that three may still be achieved.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Okay, so I'll do a very brief overview, that's one or two sentences, then at this point, based on what we're hearing so far, we have Sebastien and Tijani.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, thank you Alan. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I have a genuine question and if you think that it's not the best time to answer this question I will be happy differing to another meeting, later. I was very impressed by the two public sessions yesterday, but no one from At-Large was there [CROSSTALK] on stage, yes on the panel. And question mark, why.

And the second point is that on the substance of the discussion, even if we ask for five seats as a member in the EPDP, if I what I've heard to have a 30-hour per week to work on that issue to be ready to finish by the end of -- within 12 months? I don't think we'll deserve any one of them if it's this amount of work, I'm not even sure that we will find one, but if we find one, let's try to have it in the membership; but five it's just impossible from my point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think anyone's going to disagree with you on that. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Tijani speaking. I don't think that this working group will manage to finish the work in one year if they're working on only one team. So, I think that they will do as we are doing now with the subsequent procedure. Having tracks to address a small part of the work by tracks so that we can perhaps finish the work and I think we have to try to have our people everywhere, if we can. Of course, but on here people that can commit time and energy. If it is not possible to have the number we want, okay, but we don't have to restrict ourselves from the beginning. And saying one or perhaps a liaison. No, we want to be there with force. If it is not possible, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a liaison in GNSO, presumably she is making that case on our behalf. The discussion is very much a GNSO discussion; on setting both what the scope is and the membership of the group. And we have John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. While I am encouraged by the enthusiasm to participate in the EPDP, I would ask the ALAC that's in here, who among us has 30 hours to devote as a full-member to this project? Because, if you're not, if you can't put

in the hours than the peace meal contribution is not, unless they implement some sort of like part-time, 15-hour slot. You need to be there with both feet and if you're even considering a leadership position that's like 40-hours plus, so when you're considering the EPDP and working and influencing it, this is your commitment for the period -- for the next year period for your policy work right now, your policy outreach. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. To be clear, the 30-hour number that was put out and it was just a stab, you know, a number that came out of the air was including prep work, reading, email and everything. It's not 30-hours of meetings a week. And that's number one; number two is that it's not over a year. From the PDP convenes, actually convenes which means they have to finalize the Charter, they have to solicit input and input has to be identified. That's not going to happen before the end of July at the very earliest and it has to be, the subsidive work has to be finished before Barcelona.

So, we're really only talking, I'll try to count months in the year, three to four months of work over that period of time. We are -- we have about 12 to 15 -- 12 sorry, about 15 minutes left in this session and we have other items, so I don't want to spend all the time on how we are going to select an EPDP representative

when we're really trying to focus on the GAC EPDP. If we have a few minutes left at the end of it, we can go back to that. We will likely be talking about that later in the week assuming we know what it is we're talking about. Christopher, very short intervention.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Very short indeed. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. On the ED -- you know, first one person is clearly not enough a strong argument for having for example three is the conference call schedule. You will have to have a small team who have confidence among themselves and who communicate well, to share the conference call schedule. Otherwise, somebody will be asked to volunteer, and they will not fulfill the tasks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, my best guess of what we're likely to get is one full person, a liaison or at the very least a liaison I think, or a full member and an alternate and it's not clear what the rules were - - will be for an alternate speaking. I'm presuming it is only if the prime member cannot attend a meeting, so that's my best guess but it's just a guess. But, in any case that again is something that's an eternal air-like matter not a GAC issue.

The one part that is a GAC issue, I think we can raise, is the potential difficulty of finding people who will make that level of commitments and that is going to be a challenge, certainly for us. I mean if we were given five seats there's no chance we could fill them and fill them with people who would really meet the commitment. So, that kind of level of support is not even something on the table in my mind. Next item, geographic names; where track five matters. Do we have anything to say or are we just looking for feedback from them? Open the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I think we -- excuse me, Christopher Wilkin --

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, can we do one-minute timers from now one, because we are gonna be running short on time. Christopher, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I think we're definitely interested in their take on this issue because there's a significant overlap between any concept of public interest in from the national and local authorities' point of view and our concept of public interest seen from the point of view of the final user.

We have a point of view, but I think in the short meeting with the GAC it would be sufficient to ask them that question -- the question is how they intend to continue to participate and to reserve our more detailed discussion to a subsequent occasion. I spoke yesterday to the Francophonie members, the Francophone members by Tijani's invitation and I did notice that we've seen very little of them and indeed many other GAC members during the course of the work-track five.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll point out that at this point, individuals participating in work-track five have positions the ALAC has not had a discussion of what the At-Large position is if indeed we can come to a common ground. So, let's not confuse the difference between individual positions and those that we have formally taken. It is something that we need to do soon but we have not yet. Yes? I see, I'm just trying to look at the list and I -- Okay, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

[inaudible] going to say.

ALAN GREENBERG:

[inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, it's true that from the GAC side until now rather few people have been role-called in the WT-5. Manuel told us when we were preparing for this meeting that the GAC has -- is now in the process of collecting opinions from its members on a wider scale and they're trying to get the feeling of what the GAC position could possibly be, so we can ask how far we really are in that process. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone want to take this lead, or would you like me to do it? I don't think a co-chair of the group should take the lead on presenting an ALAC position or lack of ALAC position for that matter. Javi, sorry your card is up to speak, go ahead.

JAVIER ROJO: Yeah, Javier Rojo for the record, good morning. Yrjo, on that point, the GAC on the point of having kind of collated and GAC positions in the work track five, there's already one document that had some points of view from GAC members, it's not a GAC position but definitely GAC is working on sounding the people there and I think we're gonna find a level of coherence in many GAC positions. It's a community that's highly sensitive, of course, to this topic and that's what we saw from the few

members that were in that unified or collated position, so, I guess the point there is that the work track is making efforts to outreach other members and there's good communication happening.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any further discussion? Next item is ICANN-ITI. We don't know anything about that but we're gonna be really, really up-to-date in just a few more minutes. The recommendation that came out of the leadership meeting on this is, you'll recall we have a joint ALAC statement. We believe that we need to do some follow-up on that partly because ICANN has said the ITI is going to address it and neither the GAC or the ALAC is particularly convinced of that.

But could we please put the agenda back on the screen? But at this point our focus is onto other things so we're likely not going to have a subsident discussion within the GAC meeting unless they want to raise something. Or can someone read out what the next agenda item is? Thank you. Stay there, up there on the larger view. We'll do a brief one. I don't think we're going to go into any great detail on it. And, the process of Charting Organizations evaluation of work stream two recommendations. We can certainly have a discussion on that. We just had a discussion on that and who would like to take the lead?

Jenny, if you feel comfortable doing it, I don't think it's a problem. We're sort of at an area where the co-chairs of the CCWG are not going to, not really in an active position and I don't think it's a problem for you to present if you feel like it. Okay, so quickly summarize. They know what it is, and you can summarize what we just decided in our earlier session that is we're gonna be looking at it. It's possible we make comments; our one comment we made already which is a strong one is we're really concerned about the overall workload that's going to be caused by it or driven by it. Any further comments?

So, I will try to find, between now and the GAC session, which is immediately afterwards, or almost immediately afterwards. We will -- no, sorry GAC is tomorrow?

HEIDI ULLRICH: GAC is today.

ALAN GREENBERG: GAC is today, the sec -- I'm confused now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: 11:30.

ALAN GREENBERG: Second session. So, we have a break between now and then. I will identify someone to take the -- thank you -- I'll identify someone to take the work track five stuff in the interim and thank you. And we now have our guest at the table and we're gonna hear what is happening about the ITI and what state we're at and who's taking the lead. Jana will be taking the lead and I'll turn it over to you.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Hi, Jana for the record. Thanks, Alan. We're here to provide an update on ITI but wanted to ask you first, Alan, if you wanted us to give an update or did you just want us to open up the floor to questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: An update please. Update.

JANA JUGINOVIC: I don't know if you have the slides, Heidi? Oh, there you go. Great. So, for the last few months since we provided the previous update we have launched the new feature for acronyms and terms. If you could advance to the next slide, there you go. We replaced the existing feature on ICANN.org

with this updated feature. What we did was we took 250 terms, we translated them, and we updated the translations.

We're obviously still waiting for a few more approvals on the definitions or the terms for the six of the remaining SO/AC's and we have implemented multilingual alphabetical search to make it easier to find and in-feature search as well. One of the reasons why we started with this feature to test the document management system and content management system was to test the implementation, quite frankly. To see if that content model that we had, and the DMS, would be able to -- you'd be able to surface the content through the content management system and it worked quite well.

We are still adding new terms to the acronyms and terms feature, so we'll be adding 200 more in the coming weeks that are still being written and translated. We have provided an email address on that feature so if you have questions or concerns about some of the terms or how they've be defined or if you see a term that's missing please do email us and let us know.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Are you awaiting approval from us? Because I'm not aware of something that we're supposed to be approving at this point.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Yes, we had sent a, the term for ‘At-Large’ and various At-Large terms for review by the policy team. I think they’ll be sharing it with the group here to make sure that it’s written in the way that’s acceptable to At-Large.

ALAN GREENBERG: It’s not uncommon for me to miss an email but I thought someone would’ve reminded me if indeed something’s pending, but we’ll work on it. [CROSSTALK] You think it’s...?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Scope.

ALAN GREENBERG: What is scope?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That is Mary’s team. Just make an action item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I’d just like the record to show that if you’re waiting for something from us, it would be nice if we’ve gotten it.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Absolutely. Absolutely. If you could advance to the next slide.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And sorry, when you say, 'we got it', when we all got it please.

JANA JUGINOVIC: We'll work with Heidi and give it to Heidi to distribute to the group here, for sure. The next slide, if you could advance to the next slide Heidi. Yeah, there you go. We've also started work on wire-framing for -- we're beginning with announcements and blogs. Obviously, this is a content type that a lot of folks use to find out what's happening with ICANN and with registry agreements. Registry agreements we chose because it's a very complicated piece of content to reconfigure in the document management system and surface it on the content management system.

We're obviously trying to make it easier to find in that content and to display it because there's many different documents to display in a registry agreement so it's taking a bit of time to make sure that we don't do it incorrectly quite frankly; not breaking any blanks, make sure the content is intact when you're seeing it on the content management system. With that

wire-framing, obviously we're making sure that the content is able to be displayed on desktop, tablet, and mobile and including things like considering Arabic presentation which is a different type of UX and obviously for French and Russian when content is translated because you do have issues of expansion of text when you have French and Russian content -- so, we need to make sure that we're obviously doing that correctly.

We'll be posting announcements and blogs in the beginning of August for the public, for you, for everyone to experience. You'll be able to experience it, to see what it's like to view a blog, what it's like to search for a blog announcement, and then a month later, registry agreements. So, that's what we have on deck for the feedback site and we'll work with the policy team to make sure you know when it's posted to the site, so we can get your feedback.

Oh, wait, go back to the previous one, thanks. In terms of the IZON audit, we've completed 75 percent of the IZON audit of the content currently on ICANN.org., which means we're looking at all the content, applying tags to it to make sure it's more findable. By tags we mean topics and subtopics. Once that taxonomy work, that audit work is complete we'll actually be doing what's called 'tree-testing'.

What that is, is to make sure that, that taxonomy that we implemented works for the ICANN community and we would actually do that through the feedback site and the accessibility testing in groups like yours to make sure it's easy for you to find content. So, we're excited about that ending soon, the audit, because it's quite a big endeavor but the tree-testing part, making sure that the taxonomy works for you guys is very, very important to us.

The last one, we have Noah on the call which, he's gonna tackle the accessibility guidelines which we shared with you. There was an update to the accessibility guidelines a few weeks ago, though, that we haven't yet finished reviewing, so the ones that you're seeing are not complete because we still need to evaluate these new ones that were posted but I'm gonna turn it over to my colleague Noah, who's joining from Los Angeles. He's our front-end architect. Noah?

NOAH ROSS:

Noah for the record. Thank you, Jana. Essentially the WCAG 2.0 has fairly been the standard for quite some time. 2.1 was actually just released on June 5th and so our team is vetting the new requirements to talk about what needs to be added to our recommendation, but I believe you have been given the initial

recommendation, so I am here to help fill the need of questions if you've got any?

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Thanks for sending the slide and for sort of working with the WCAG guidelines, but I did notice that you were saying on some of the videos you were not going to be transcribing them and there was also, you might want to look at, one of our colleagues ALS's, Joly MacFie, ISOC New York; he's been using an automated one that is pretty good in doing the transcribing and the benefit for everyone is that it's free and so you might want to look into that to some of the videos and uploading them to YouTube and then having them parted out and then do the captioning.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Thanks, Judith. I'll get that feature from you after the meeting because I'd like to see it. We do put the transcription, when we do transcribe videos, we do that through the language services team, sometimes the automated tools don't do the

transcriptions 100 percent correctly so, but I will touch base with you after and get that from you, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any more comments?

JANA JUGINOVIC: Now I'm gonna turn it over to Ash, because we posted a blog about a week ago about the technical infrastructure of ITI that I thought Ash could provide some insight into.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you, Jana. This is Ashwin Rangan for the record. There were two different blogs that went up, one on weekend which is our internal intranet and the other on ICANN.org which is the external facing website that we have, and I hope that some if not all of you have had a chance to take a look at that blog. We've been saying for quite a while now that the ITI initiative is not just about the website, in fact the website perhaps is about the smallest visible component of what we're doing with ITI. To use an old phrase, it's the tip of the iceberg.

Most of the work is in structuring the information that we have inside of the organization so that, that structuring lends itself to easy findability. So, what we're seeing is the symptom of a very

deeply rooted problem. The symptom that we see when we're on the website is that information is not easy to find. The problem is that the information is not well structured. So that question then becomes, how do we structure it and how do we make it easy to surface and find? So, the result of that is a series of technologies that need to get implemented starting with the foundation of document management repository.

Now, it's if you think of a document management repository, Word, with its directory, is a document management repository but it's not a robust enough document management repository if you think about it because finding things, if you've put it in a Word document is quite difficult. So, there is a convention for how things should be name, for instance, there is a convention for how things could be tagged as another example.

So, naming leads to the tree structure but tagging leads to easier findability. Within the organization when we create content, some of it may be intended for external publication, some of it may be intended for internal consumption or could be a working process. And, if it indeed is meant for external consumption, how do we go through an audit process so that the right content, the right version of the content, has been reviewed by the right people so before it gets posted for external consumption.

These are all considerations and those have led us to look at the entire architecture that we have, the infrastructure architecture that we have and to have to redo most of it because our website didn't understand these needs when first it was put up so we've lived with the consequence of early decisions for many years and rather than rush to a new solution we're taking time to deliberately layer each of these one at a time, make it visible, get feedback, and pound it really hard so that once it's fully complete, it can in fact scale and will be successful for many years to come.

So, that's what I have published as a part of the blog and if you haven't had a chance to look at it, I would strongly encourage you to do so and if you have questions to let us know. We'd be happy answer them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Ash. We hope -- the speaker cued Sebastien first I believe.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [Participant speaking in different language] I'm going to speak in French because we're talking about languages so let's use out interpreters for that. I hope you're able to listen to me, if you speak French that's okay. Are you ready now? Thank you very much. I had two questions, the first one, it's -- you can start your one-minute -- the first question is about when we do translation very often I do not agree on the terms being used or the translation that was made.

I know it's not your group who's in charge of languages, but I think it would be great to have a place where we can say this is not what you mean to say, this is not the right translation. It's not a question of saying the work is not up to par, but sometimes when it's our language and we know so much that I can, we can help out with the terms being used, that's my first remark.

The second is thank you very much, Ashwin, for your blogs, they're extremely interesting regarding tagging. The result that we have today with those tags as a user is that groups that I do belong to the list of meanings are in a certain order. Sometimes it starts with the latest meeting, sometimes they start with the last meeting, and we should have a rule for that so that we can find the last meeting, thank you. [CROSSTALK]

JANA JUGINOVIC: Jana for the record. On the issue of language services and translations, that's within our department, the communications department and I understand, we do hear that some translations, that there is discrepancy in terms and someone would like to see a different term. I think with when we're able to launch the new, the updated website, there needs to be a way to comment on the translation, I agree. So, I'm actually taking that as an action item to say we need to have part to say, 'do you have a comment on this translation?' I think that's a great idea. I'll let Ash tackle the second question.

ASHWIN RANGER: [Participant speaking in different language] Thank you very much. I understand French, but I don't speak French. The blog it's difficult to convey what we're doing from a technical perspective in laymen terms. So, we're doing the best that we can. To you point about specific sequencing in which information should be surfaced. We have different thoughts about how we can link things internally so that not knowing how a specific user wants to find information we ought to have a multitude of ways in which information could be surfaced.

So, for instance, one could look at a current proposal and look for its status and if they were a researcher they might want to know what were previous proposals if there were any, were

there versions of proposals that we looked at and discarded before the current proposal came forth. So, they may want to go backwards. On the contrary, someone who's in a hurry might actually want to look at the current and only the current and move on forward.

Now we also have if you think about the current GDPR discussions many different parts of the community involved in that discussion, so a third person might be interested in finding what's the current state of GDPR from a multitude of perspectives, whether it's the GAC or the ALAC or the SSAC and so on and so forth. So, we are not quite done figuring out how best to link all of these, but we are definitely thinking about how best to link it so that not knowing how the viewer wants to approach it, we want to provide that capability. So, that's very much work in process both thinking and technologically. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We have at this point 10-minutes left in this session. We have a speaker queue so if everyone could please, including the responses keep them short. I see a hand up. Yesim is next, then we have me and John.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you, Alan. Yesim Nazlar, ICANN staff, we have a remote command from Dev Anand Teelucksingh. So, ICANN acronyms and terms look good; one suggestion -- make it easier to copy and share -- just one second, please. Make it easier to copy and share a direct link directly to a specific acronym or term, making this a shorter URL would also be helpful. This will make it easier for everyone to link to terms when sending emails, blog posts, special media posts. Thank you.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Jana for the record. I'm glad that the gentleman asked the question, I didn't catch the name. I don't -- okay, thank you for the question. WE have actually been working on a V-2 to implement that feature because we absolutely agreed. We couldn't implement it right away because we wanted to make sure we could do it by term as opposed to the whole page. And then for each of the different languages and make a readable URL as well, and trying to make it actually work in email because there's different email programs.

So, if you do a copy to email or just copy link, there's a little bit of functionality that we needed to work out but totally agree and it's on the list, hopefully in version two which should be coming out in a couple more months. There's gonna be some enhancements to it but great question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As you just mentioned GDPR as an example of things someone might want to look for. The vast amount of material, the vast proportion of material for any current subject is not on the web. ICANN's blogs maybe, a formal document ICANN posts, but the vast majority is on the Wiki and every time I've raised the issue before I've been told Wiki's not being covered in this iteration.

I understand how the taxonomy and tagging, and things may not be covered but if we ignore the Wiki completely, we are essentially saying we don't care about the work we're doing right now. Thank you. The same goes by the way for things like meeting agendas and meeting records of when meetings were held. It's all on the Wiki. There's nothing on the web at all about that. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD: David Conrad for the record. Yeah, we're aware of the requirements and the necessity for incorporating you the Wiki and other areas of content into the overall system. Right now, what we're focused on is the core functionality. In order to ensure that the underlying infrastructure is able to support what we need it to do and to get the initial set of documents that are

sort of most requested by just looking at web analytics, the end goal is of course to start incorporating everything into the ITI project but that's dependent on budget and time and resource availability.

So, what we've been trying to do is prioritize for the areas that we think are the most critical to the most -- to the largest set of users and then add on as soon as resources become available, sort of as more money becomes available. The other areas that are required by the rest of the community, so we understand the desire it's just a question of prioritization and timing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'd like to note that every other time I've mentioned it the answer is tough we're not doing it, that's a delightful answer thank you. I understand priorities. Next, we have John.

JOHN LAPRISE:

John Laprise for the record. Thank you, Jana, for your presentation. I just have one question, why was the content taxonomy still ongoing while you're already starting wire-framing? That seems to be a little bit, cart before the horse kind of thing.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

That's an excellent question and in an ideal case scenario, the content would've been done, we would've done tree-testing and the initial site map for sure. The wire-framing that we did for the first one's because blogs and announcements are kind of their own entities. It's not dependent on the taxonomy at this phase. What we will do is because we're tagging the content right now, we have the multifaceted search for blogs and announcements that you will be able to filter by topic, by author, in the case of a blog, date range.

When we do a clean-up audit, in the sense of when we clean up the taxonomy to remove terms that are not working we'll still be able to surface it. Content that we're tackling for wire-framing, we're tackling it not dependent on taxonomy if that makes sense, but I agree with you in an ideal case scenario we would've done that but because of the constraints of time and money we said okay, let's try and do it in parallel. Tackle the content that is not dependent and park the ones that we need the taxonomy for to do. But you're absolutely correct, John, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I have a question on the current website. Is that in scope or out of scope for this discussion here?

JANA JUGINOVIC: Jana for the record. ICANN.org?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: ICANN.org and meetings.ICANN.org?

JANA JUGINOVIC: Yes, so we can provide, it might actually be helpful if we provide Heidi with a slide to share with all of you, but all the public sites are in scope, the public content, At-Large, meetings is included and there's 13 other properties that we're going to collapse into ITI and so, that's, yeah, absolutely -- it's part of it. It's the main flux of the first content that we're tackling and meetings as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, I have a question about the current website. Is it in scope for this meeting, for me to ask this question? [CROSSTALK] okay, so yeah, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. It's about broken links. We've had several instances of broken links. I've notified staff, they've notified the webmaster, and, in some cases, it's been

months. So, I'm a little concerned about where resources are going and how many webmasters there are, is it just one person, or, you know why is there such a que? Thank you.

ASHWIN RANGER:

So, thank you very much, this is Ashwin Ranger for the record. What you today see as ICANN.org, meeting or otherwise, is actually about nine layers deep. There are eight redirects at the deepest layer, so the broken links can be anywhere in that structure, as unfortunate as it may seem. That is the reality of our current structure.

So, you can literally think of it as an archaeological dig, as you dig you find the next layer and you dig deeper and you find the next one -- you still haven't gotten to the property that you're looking for. It is eight layers below where you started. We are finding that some of these are turning into research projects because we spend somebody, and we say, fix the redirect and then they come back and say but that's not what you're looking at, there's more to it. So, this is a very difficult problem.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

May I suggest, it may be useful for you to just run utilities to identify the redirects and then instead of your people doing the research forwarding it to the people who actually have

responsibility, they may know where the redirect should go or where the broken link should actually point to. I have a very quick follow on to the question of the Wiki, and I presume others as well, has grown randomly.

Lots of people have editing capabilities, they just get put in semi-random places, so if you look at our election pages, most of them are in one place but some of them are somewhere else. Trying to fix them, breaks links. Has anyone thought about how we can eventually get to where we save Wiki, and I don't know if it's a simple answer or a not known answer, but it's becoming a serious problem.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

I think similar to -- Jana for the record, thanks for the question. I think similar to with ITI, you do need to do a content audit because you do need to have a site map. Without that content architecture you can't actually have what you're wanting to do right? Where you have random content here and random content over there. You're not grouping content into categories, you're absolutely right.

So, for the Wiki one would need to start with a content audit, then do the information architecture and develop those user journey so that somebody can get to the content more easily.

With ITI though, and this gets back to the question about redirects, because we're spending a lot of time on the content audit, we're focusing on a URL strategy, obviously, because we need to have a sensible URL that's readable so it's not a jumbled -- you can actually, terms that you can read. T

hat are identified by language, so you know which language you're looking for in the URL and that deals with the issues of the sometimes eight to nine to 10 levels of redirects but also doesn't break the links that someone has saved, you know, in our community. They save a lot of URL's, they don't want that broken so it's a big job, but I agree. So, that's what you'd need to do for the Wiki.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Now, I'm afraid we're out of time and I'd like to thank you very much. I certainly have a better idea, I hope everyone around the table does and for the extent time allows, perhaps we will try to do this again in Barcelona and try to find how much progress you've made in that time. Okay, thank you. We'll take a minute to move the finance people and the next session up to the table. Okay. If we can stop the side conversations, please and people go back to their table.

I'd like to welcome Becky Nash and Benedetta Rossi and I'm told Wanda's on her way and I'm presuming Becky will start off? And, I'm not quite sure what you've planned for presentations. I presume we have 45-minutes, well not quite anymore, and I presume there will be adequate time for questions because I suspect this group may have one or two. Yeah, just maybe. Becky?

BECKY NASH:

Great, thank you, Alan. Hello everyone, this is Becky Nash from ICANN Corp. finance department. We have a finance update where the agenda that we would like to run through would be an overview of FY-18, our current fiscal year financial overview. We then have slides as it relates to FY-19 operating plan and budget process. We do have an update on the reserve fund replenishment, the comment period which ended, and a report has been published, we have Q&A and then some appendix items as well. I'm happy to stop during the presentation at each section for questions, if you would like.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think we could presume this group has a pretty good understanding of the original draft fiscal year budget and

operational plan, so I think we want to focus a lot, more on the changes that have happened since then. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Very good. I will quickly run through a current update on FY-18 and then jump straight into the FY-19 changes from draft to final adopted budget. On this first slide it is an update through our last quarterly update, which is the Q3 stakeholder presentation where we had results through March 2018. This gives our actual versus budget for the nine months ending March 31. On the left-hand side, we can see that the funding through March of 98 million was lower than the budgeted revenue or funding of 107 million for those nine months.

That is something that during the FY-19 draft publication of the budget we talked a lot about. The funding that was lower, expected lower funding in FY-18 as compared to the original budget just due to the lower transactions for registries and registrars. As I continue on this slide, you can see that the expenses for the nine months ending March 31, of 93 million were also lower than the budgeted expected expenses for those nine months by 12 million. So, as a result ICANN organization did slow down the expenses again we have an objective to have a balanced budget and a balanced statement of activity so that we do not expend more expenses than funding that comes in.

The next item that we have here is just related to the FY-18 amounts for the IANA Stewardship transition. Expenses of a million which we lower than budgeted by a million as well. FY-18 is the last year for which we have budgeted amounts for the IANA Stewardship transition project and this relates to the workstream two activities that are to be completed by the end of FY-18.

On this slide we also just have a breakdown at the bottom of the slide, which would take our total expenses up to 93 million. And break it out between, what we call, ICANN operations versus the IANA Stewardship services. And this is just information so that the community can see that the IANA services are imbedded in the ICANNA operations total consolidated expenses.

The next two slides give a break out of the funding versus budget and versus FY-17 and I will just move ahead on these because as we just discussed as part of the agenda we would like to cover more of the changes to the FY-19 budget. So, let's stop on this slide briefly. As of March 31, 2018, total funds under management were 461 million, in the upper right-hand side you can see that the breakout between ICANN operations was 105 million of this total and the new gTLD program related investments were 357 million and that's related to both the auction proceeds and the new gTLD funds which are the funds of

the application fees that were collected up front. This slide is important should we have time to address the reserve fund replenishment strategy public comments report at the end of this presentation.

This slide gives a full year, fiscal 18 forecast where as we discussed the funding in FY-18 is expected to be lower than the budgeted FY-18 and as a result the expenses as well will be lower in FY-18. We are coming to the close at the end of this month of our fiscal year and we will have publication of our full year actuals versus budget and forecast in approximately 35-40 days after the quarter end or full year end.

As discussed, this next section, we're gonna go into the FY-19 operating plan and budget and discuss some of the changes that occurred between the draft publication and the proposed for adoption and adopted FY-19 operating plan and budget. Quick snapshot of the FY-19 planning process, we appreciate all of your efforts and all of the community's efforts in the activities as it related to the FY-19 operating plan and budget process.

We would just like to highlight that the current status which is noted here at ICANN-62, is that the ICANN board adopted the FY-19 operating plan and budget on the 30th of May and we went into the empowered community period, which is the 21 days has already elapsed and then the seven days period to make the

budget effective is expected to be I believe today, the 27th of June.

So, as of right now this process was organized so that we would be able to present an adopted budget well in advance of the next fiscal year as a reminder our fiscal year starts on July 1st and we wanted to ensure that we had a fully adopted, effective budget before the beginning of the next fiscal year. We highlighted that this year, the FY-19 operating plan and budget was adopted by the ICANN board one month earlier than prior years and again that's to allow us to have that empowered community period. And we are planning for future years to try and make it even earlier just to permit more time to have it in effect at the beginning of the fiscal year. The FY-19 public comment process resulted in approximately 184 comments.

On this slide we provide the major themes that were presented as part of the comments during the public comment period. As we can see the majority of the comments as noted in this table were related to community travel support and community travel funding. The next large area centered around community outreach and engagement programs.

We had several comments about the ICANN.org headcount and the levels of headcount for ICANN personnel and then the last, number four, was the budget development process and the

document content structure. That is an area that we wish to continue to do engagement to find out if the documents that were presented as part of FY-19 were informative and provided the community with enough information for the public comment period.

I'm now gonna cover a summary of the changes from the draft FY-19 operating plan and budget and to the final adopted 19 operating plan and budget. So as a result of public comments and some new information or corrections on some assumptions, there were updates on several key projects that were denoted in our FY-19 operating plan and budget and there's a summary in what we call document number two, the total budget of all the changes, including commentary or corrections of labels along with some financial changes.

In this slide we are highlighting the key changes that were included. So, in the first four or five bullet points we're actually discussing some changes in the FY-19 funding assumptions. As a result of new information at the time that we prepared the proposed budget for the board to adopt, we identified a few areas that needed some assumption changes.

So, the first one was the funding or revenue as it relates to meeting sponsorships. We made a revision down by 300

thousand, just based on the trend over this last 18-months, that meeting sponsorships has been declining for ICANN meetings.

The next two are corrections and new information on assumptions, some of which are a result of public comment recommendations as well, where we did have an increase in the rate of growth for the legacy TLD transactions, that was just to incorporate some new information of our latest quarter of Q3 that showed that the rate of growth was slightly higher but then we did have a rate of decrease in the growth for the new gTLD transactions or registration volumes, and that was something that was highlighted from our community in the public comment period.

We then had a decrease in the registry fixed fees which was just an updated assumption and an increase in the registrar accreditation fees, which was a result of the difference in the forecast of the number of accredited registrars at the end of FY-18. The next few bullet points on this slide and the next, then we move into changes made directly as a result of public comments. So, as a result of a public comment, the fellowship program travel funding was increased or reinstated for 150K. This was an increase by 15 seats per meeting and allocated to the fellows for the SO's and AC's for direct support during the ICANN meetings.

The next bullet point is the CROP where there was a change of 50 thousand was reinstated to support four ICANN sponsored meetings, I know that we will be covering this in just a few minutes with our colleagues here, Mary and Benedetta. The next few changes, we had an increase in the ICANN Wiki, we funded two-thirds of the historical contributions in FY-19, and then we have a comment that there will be progressive elimination of support over the next two years as it relates to the ICANN Wiki.

The next bullet is as a result of public comment and discussion in Puerto Rico. The funding for reviews was reduced by 800 thousand and this was just related to the timing of the reviews and as a result, just due to the fact that the reviews will continue but it's unpredictable as to the rate of the reviews. We then put a portion of the contingency denoted as reserved directly for the same amount of 800 thousand, just in case it should be necessary to fund that amount, again the 800 thousand was reduced out of the reviews detailed budget but there was 800 thousand specifically reserved as part of the ICANN contingency for reserves.

The last point is that the subsequent procedures recommendations language was revised to reflect that when policy recommendations are finalized the ICANN board will

consider the recommendations and will consider how to fund their implementation.

This last slide here just gives a summary of the impacts from the drafts to the proposed for adoption and now adopted by the ICANN board where you can see that the funding decreased for a total of net of 300 thousand from 138 to 137.7 million and the expenses excluding contingency pretty much remained the same from 133.5 million to 132.5 and we are denoting the buckets that were as a result of public comment we increased expenses by 300 thousand and then that change in the reviews of 800 and other changes in corrections of .5. The contingency as a result of the final adopted budget increased again for the reviews from 4.5 million to 5.2. I can pause at this time just to see if there are any questions about the changes from the budget.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, we do have a queue. I'm first and I have two very quick questions. Can you go back to slide 13 please? [CROSSTALK] and I put people in the queue in the order they appear, the order we note they appear. I'll raise my card next time to make sure. There's an item for outreach and an item for CROP, I would've thought that they were the same item.

That's question number one and on slide 14, slide 14. I would've expected a decrease in accreditation fees due to the prediction that a lot of the drop-catching registrars are gonna be disappearing and was that already in the budget prior to that or am I missing some other change I don't know about? Thank you, those are the two questions.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your question. This is Becky Nash for the record. Your first question was just related to how we sorted or presented the public comments received on the draft FY-19 operating plan and budget, and just due to the number of comments related both to outreach and engagement in general and the specific of the CROP, we decided to separate those two just for better visibility as we presented tabulated results. We did individually address those in the report by ICANN Org.

Your second question just related to the assumption changes as it relates to the registrar accreditations. You're absolutely correct that the accreditation fees are driven directly by the number of accredited registrars, and during the period of the public comment we noted that the forecast had the incorrect assumptions of the ending projected registrars because we already had included a large decrease in the number of projected registrars in our FY-18 budget but we didn't want to

duplicate that and we had a more refined assumption of the ending number, but you're absolutely correct that, that number's decreasing at this time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sebastien?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Sorry, quick clarification on that. In other words, we had already anticipated the decrease of number of registrars that has occurred it simply occurred a bit later and a bit to a smaller extent than we had originally anticipated. So, in adjusting the budget to the actual decrease that occurred, we had to increase a bit the funding for accreditation of registrars. It's simply an adjustment to the reality versus our previous assumptions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Two questions the first one on this slide to understand. Decreasing the rate of gTLD transaction, it's a decrease or it's an increase? Isn't that supposed to be a minus? But just to be sure I understand, and I want to ask my second

question in the next slide. ICANN Wiki, I guess you are talking about the ICANN Wiki, not the ICANN Wikis and maybe you should take out the space between ICANN and Wiki, it will be more understandable. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: So yes, and yes. There should be a minus in front of the 1. Million 7 for the decrease in rate of growth in the gTLD transaction, you're right. So, the new gTLD transaction continues to increase, year on year, but we have adjusted down the rate of growth; what this means is it's correct, there should be a minus. And you're right, it's the ICANNwiki without a space.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBOND: Thank you very much, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So, a comment and a question. The first one again on that same slide that we were looking at. IT would be helpful to have percentages included as a percentage of the overall expense, because when you say minus 300 K, well if the whole budget of that item is 300 K, then it's pretty significant, but if it's 300 million and you just take 300 K out well, you know. Secondly,

my question, regarding Atlas three, are you starting to make any provisions regarding Atlas three and the third At-Large summit and is there any impact on the FY-19 budget so far?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'll take that one, thank you. So, you're right, the 300 K of decrease on the funding for the ICANN meeting sponsorship that we collect is from 800 K to 500 K. And simply 800 K was an assumption that we used using historical patterns and the pattern recently is that the volume of sponsorship is decreasing. So that's the reduction of 300 K. Regarding Atlas three, there's no specific provision in the budget, I guess that you would have noticed during the public comment had there been any. I believe that the plan is that we have Atlas three at the first meeting of FY-20, unless I'm mistaken. So, that's why there's no --

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: That's correct but of course this is a significant item and therefore the question is whether there will be forecasted advance payments or anything like this ahead of it, or you're just going to include it in one budget?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Without trying to make accountants out of you, it doesn't matter when we pay. It's not the point of cash payment that drives when the expense occurs in the budget, it's when the event is planned to happen, and you know probably, or you may know when we reserve a venue for an ICANN meeting, we contract one, two, three years in advance. As part of those contracts, there's always a deposit or a sequence of deposits.

So, we just made deposits for Montreal, for example, well a few weeks ago. And we're going to continue doing that, there's sequences in that. So, cash payments are made way in advance sometimes, of when the event occurs. The expense is recognized at the time the events occur. So, there will, we don't need in quotes to include expenses for Atlas three presuming it will happen in FY-20. The in previous years budgets because we are recognizing those expenses in the year in which they happen.

Of course, we are booking in our accounts the payment that we could have made, for example, for Montreal, a year and a half from now. This is of course very well recorded but it's not an expense yet. It will be expensed into our books and into the budget at the time it occurs so that's why it's not happened yet. And of course, I'm sure we will be talking more about Atlas three

from a planning standpoint and a budgeting standpoint for the year FY-20, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have 15 minutes left until end of session. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Xavier and your team. I see that you are measuring the change in the rate by dollars, and this is strange for me. You are speaking about trades and you put dollars.

XAVIER CALVES: Tijani, you're referring to funding changes for example? [CROSSTALK] Right. Yes, thank you. Agreed we simply tried to summarize here the dollar change across all the changes to the budget so that people can see the impact, and you're right, we didn't indicate the various rate of changes and Olivier's question was also pointing out, what did we reduce 300 K from? To be honest and we'll take that lesson, we were trying to put as little numbers on this slide to try to not confuse people, but we'll try to find a more comprehensive presentation of the changes in the future so that it's more clear.

If I tried to guess, and Becky will correct me if I'm wrong, on the fly but the rate of growth for legacy TLD's, the 700 K represents

less than half a point of change. So, if it was 2 percent of growth, it's probably like 2.3 percent of growth or something like that as a result of that change. The change for the new gTLD transaction of 1.7 million must be, from memory again, from about 18 or 19 percent of growth to 15 percent of growth. Something like that.

So, it's not major but it's also the most recent, it simply represents the most recent projections that we were able to reproduce. I can't remember if Becky said the draft budget that we produced, we used our latest projections that the end of September 2017 when we produced the final budget we had more recent projections at the end of March 2018. So, we had six months more of knowledge, which helped us refine our assumptions that's why we've done that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you we're trying to, we're asking if we can go five minutes over, we are 14 minutes to go at this point and we still have a significant amount of the presentation we haven't heard yet, I think and I did have my hand in the queue, I don't want an answer I just want to point out that our current assumptions, our current focus is on Atlas, but we also in the long-term, in between Atlas, have general assemblies which we have been funding from the AC/SO special budget request. That's not

gonna be possible if it stays at the level of 300 thousand or so in coming years. So, just noting that.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your comment. The next section actually does, just talks a little bit about the additional budget request process for FY-19. As you indicated, the budget for this was 300 K, we did receive 55 requests and the 17 requests that were approved were published at the time we published the FY-19 proposed for adoption to the ICANN board document and then we did have a final report out on all the additional budget requests that was published to the ICANNwiki on the finance project page. Time permitting, I suggest that we move to the reserve fund replenishment.

I will just briefly talk about this and then we will turn it over to our colleagues, Mary and Benedetta who do have a short presentation. In this presentation we do have several slides, that should you have any questions, please reach out to us at ICANN planning inbox, but for the moment we just wanted to give you a view of all the responses that were received as part of the most recent public comment period related to the replenishment strategy for ICANN's reserve fund. I'm gonna turn it over to Xavier who can give a quick overview of this slide.

XAVIER CALVES:

Very quickly, we tried to represent on this slide the breadth and ranges of positions from various communities who commented on the strategy reserve fund. From left where on any of those plausible sources of replenishment, where we are describing who that suggests that less or no, none of these sources are used -- to the right where more of these sources are suggested to be used. So, if I use for example, the auction proceeds line on the second line from the top, you can see on the left there's a number of positions that are suggesting full, for various different reasons by the way, to not use the auction proceeds for replenishment of the reserve fund.

On the right, other organizations are suggesting using more auction proceeds for the replenishment of the reserve fun, and in the middle the reflection of what ICANN had suggested to use as strategy which is sort of the middle ground that we are proposing there. As an illustration, for example, At-Large, in its comment, the organization suggested that up to 25 percent of the auction proceeds could be used for the replenishment of the reserve fund, as an illustration.

The only last comment I will make on this slide is simply that there's, you can see a fairly wide range of opinions on a number of the topics relative to their strategy of replenishment and on

other topics there was a fairly good consensus. For example, fees increase -- there was a consensus on not increasing them with the exception of At-Large who suggested that fees could be increased by 2 cents per domain name registrations.

Another area of consensus is that ICANN should contribute more to the replenishment than the 15 percent by reducing its expenses for example. And of course, in doing so, so as a reminder ICANN suggests that with the success that's being driven of three million per year for five years, so that ICANN can contribute to the reserve fund by reducing expenses up to 15 million.

The public comment suggested that either more should be done or the entire deficit of the reserve fund which is, as a reminder, approximately 68 million be entirely replenished from SCOT savings. 68 million means, per year, between 15 and 20 million, about 15 million per year of savings which is about 15 percent, let's say a bit less than the ICANN budget which would mean simply stopping a number of activities, be able to do that and possibly resuming them in the future.

So that would require very drastic change of ICANN's activities, that would require of course, public and community consultation. So that's the results on strategy of replenishment. The next step is, now that we have this , these results for the

board to reconsider a strategy and see how the board suggests to move forward with this. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think I'm the only one in the queue at the moment. Just a note, on that slide where it shows the ALAC's at 25 percent that is not necessarily an increase. It depends on what amount actually ends up in the auction proceeds. If in the worst case we only have in 110 in it, that in fact is a decrease. That was the reason why we stayed at this percent instead of the number.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we'll turn it over to them. Mary?

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Hello everyone, this is Benedetta Rossi speaking from the Scope team presenting for the FY-19 community outreach program. Mainly about the updates for FY-19 and the updated guidelines. So, in terms of the CROP goals, I know you're all very familiar with them, they're unchanged, so I won't linger too much on them. So, we're still focusing on building local and regional awareness and recruitment of new community members engaging with current members or reactivating previously

engaged ICANN community members and communicating ICANN’s mission and objectives to new audiences.

So as your all aware, 50 thousand U.S. dollars were allocated to FY-19 budget for CROP and that was based on direct community consultations from the public comment process on the draft FY-19 operating plan and budget. And staff considered further consideration about how to provide the support to the community outreach efforts, which are obviously very important, to the community. While also bearing in mind how we can remain within the appropriate budget limits.

So, the new CROP allocations are to be subject to new guidelines, as you’re all aware, and more importantly specific criteria and staff will actually develop an assessment at the end of FY-19 based on new CROP guidelines and we were directed as staff to review the current guidelines and consultation with ICANN executive team to ensure consistency across the board, to review the current guidelines and develop improved additional criteria. The general principle for the new updated CROP guidelines is that CROP may be used for FY-19 outreach efforts which are directly and demonstratively related to ongoing ICANN policy and technical advisories.

So that’s in line with the same guidelines which were applied to the reviews of the FY-19 additional budget requests. So that’s

the same, the same principles were applied to CROP for FY-19. One of the direct points that staff also reviewed in developing the new CROP guidelines, which we will get to in one of the next slides, is also what exactly an ICANN sponsored event means.

And I know that was one of the questions that a lot of you were asking staff, so we will get to that. So, the FY-19 RALO allocations are the following; each RALO will be allocated up to three individual, regional trips, so again the travel allocations will not change in terms of the length, so we're still looking at four days, three nights maximum for regional travel. So not out of region travel will be allowed within a CROP.

The difference is that the types of events that will be allowed within the new CROP guidelines will be mainly focused on ICANN public meetings occurring in the RALO's region or official meetings as organized by ICANN, it's noted we will touch on what exactly that means, occurring in the RALO's region -- like, for example, the GDD summit. But if there is no public meeting or official ICANN meeting occurring in the RALO's region, you may utilize the CROP allocations for meetings within your regions, well within the RALO region, as discussed by the regional GSE vice president.

The guidelines for that will be, again, that the meeting will be directly and demonstratively related to ongoing policy or

technical activities, like for example, a regional registry internet meeting; and consistent in all the other CROP years, consistent with the ICANN organizations outreach plan for that region. So, that is a usual collaboration that is carried out between the RALOs and the GSE vice presidents. A RALO may choose to use one or more trips, again that's something that we've done in the previous years as well, for the same meeting in the region and it just counts as one of the three allocations.

Baring in mind that obviously the guidelines have been changed mainly focusing on ICANN public meetings, if a RALO has used at least one of the three allocations for FY-19, for an ICANN public meeting or official ICANN meeting occurring in the region, you may then utilize the remaining allocation for a meeting occurring in the region that, again, is assessed by the Global -- the regional and global stakeholder engagement team's vice president as being directly and demonstratively related to ongoing ICANN policy and advisory or technical activities. So, this might be the more interesting part of the presentation.

So, what does it mean official meeting organized by the ICANN organization? So, what we're looking at is a meeting where all the programming and logistics and all the other arrangements are solely, or primarily, the responsibility of the ICANN organization. For example, the GDD Summit, but not conference

events where ICANN's involvement is just a minor or gifts or just sending delegates or staff by any means as invited speakers.

So, it's really where there is active involvement in the organization of the event and obviously ICANN public meetings. The FY-19 CROP process is mainly unchanged, so the first step is drafting an outreach strategic plan to be posted on the CROP community Wiki space. We've actually, we're going to be launching the CROP community space by early next week and the program, so you'll be able to see it. We've made, what we hope, are improvements to the space so it should be much clearer to use, hopefully. So, we'll look forward to your feedback on that.

So yeah, the first step will be publishing a regional outreach strategic plan for each of the RALOs to be posted on the Wiki and approved by the RALO leadership and then for that to be concurred by the regional vice presidents and then just posted on Wiki as usual. We will continue having a six-week requirement for travel requests, so all concurrences for trips and approvals, for each trip and approvals must be at a minimum obtained six weeks before the date of the travel.

What has changed is just one item within this, which is that the actual submission from the community for concurrence by the GSE vice presidents should be submitted no less than five

working days before the six-week travel guideline. The reason for this is that we have encountered a lot of instances where, yes, the six week requirement was met, but the trip submission was submitted on the day that all concurrences by the global stakeholder engagement vice president needed to be met and so that was quite hard to obtain at times, so that is the reason why these five extra working days are, especially to ensure that there is the right level of review of the trip request, making sure that it is keeping with the new CROP guidelines and --

ALAN GREENBERG: Benedetta, we are two minutes from our absolute end because the interpreters will leave, so if we conclude as quickly as possible --

BENEDETTA ROSSI: This is the last slide.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Just so you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a small speaker queue, Olivier up first.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. A couple of questions, the first one has to do with the relation of being able to have CROP trips to meetings that are only relating to ICANN or that are linked to ICANN. What is the, is that number of meetings that ICANN is going to sponsor, outside meetings, going to remain the same as previous years or is there a decrease in this? Because what it would basically mean is what if ICANN is, let's say, sponsoring only 50 percent of the meetings that it used to sponsor before than we're looking at a real decrease in the options that CROP allocation could go to.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Benedetta, can you go back to the slide with the different types of meetings, before this one -- the one before. So, if you look at the types of meetings, there's I suppose, three levels or three

types ICANN public meetings, let's leave that out. Olivier, I think your question may be related to either B and/or C and of course what we've done here for developing the additional guidelines here is we've moved away from the language of saying, ICANN sponsored, because that seemed to create some confusion in the community about what that meant. While trying to keep within what we were directed from the board when this new amount was adopted.

So, I can't directly answer your question about the number or amount of sponsored ICANN meetings, I would suggest that's a question for our GSE colleagues because that is something that they run. But, if look at categories B and C, leaving aside the question of numbers, or amount we've tried to build in some flexibility so that it may or may not involve meetings where there is a monetary contribution or where there is something ICANN organized, so that's a conversation for each RALO to have with its respective VP from the GSE team.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We currently have a queue of myself, Tijani, Sebastien, Glenn, and Eduardo, and I think Javier and we are [CROSSTALK]. Sorry?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: May I answer this?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no sorry. We are out time. The interpreters need 10 minutes for a break.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, I'll write it on the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can continue without interpretation if you'd like? Another 10 minutes without interpretation, that's the coffee-break. Alright, and I thank the interpreters very much, you're off. And we will continue talking. Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and I'll try to be quick. So, looking at, and I'm glad we're looking at this slide, looking at the ICANN public meeting occurring in that RALO's region, was never the intent of CROP to begin with and there seems to be a shift. It's community region outreach, and I'm not getting -- an ICANN meeting in a community is already an outreach. What a waste of ICANN money to actually use this for an additional person coming to an ICANN meeting.

Second, the GDD summit. You've mentioned it here and one of the later slides afterwards, I'm afraid to have to tell that this is an industry related summit that is restricted to registries and registrars. That's what it says on the GDD summit webpages. Okay well basically, this might have to be fixed big time because when we have us to be able to attend those, I don't think we've actually been able to attend these and there is no policy actually being discussed in there either; it actually says on the website.

Thirdly, for the rest of the meetings I didn't get an answer, is GSE budget basically for support of local meetings being used, because if that's the case then that's a double reduction with CROP and GSE.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We're gonna go for a few more minutes. I think we need a bio break at least for a few minutes before we start the next session. So, I don't think there's time for answers. What I am gonna do is we'll go as far as we can which will allow us another three minutes we'll then ask anyone to submit their questions to staff, we'll pass them on to accounting, we'll pass them on to the appropriate people and hold a teleconference as soon as possible. [CROSSTALK]

We'll do our best to make sure that doesn't happen this time is all I can say, and I'll reiterate with Olivier said. GDD summit, it'll be hard for us to justify outreach at a GDD summit, even if we're allowed to go. And I'll also point out --

MARY WONG: Alan, may I also jump in really quickly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

MARY WONG: That we've used the GDD summit as an example, its not the only event limited to B because at this point we don't know what other ICANN organized events there may or may not be and that's not within the remit of the finance or even the policy team to determine so it's important to remember, we're doing our best to build in as much flexibility so we can provide to the community within the budgetary restriction 150 thousand dollars and within the restriction that we in AUG initially receive from the board that was initially ICANN meetings and ICANN sponsored meetings so we understand it's difficult and it's frustrating but we're trying.

And to some of the questions that were sent to us, we apologize we were late in our response because we were working on these guidelines and we were hoping today to provide you with some answers and we're certainly happy to take in questions as much as we can.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you and I'll point out in my 12 years at ICANN, I can't remember ICANN organizing an out of session, and I don't think that applies to us, so. The history isn't really good, and I'll also point out RAR's, the RAR for any given person is not necessarily in their own ICANN region. The RAR meeting because the boundaries are not the same. We have time for one more question, who's next on the list? Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. This spirit of the CROP is to make outreach and to bring people to ICANN, teach people that we didn't know about ICANN, or who are, who have never been interested in ICANN. If you restrict the CROP the ICANN meetings, to the ICANN public meetings, and if there is not public meeting you can have other kind of meetings.

This is absolutely out of the spirit of the CROP because ICANN meetings, people know that there is a meeting of ICANN in the

country -- and do we always do outreach in this country since we are here, come to those meetings. So, this is not the objective, the objective is to go to regions that we don't know and to go to that environment not the ICANN environment. That's why and that's how and that's where we can recruit people. So, I think that these guidelines are, in my point of view, out of the spirit of the CROP. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Thank you for participating. No -- we really don't have time for an answer. Please understand we're not attacking you personally but this is the only method we have of conveying this level of frustration that we have and it's a large one and you will hear from us.

So, I repeat please, everyone who has comments or questions, please forward them to staff. We will consolidate, and we will schedule a teleconference as soon as possible. You may, we have four minutes for a bio-break before we start the next meeting.

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Just, since I realize y'all have a lot of questions and additional comments, please feel free to reach out to CROP staff and we can happily join another call out of the ICANN meeting, so I think

that, that might be helpful so that we can address all of your questions more thoroughly.

ALAN GREENBERG: We will set up a Wiki page for people to post their questions, how about that? So, you don't have to actually email them. Action item.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But the question is that you answer the question and that you hear us. We are not living in the same world, in the same organization. You don't understand what we are trying to tell you. That it's B.S.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thank the technical staff for bearing with us and we will try to reconvene in about five minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]