BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (8 of 13)
Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

ALAN GREENBERG: … Users and all sorts of other end users. Sebastien, to address that, has said, "Yeah, keep end users in, but add back individual." Take off my chair hat and put my personal opinion in. I don't think there's a difference between Internet users and end users. I use the terms interchangeably and I don't think there's any formal definition. I may be wrong.

I would strongly advise that we do not, without significant discussion, change how we define our community, and in specific, I would suggest that if we are going to change this definition, we also want to have that change reflected in the bylaws, that we don't want to have two different definition that are sparring with each other and that this is not the appropriate time. There will be significant discussion about what the community should be in the review.

I will point out, for instance, that I disagree with the very first part of that sentence. I think At-Large is the home of users, not the ALAC. The ALAC is 15 people.

So, I think this is not the time to wordsmith that document which is in the bylaws and I would strongly suggest that we not do that. I will take a very short queue. We have another 25 minutes, 23 minutes, to finish this whole section. Not just 1.1, the whole set of rules of procedure, so I don't want to spend a lot of time on it.

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.

If we do not have clear agreement here, it would be put to a vote of the ALAC on Wednesday. So, we do not have to finish it here. It would be nice if we can take it off the table here and come to closure. I see Jonathan and I think Marita. I can't see whose card it is, but I'm assuming it's Marita's card. I don't see anyone else whose hand is up right now. Javier. We have one minute timer and please keep it concise.

Heidi is suggesting before people speak let you know what it takes to change the bylaws. The rules are different for different parts of the bylaws, but the bylaws describing At-Large, we would have to make a proposal to the board. The board would have to accept it. It then goes before the whole community to object to it and they [can] be changed. It would take a good number of months and I believe they would want to see a strong rationale for why the new words are better than the past words.

So, there is no question. We are not changing the bylaws right now. It's not on the table at all, even if we wanted to. So, thank you, Heidi, for that suggestion. Jonathan, Marita, Javier, and Sergio. One-minute timer.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'm a broken record on this issue, but I don't think either one of these are a definition anyway. It's just a semantic distinction without a difference. I think, instead, we need to be thinking more broadly about the interest you represent and to make it about end users doesn't really make it a distinct group of people at all and I'm not sure that it should be. I think that we ought to be focused on end user activities and people

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

that are engaged in them and that that's the interest that we represent. It isn't a discernable group of people that we're attempting to represent the interests of, but really a type of activity on the Internet that in fact represents the majority of the activity on the Internet.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we can keep the discussion focused on this proposal and not where we should go sometime in the future when we go there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. I've had enough experience with this kind of stuff to say that you cannot start changing documents down the line. If you're going to change things like this, you must start with the root documents which are the bylaws, and changing bylaws is not a trivial issue, as Alan noted. So, I'm out on this one for sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Javier?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Support Marita.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sergio?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I mean, I believe that the fact of having individual users instead of end users has a connotation. We have been discussing the addition of individual users to the bylaws and we have been using and we have worked on – in our regions, we have worked on this topic. So, this is not just something that we cannot take into account. This is a political issue. We are using those terms. And because of that political reason, I think that we should have Internet end users and not Internet individual users. This has a connotation. That phrase has a connotation, a very strong connotation, especially for the organizations that have a collective representation or a group representation. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would point out that the term we use is "unaffiliated" individual members. That's the key word in differentiating those users from those [of parts] that are affiliated with ALSes. The individual users we're talking about here are the four billion individuals who use the Internet, not the very tiny part of that that's part of At-Large. Next we have Dave and then Humberto and I'd like to close the queue at that point.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: I think we should not go and then change the bylaws. If the bylaws need a change, it has to be discussed thoroughly, but we can't change the bylaws at any time.

If ever we decide to go and take the route to change the bylaws, then I'm making a proposal that the wording should be the ALAC be the primary organization for the At-Large community which consists of individual Internet users, if ever we need to go and change the bylaws.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that reduces it from four billion to a few thousand. I'm not sure I would support that. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you. I will be very brief. I just say that I don't agree with Sergio, and along these lines, I am in favor of the suggestion put forth by Sebastien Bachollet because I had [to work] in Chile in a project for the defense of users in case of disparate resolutions and many of the users that we defend are small and medium-sized companies. I mean, they are entrepreneurs. So, the suggestion or the amendment being proposed by Sebastien Bachollet, I believe it is more accurate and a broad suggestion that might reflect our task. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Could I have a show of hands of the four billion Internet users … No. Can I have a show of hands of ALAC members, current ALAC members, - are there any current ALAC members who would like to see a change at

this point? I don't believe we have quorum here, so this is … We do have quorum. I see number eight. How many people, current ALAC members, would like to see a change in this wording as opposed to keeping what is currently there and what is in the bylaws?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But current, you mean the draft we have?

ALAN GREENBERG: The first two sentences have not changed in the draft, so it is current and proposed. You would like to see a change?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am really confused. Yes. Because I never heard that we are proposing to change what is currently in the bylaws regarding the definition. This is my problem. I'm sorry I was late because I was at another session.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I will repeat. We cannot change what is in the bylaws here. We can one day if we have a strong enough will and a reason. What was suggested was to change the words that we have in our rules of procedure, which currently are a copy of the bylaws, to be something else. Sergio has made one proposal. Sebastien has made yet another proposal. I am asking, are there any current ALAC members who support such a change. May I see hands of current ALAC members … Yes, Ricardo?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: We will be going back to the one [you show us] this morning or we are going back to the one that's already on the … Sorry. I have the same confusion as Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no proposed change on the table from me changing the first two sentences. They are out of the bylaws and I believe are a crucial part of defining who we are. We may change in the future, but that would require significant discussion. So, I believe we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Are there any ALAC members along there? I don't think so. We have eight ALAC members at this point, all of whom are supporting no change. Therefore, that is a majority and we will not entertain a change at this point.

It is a valid discussion to have going forward, and as I said, I think the first sentence is wrong to begin with because the ALAC is not the home of Internet users. At-Large is. So, lots to change but I don't think it's today's job. The only thing we've changed in 1.1 are the things which reflect the fact that our RALOs now also have unaffiliated members in addition to ALSes.

Can we put back the rules of procedure document now? Thank you. And when we get it up, scroll to page eight. Give me a moment. I had the wrong document up here in my screen. Now, I'm omitting things like pure typographical errors. In one point, we had two periods, so I removed one of them. I don't think we need to debate those here. I

hope. Bottom of page eight, please. This is the 34-page document with red-line and blue-line changes. For the record, we have 12 more minutes left in this timeframe. I'll start talking about it even if it's not on the screen.

This is a new section, section 5.9.10. It is a section that's been added. In general, the ALAC chair has very few discretionary rights. That is the ALAC chair, with only a few exceptions, can only act on the direction of the ALAC. This is a new section which says if the bylaws or the ICANN board give a specific responsibility to the chair, as opposed to the group, that those responsibilities can be exercised by the chair alone without consulting the ALAC.

So, as an example – and the only one that is currently in the bylaws is the seven AC/SO chairs select the members of the specific reviews. The members have to be endorsed by AC/SOs, and for instance, the ALAC members are endorsed by the full ALAC, but the decision on which ones to put on a specific review if there are more candidates is a responsibility given by the bylaws to the chairs. This allows the chair to exercise that responsibility.

Some other example is recently the SSR-2. A year ago, the SSR-2 review was halted and the chairs were given the responsibility of deciding what the problems were, fixing them, and restarting the review.

Even though we don't have the words on the screen, are there any comments on this? I'll wait for it to show up before scrolling to the next one. Bottom of page eight. It's in red, easy to see. There we go. If we can make it any larger, that might help those of us who have aging eyes.

Alright. Seeing no comments, no hands, let's go to the next one. Page 16, please. Thank you.

We have recently been using consensus decisions of the ALAC much more than we have in the past. There was no provision for that in the rules of procedure and all this says is that for consensus decisions made via e-mail we use the same rules as for consensus decisions in person, and that is the rule of thumb – and it is a rule of thumb, not a law, is that we need 80% in support of, which means not more than 20% against for something to be considered consensus.

The only comment that was made in the discussion on this was by Seun who pointed out that that presumes that – no, sorry. That's in regard to a different item altogether. Sorry. So, there were essentially no comments on this. No comments here? Thank you.

Page 18. At the bottom. Thank you. We have several sections in the rules of procedure for essentially saying how ALAC meetings are held and what it says is they're open, anyone can attend, anyone can speak, but it's up to the chair's discretion to prioritize who speaks and priority is given to those formal members of the group.

I realize although ALT meetings have always been similarly open and subject to similar rules it's never been documented and my original addition which you see on the screen right now simply said basically meetings are open.

The issue was raised, if you can scroll down to the top of the next page. The issue was raised, but how do we determine speaker order and

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

such? So, I essentially copied and pasted the other subservient sections from the ALAC, changing appropriately from ALAC to ALT. Hope there's no discussion needed on that. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just a small point. Priority should be given to the ALT members, and then after that, the ALT advisors because normally the decision … Not the decision, but if the ALT should take anything, only the five members are able to do so. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I personally don't think we need to specify that in detail. The chair is the one who is given explicit control over the speaker order and the chair can make the decisions based on what the subject is. If the subject happens to be one that is of critical interest to one of the liaisons, that person may well get priority. Maybe. If we can't trust the chair to do that properly, we have chair removal procedures.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, if I follow your rationale, we don't have to put any rule. The chair will do everything. We trust him. We trust everyone, but it is good to have rules, clear rules, so that there is no misunderstanding. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there a strong feeling that we need to clarify that here? Andrea?

ANDREA GLANDON: Sebastien would like to know … He has one question proposal about ROP. Can we add a maximum time to deliver result on any election selection consultation?

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi was talking to me. Can you repeat the first part again?

ANDREA GLANDON: "I have one question proposal about ROP. Can we add a maximum time to deliver result on any election selection consultation?" That's from Sebastien.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Given that nothing was raised in the whole discussion period and there is nothing in our plan changes in that area, I would suggest that that is not something that we can add at this point. It's certainly a valid thing to add, although from experience, I would say there always has to be an escape hatch because there are some unusual circumstances which cause significant delays in announcing result. So, again, it's a fair comment. I'm not sure that wording is reasonable and I think it's a bit late to add a brand new section right now.

Page 26. This is some relatively minor clarifications. The first one simply says – normally we have a seven-day waiting period for acceptances. This simply says that if everyone has already accepted or declined, we don't need to wait for the end of the period. The second one is [inaudible] avoidance of doubt. There are two potentially conflicting

rules. One says that if there are a majority of the sitting ALAC members vote, then we can declare a winner. But, later on it says what happens if we have three people running and the last two tie? So, it could be a situation, for instance, of 13 votes, one and one. It's not 100% clear whether the majority takes place or we have to go through the procedure associated with the three and this simply says if there's a majority, the winner is declared. So, it's an edge case. It's not likely to happen often, but it clarifies a potential dispute. I see no comments.

Page 29, the next page. Sorry. I was talking about the wrong page. That was not one of the ones I was planning to focus on. If we can go back to page 28, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: 26, there is a lot of modification that you skipped.

ALAN GREENBERG: That I skipped? Okay, hold on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [off mic].

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah! You're right. Thank you. That's actually a substantive one. This is in the board selection process. Sorry. Is this the board or the … I've lost track. Sorry, this is election of the chair. This is talking about what happens if there are three candidates for chair – something which has

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

never, ever happened. We have had times when there's no candidates, but we've never had three. But, if there are three and we have a run-off, what happens if the two candidates tie? This simply says … Remember I gave two options and this simply says if we are left with one candidate, that candidate is subject to another vote with an abstain option and the candidate still has to get the majority of votes. And all of the people who gave an opinion selected opinion B, so that was the one I put in.

27 is a non-substantial change. It puts in a [/staff] which was accidentally omitted in the original document.

28. The first change is relatively small. It uses the correct term instead of the incorrect term for people who are part of the NomCom. They're delegates, not representatives, and it clarifies the procedure that is used and has always been used for appointing the delegates. That is, there are recommendations from the RALOs which are then considered by the ALAC.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There is one before.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is one before.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: 18.3.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, okay. In case of selections requiring complex or specific criteria, the ALAC may choose to form a subcommittee to carry out the analysis and make recommendations. Several years ago, the ALAC decided to form the ALAC Appointee Selection Committee and in virtually all cases where the ALAC must make a choice, it goes to this committee to make a recommendation which the ALAC can then accept or not. Sometimes this group gives the ALAC options. Often, it does not.

Because we decided to go to this committee with virtually every selection, they are not all necessarily complex procedures. So, this simply ratifies the fact that we can go to this committee even if it's not complex, but just we're looking for certain criteria. It just puts the words in line with what we do.

Judith had suggested that we actually name the committee. We do not name any other ALAC committees in these rules of procedure and I don't believe we need to here. May I go on to the next page, Tijani? Your eyes are obviously much better than mine.

The next one I have noted is page 29 and one of them is correcting a URL. The last paragraph, however, is relevant.

This is part of the board selection criteria. The process we have is that people essentially apply. They fill in an expression of interest and it's reviewed by a committee made up of representatives of all the RALOs and that committee – the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) – creates a slate of candidates. Those people will eventually be voted on by the full electorate, plus there is currently a provision that the RALOs can take a candidate that had applied but was not successful

and put that candidate back on the slate. In other words, say the BCEC made a mistake. They omitted someone who we strongly feel should be a candidate and put it back. We'll talk about that procedure in a second.

This simply says that the BCEC must publish some information about the candidates, so the electorate or the RALOs can make informed decisions. That has been the practice in two out of the three elections and was not in this last one, so we felt it was important. It was certainly the intent. Scroll to the top of the next page.

It was pointed out some candidates, if they're not successful, may not want their name published. If I run and I'm not successful, I don't want everyone to know I was rejected. Therefore, we will give the candidates the opinion of not having their information published if they are not successful. That of course means they cannot be subject to a petition, but that's a decision they can make. Any comments on any of this? Thank you.

The petition process, which is the next one … Olivier, please go ahead. We are eating into the CPWG time, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Just a very quick one. In light of GDPR with regards to the candidates themselves, at the moment, if I understand correctly, the names and details and all the details of the candidates are actually on public pages. Should there be an provision for these to be behind a log-in since this is really for the ALAC to look at?

ALAN GREENBERG:	It's not necessarily just the ALAC because RALOs have a say in these elections and things like that, too.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Or members that have [inaudible] on the Wiki.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I have asked ICANN to provide us with advice regarding GDPR and privacy issues. We have not had that yet. It's something the next ALAC will have to consider going forward. We are not allowed to say, by the way … Well, we are allowed to say, "Are you willing to have your information published?" But they have the right to say no and we cannot change their privileges because of that.

For instance, that last paragraph I just talked about saying, "You can say don't publish," but then you're still eligible for selection. Now, how do we know you're eligible for selection if we don't know your name is there? We have some real problems there. I don't know how to solve it. We're not going to solve it in this iteration. It's not the only place. There's a whole issue of we publish mailing lists with e-mail addresses with names in them. We have public things. We have public Wiki pages where people post things. How much of that is not GDPR compliant, I don't know.

Okay, back to the petition process. The concept of the petition was introduced in that to address the issue of if significant parts of the At-Large community feel that the BCEC, the committee which remember is composed of people they put there, erred – if they made a mistake

and they omitted a really good candidate, that the RALOs can put that candidate back, essentially.

The requirements are that three RALOs had to act to do that, so three out of the five. In essence, if each of them felt that this was a compelling candidate that should be there.

There is a question in the last election which is the first time we ever had a petition made by one RALO as to given that one RALO acted, do the others have to consider that same candidate? Certainly, the original intent – and Cheryl is not here, but she's one of the other few people who were here at the time. The original intent is each of the RALOs really had to feel strongly. Not just, "Are we willing to tick the box off and say yeah." So, this procedure makes it relatively clear that one doesn't trigger the other. There has to be time for the first RALO to tell the other RALOs and give them time to consider, but they don't necessarily have to vote on it, for instance.

In the discussion that has ensued, there was a very strong sentiment expressed from ALAC members and non-ALAC members to omit the petition thing altogether. That is, it was a nice idea but we don't need it. The BCEC is composed of people that we've selected. Why don't we trust them?

Personally, I agree with that sentiment, but it's a significant alteration of the procedure and I don't believe we can consider it on the fly in this set of revisions if the ALAC feels – the next ALAC feels at all strongly, it's something that the ALAC could consider. Tijani, who has acted as the chair of the committee that oversees all the elections has made several,

four or five other significant suggestions in how we should select the board member – changes to how we select the board member. I think all of them should be considered. But that's a discussion that we need to have. And of course, we need to decide is a discussion on board member selection where we want to spend our time or do we want to spend our time on policy issues and stuff? The time that we're taking away from right now to discuss this.

So, the proposal are the words. There has been nothing that was said on the list in the interim other than do we really want this whole procedure at all? And I think that's a valid thing, but Tijani has his hand up. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Alan, I was there when this selection of board member was defined and the text was written. I arrived at the end, but I was there. And I remember I was against the petition, but you convinced me that it is a good thing and I accepted it.

Today, we are seeing that we need the RALOs to decide. The way it is done now is that if the chair or the leadership don't want it, they don't do anything. And for Alan, if nothing is done, that means that the RALOs don't want it. It is not my point of view. If we have to keep this petition, we have to make the RALOs decide. The RALOs, not the chair, not the leadership. The RALOs. And this is the point of difference between me and Alan and I really want it to be sorted out, but I know he is right. We cannot do it now. But, I disagree with him when he said, "Shall we do that or work on policies." This is very important because the next

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

selection is very soon. It's the one in 2020, I think. So, we need to sort it out far before so that it will not be done according to the candidates. We have to do it [inaudible] now that we don't have candidates. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you and we'll pass that on to the next chair. Just for the record, I may have convinced you we need to leave the petition in not because I [inaudible]. I thought it was a dumb rule to begin with. But, we had strong support from our community. I was the drafter the rules but drafters don't change the rules, necessarily. We have a comment from [inaudible]. Please, go ahead, Andrea. Then we have Dave. Again, we are eating significantly into the CPWG time.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This is from Sebastien. His first sentence is proposed text. "A RALO has no obligation to act in relation to a petition within another RALO." And then the second is his comment. "I really think that the minimum for a RALO is to answer to a proposal to any other RALO."

ALAN GREENBERG: He is suggesting that we say that each RALO must respond and I don't disagree. I believe he is suggesting what Tijani is suggesting, that the RALO must take a vote. I don't know what we would do if the RALO chose not to. We have no control over that.

We are not going to finetune this. Either we make this change or we omit it altogether. We'll take a vote of the ALAC on Wednesday to decide which way to go.

I have page 30 and I'm not quite sure what is there. Oh, that's the one we just did. Page 32. Oh, sorry. Dave, go ahead. Please, Dave.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: Okay. I think this proposed change is very important. [inaudible] we have five RALOs and each of the RALOs are in support of one candidate. So, we are going to have [inaudible] for five candidates. I think in the wording mentioned by Alan, it should be clear [inaudible] that if three out of the five RALOs support a candidate. It has to be very clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe it is very clear.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: No, the wording is not clear. [inaudible] a RALO believes that [inaudible] RALO. I'm not telling a RALO. We have five RALOs. If AFRALO decides that my candidate is good, or EURALO decides my candidate is good, we are going to have a petition of five candidates. That's why, in the wording, it has to be very clear that if three out of the five RALOs decide that a specific candidate has to go on the [slate has to go]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Dave, 19.9.3 says candidates will be added only if they receive support through a formal vote of at least three of the five RALOs, each RALO voting according to its own rules. I believe that is clear. If you'd like to propose alternative wording to that paragraph … Paragraph 19.9.1 talks about what a RALO must do. 19.9.3 talks about the condition under which someone can be added to the ballot.

Page 32, section 19.11.8. This is one that has been a disagreement on from Seun, so I will try to describe that disagreement. We have another provision earlier that says in normal votes of the ALAC, we always must have an abstain. This says that should apply in the selection of the board member also. The exception is in regard to the process we use to narrow down a large number of candidates to three. We use a proportional voting mechanism where everyone rates all of the candidates first priority, second priority, third priority and that kind of voting mechanism does not allow an abstain because otherwise you'd be prioritizing abstain and abstain could win the election. So, other than that …

Now, the problem is the rules for selection saying you must have a majority of those voting to win. That means an abstain effectively counts as a no, because since we're only counting the yeses, voting for another candidate or abstain goes against the one candidate. So, he believes that abstain should be we do not count the person. That would require a change to the rule on how we recognize a winner, which I think is a substantial change and therefore we need to decide do we include this paragraph of abstain or do we not? If we do not, if we do not include this paragraph, it is up to every committee governing the election to

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

decide whether to put abstain there or not. I'll accept a comment from Tijani since he's been in that position two times now.

So, the question is not on the merits of it, do we include this paragraph or not?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. In fact, it is not. My proposal is that since we agreed that everything related to the selection of the board member should be discussed later and the rules should be updated later, but before the next round of the selection, everything related to this selection should be left to this stage. Now let's do the other modification but not those related to the selection of the board member.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, you're suggesting that we include in the vote of the ALAC whether we include the petition section, we also include this section.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Fine. Let's see what else is left at this point. I have page 34. Hold on, there was something at the bottom of 33. 32, sorry. This one says revocation of ALAC appointments. That's a standard thing that we have. We can tell you you're no longer liaison. This simply notes that revocation of the selection of a board member is governed by a bylaw

provision and is not governed by these particular rules. Again, this is one of the conflicts that came up with the bylaws.

And last on page 34. These are a number of changes related to the empowered community. The powers that the community can use to approve or reject budgets, remove board directors or the whole board for that matter, and a number of other actions. And for instance, has to approve certain classes of bylaw changes, the ones that are key to the accountability of ICANN.

There were a number of provisions that were put in for the transition. For those who aren't familiar, we believed that there would be a transition of IANA from the US Department of Commerce to ICANN and that was contingent on accountability bylaws. We were in a position where we had to say that if the bylaws get approved, or when the bylaws get approved, then certain key provisions kick in. And the paragraphs that are removed, if you look at them, describe that process.

Another one of the provisions here said as soon as the new bylaws kicked in, all of the directors were no longer directors anymore. We did not have a board. One of these provisions said we are reappointing our current board member. They were transition. They could be left in without harming anything. I've chosen to make it cleaner and not have to explain them to someone five years from now and are just removing them. I left the section numbers in because I personally have … I don't like renumbering sections that haven't changed otherwise and I think

that's the standard procedure, so I've left the section numbers in, noting that they're not omitted by accident.

The only substantive change there is in section 24.3 where it says the representative on the empowered community, who is the chair by default but can be changed, may only act on instruction from the ALAC because it is the ALAC that makes the decision to take action and not the chair. But there's an exception. Because of the legal structure that we're using under California law, the empowered community members must appoint board directors.

So, if for instance we selected Leon as our board director, the other ACs and SOs don't have the right to say no. They have to. If the NomCom appoints people, we have to say yes. So, the empowered community representative has no discretion in those areas and that simply says we're not in violation of our own rules by the chair acting without consulting the ALAC first. So, it's just a nicety.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Representative, not the chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, the representative. And that's it. So, in summary, we have adding a footnote about the European ALS which is comprised of individual members, the unaffiliated members who are affiliated, and we will put to a vote of the ALAC whether to make the [inaudible] changes associated with the selection of a board member or not before we vote

on the final package. Done. Thank you very much. Jonathan, my strong apologies. We have taken a very significant part of your time.

Just a note. At this point, we believe we still have a 30-minute slot unused in the wrap-up session part two, and assuming it doesn't get usurped by something else deemed to be more important, we will give more time to the policy group then because I think this is really important. To be clear, I could not leave in clear conscious a set of rules of procedure we've had a whole bunch of problems in and leave it to Maureen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Olivier Crepin-LeBlond and next to me is Jonathan Zuck and we're both co-chairs of the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group, that is a consolidation of several working groups that existed prior to this meeting.

Just giving a quick intro since I don't think that everyone around the room is part of this Consolidated Policy Working Group. The working group, by its very name, is dealing with all matters of policy whether it's policy that affected the ccNSO, the GNSO, pretty much anything that takes place [inaudible] including the responses to public comments. We have weekly meetings. We've been following the … I have to speak closer to the mic. This one is weird. It doesn't work. Look at that. It sags.

So, the working group in itself has met weekly. We follow very closely the expedited PDP on all these GDPR issues but we also follow the Subsequent Procedures Working Group and the Generic Names

Supporting Organization and a whole lot of other things as well. So, I'll hand the floor over to Jonathan as he's got some slides to share with us. So, over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. My voice hasn't aged as much, I guess, as you're saying. But, no. We're trying to figure out what the best way is to accomplish a number of different things that come up in a number of different ways in our various discussions. One of the top issues is how do we get more people engaged in the policy development and policy communication process. There's sort of two different processes involved there. One involves figuring out what we're trying to say and then figuring out the different ways we're going to say it. That's in public comments and it's also in participation in various work groups that are formed most often through the GNSO, but sometimes they're cross community as well. So, we're looking at what the barriers to entry are for people, trying to figure out how to get more people engaged. But also deal with this issue of representation a little bit better also.

So, this is a little bit of a repeat of a slide deck that I gave a couple of ICANN meetings ago to just talk about a process because what we want to do is find a way to more actively engage the RALOs in this process of policy development.

So, this first slide is just meant to represent the tug-of-war between business and contracted parties that often takes place inside of ICANN with the end user being the teddy bear about to be torn in half in the middle, and then floating up like angels in the sky is the NCSG.

So, the idea here is simply that we're trying to figure out how best to represent the interests of the teddy bear in the middle of the tug-of-war. Next slide.

Again, I think the objective that we're trying to have is a persistent of perspective. In other words, try to bring an end user perspective to these discussions and have that be something that's somewhat consistent so that people know what the At-Large position is on X, Y, and Z and that that's something that's kind of known community wide because everyone has become involved in evangelizing that point of view. That's something that we're trying to work through.

So, the At-Large community needs to be selective in the things that it forms opinions on because there is a specific end user perspective focused on just those issues and consistent to the extent possible. That doesn't preclude anybody from representing their individual point of view. They just don't do it as an At-Large representative. You're here. You're a human being. You're welcome to have views that diverge from whatever the consensus position of the At-Large is, but ideally, when you're there wearing the name badge on a work group of "I'm the At-Large representative to X." You're helping to try and promote the consensus positions of the At-Large. So, the rest of the time we're just individuals, as I said. Next slide.

Some of you have seen this a little bit before, the comment funnel, how we sort of decide the positions that we take. The first one is whether or not it's within ICANN's remit. So, we have tried very strenuously to filter out things that just simply aren't ICANN's business, even though we

may individually feel very strongly about them. One of those that happened was net neutrality, for example. It was something that got discussed, but sort of got filtered out of our policy development process because it was outside of ICANN's remit.

The second – and this is somewhat contentious, which is why I bring this up. Alan challenged this earlier – is there a unique end user perspective? Is there something that we bring to the table that's different than the discussion that's already taking place or are we just engaged in a me-too exercise and we can do that, but ideally if we're trying to actually spend time developing a position on something, it's because our voice is not otherwise represented. In other words, is there something that we're going to bring to the debate that isn't already being expressed? Can we achieve consensus then?

Then, at that point, we try to allocate resources to developing the position, drafting the comment, putting together talking points for people that are engaged in working groups, etc. The idea is that gets smaller and smaller as we go down this inverse funnel, if you will, so that we're very focused and consistent in the positions that we take. Next slide.

So, similarly in work group participation, the idea would be to allocate resources to the working groups with intention. In other words, the same process ideally would take place. We try to identify which working groups it makes most sense for At-Large to be represented and try to allocate resources to that as opposed to just saying, "Hey, go do whatever you feel like and report back." Let's try to figure out where

that end user voice could be most effective. Attempt a rough consensus on key issues and represent those views in the working group.

Then, finally, as new issues arise in the process of the working group, as Alan and Hadia have done, try to bring back those issues to the group so that there can be just a broader discussion and again new consensus developed around those issues so that our representatives can take that consensus back into the group. And that's not meant to prevent you from shooting from the hip as you need to, etc., in the context of a live debate to the extent possible. Let's try to bring the band along whenever we can.

Then, finally, just continue that process. That's an American expression of rinse and repeat. So, go back to the top and define consensus and allocate it out again. Next slide.

The idea behind the CPWG, etc., is that as it kind of was described earlier, Olivier and I are trying to build the plane while flying it and every once in a while, that leads to some wings falling off and things like that. But working on trying to figure out what its methodology is and what its role is in the policy development process. So, ideally, it would convene discussions on policy issues, facilitate the process of consensus building by sending messages out through the RALOs, and this is why we wanted to have this conversation with all the regional leaders is that we really need your participation in using whatever mechanisms you have available to achieve consensus among your constituencies so that you're able to bring that back to the policy development process.

Generate talking points for people that are participating in work groups and then take a first crack at this decision funnel. In other words, I think ideally this could be the initial filter, the CPWG could be the initial filter, on whether or not it makes sense for the At-Large to comment on something or whether or not it's a work group that we really ought to get engaged in, etc. That just becomes a recommendation for the broader group. It's not a decision-making body, but maybe an initial recommendation formulation body, if that makes sense. Next slide.

So, if we were to look at the public comment work flow, right now the staff kind of publish into the Wiki whenever there's a new public comment and I think it's unclear to the community exactly what should happen in that instance. And I, honestly, I didn't check. At one point, Alan, you said that the language got changed for people to begin to discuss whether or not we ought to comment on it as opposed to people beginning to comment on it and I honestly don't remember what it says. But it's a very dispersed and uneven process.

So, what I'd like to recommendation instead is that the staff bring new comments to the CPWG that appear each week and that we begin this process of narrowing initially and come up with a recommendation about whether or not we put this out for discussion in the first place. So it makes recommendation on whether to comment and what to say. Like, what's our high-level position on this issue that's being raised in the public comment?

Then, the community, potentially through the RALOs – this is again why I'm hoping that you all will have some feedback on this – will provide

feedback and reaction to these recommendations. Is this something we care enough about and is the position that we're recommending via CPWG the right approach?

Then, at that point, if that consensus is yes, we identify a penholder, place that first draft on the Wiki, and then make that the start of the conversation that happens on the Wiki and then continue as we do today with revisions, etc., and comments on the draft. So, that's the proposal part of this that I'm trying to put out for discussion among the regional leaders today. I don't even know if I've got another slide. That may be it because that was the money slide here. This is sort of the proposal. Is there another slide? Does anybody know? There isn't. Good. Okay. When it's really early in the morning, you just never know. There might have been a big question mark or the Riddler or something at the end.

I'm happy to open this up for discussion, but that's my proposal. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I would've thought – and this is just bringing some thoughts together. First of all, I would've thought the RALO actually have monthly meetings and [inaudible] that you can't have a policy slot in there and say these are the new items and have people talking about it.

A point that Tijani has made. They have got capacity building webinars on just about everything. Now, why is it that we can't actually, if something comes up, use what's already there and maybe just have a

special session that says we've done X submissions on this issue [inaudible], and by the way, this is what the issue is and then get some interest before we actually get to the overall working group. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I think those are good suggestions. My biggest reaction or concern with respect to some of that is just timing. There's a public comment that comes out. There's a certain number of days during which we're supposed to respond. So, I guess I'd be interested in broad topics being addressed on monthly items and doing webinars and trying to establish our positions on general topics and identifying those I think is an interesting exercise that we should take up. But I'm wondering if there's a more immediate process for reaching out to regional leaders and they in turn reaching out through surveys or something like that to get a quick response on some of the things that we're trying to do, just so that we're a more live process that's happening. I don't know if it's possible, but that's one of the things that I'm trying to put out there as a possibility. I'm happy to have someone else manage the queue if I'm not dealing with things in order.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Currently, I have a queue of myself, Satish, Marita, Tijani, and John Laprise, and Hadia. A number of things. The issue of what do we do right now, at one point we used to send out messages saying, "Does anyone volunteer to be a penholder?" before we decided we should make a comment. Hopefully, that's not being done anymore. We are

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

asking people, "Is there interest?" Whatever you come up with can replace that.

I strongly suggest you do not first post a draft and then open it up for comments. Soliciting input I think is the first thing because whoever drafts the first draft should not be drafting it based on their own personal position alone if other people have input, suggestion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can I just give feedback right there? Because it sounds like you have a list of things. I'm specifically trying to … And this may be too authoritarian, so push back on that. I'm specifically trying to introduce the CPWG into that process of developing rough consensus there and then, from that, a draft would come to which people would respond to. So, there's no context in which an individual would just draft something based on their own [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: What you said is someone will draft the first draft and then people will comment. I object to words being formalized before we've solicited input. It makes it too much of the person who drafted it is defending their words.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. That's why there's this idea of gathering community input to whether or not we should comment and what that comment should be.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to try to be concise. I'll go through the whole thing. Now I've lost my …

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's my fault.

ALAN GREENBERG: The unique community perspective. Now, if we have a unique one we want to do, [inaudible]. But, on the other hand, if we are so unique we're likely to lose the battle if we don't have any colleagues that we're agreeing with. So, very often, we try to find commonality with other groups so it is not unique and we can go with the GAC or with the SSAC or with someone else.

So, we definitely want a user perspective, if there is a specific one. Sometimes there won't be. Should the DNS work? I vote yes. Is that unique to users? I don't think so.

On the other hand, we do want to look for collaboration and partners in this because we're more likely to be successful if we have other groups speaking in the same way.

Consistency. At-Large is remarkably consistent. But there are times where we disagree. So be it. Sometimes, we just won't have consistency. The KSK rollover was one of those that we ended up having two strong groups who felt strongly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess we contend that means there isn't an At-Large position on the KSK rollover.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that may be the case.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And that's fine. That's my point. Let's not represent it as such if we haven't reached consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lastly, I understand you're trying to build the plane or repair it flying. We spent several years with backup group called something else, but was operating exactly like the CPWG is right now because it's modeled after it on the IANA stewardship transition and accountability. We have a lot of experience on those issues, unfortunately not on policy issues, where we have used this mechanism and it has worked very well. We were in a position to go – often with positions that differed very significantly from other parts of the community and could say the ALAC believes and At-Large believes because we had strong support from it. So, it can work. Now we have to make it work on these more transient things.

And the comment I couldn't remember before is, remember, on public comments we often have four to five weeks to do it. We can't afford too many weeks of consulting and deciding. So, if the CPWG meets one week, then we say RALOs go out – remember, the RALOs don't meet

until once a month often. So, just make sure we're not putting so many steps on it that we run out of time before we make a decision.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I guess I'd love for the Internet speed of things to find its way into the Byzantine processes of the At-Large. Forgive me for making that recommendation. But no, it's not going to be enough to wait until a monthly meeting to discuss about it. Is there a way to get live feedback so that we move forward with a position that we feel confident in our consensus around? Sorry, go ahead whoever is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Alan. From a very high-level perspective, [inaudible] innovations in ALAC I think that CPWG has been [inaudible] use for us and I'd like to thank both the ALAC leadership and the co-chairs of this working group for this.

The problem, on the other hand, as a RALO chair that I face is that I am personally very excited with this arrangement. Maureen had also told me how do we kind of get even more response from our grassroots? From our participants?

Despite writing them twice, e-mailing them twice, except for some people who are the same bunch of people, like Justine for example who is extremely active and a few of us, we are unable to get a [much]

participation into CPWG. I think it's a tremendous loss for them and this is not really a question to the co-chairs. It is for the larger group as to what do we do in order to gain the full benefit of CPWG from the perspective of participation from At-Large, from all of us?

Second question is, at least in Asia-Pacific, we celebrate our diversity. We have a very different bunch of people with all kinds of backgrounds and so on. But we are insisting that there should be just one consensus opinion when it comes to the policy. So, how does one – how we coexist in this diversity with a single opinion? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, I know your first question wasn't aimed toward me. That's a broader discussion. I'm necessarily proposing that we need to turn the CPWG into a replica of the entire At-Large community. I guess I'm trying to figure out a way to have the CPWG act as the archers, if you will, and the regional leaders act as a kind of infantry in that we quickly go through some logic exercises, basically, in the CPWG and are very selectively asking you to try and get some opinions out of your constituencies and [inaudible]. That's very different than trying to get them involved as drafters and things like that. I think that's a different exercise.

But addressing the criticism that we face in the community, that we're personality-driven, etc., I think would be greatly enhanced by having a framework in place and that's going to be imperfect, but a framework in place for trying to back up our policy positions with this constituency that we brag about so much and finding a way to do that and finding a way to do it in a reasonable amount of time I think is worth the effort.

Then, the second question. Again, this is something that I have my own views on and I really want to hear more discussion about is this idea of diversity versus consistency. I guess my point is that the At-Large as an organization, and ultimately the ALAC as an organization, will be more effective it's able to present a strong point of view instead of, "Well, we have some people that think this and we have some people that think that, because then the community doesn't know what to do with that.

So, I think that there's two things. If we can't form a strong opinion on something, that may mean that people are going to have to go out into the world as end users to address it rather than it being an At-Large position or we have to just drop the issue because there isn't a consistent end user.

But the reason it's worth doing is that the times that there is consensus will be far more influential because we've done the rigorous exercise of identifying a consensus position and it's hard. Doing that work means that people are more inclined to listen. So, that's why I'm pushing that. But again, open that up for conversation.

So, I think we have a lot of benefit from our diversity, but I think our objective has got to be to find a way to then manage that diversity into a consensus opinion whenever we can.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have the coffee break starting in twelve minutes and about eight people in the speaker queue, if people can keep their comments and their responses sort of concise. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll try to keep my responses consistent with the average level of conciseness that I've observed over the course of the past two days.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can't afford that time. We'll go to a one-minute timer and the next one we have is Marita.

MARITA MOLL: On your funnel chart there which said unique positions, I support the fact, of course, that if we have a unique position we should present it, but there's a lot of value, as Alan said, in collaborating with other groups and putting together where we agree with other groups that we should go and clearly ally with them, because for one thing, it's going to help out in your previous problem that you were talking about which is our public relations issue.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is in this – your idea is great. Idealistic. Really great. I think a lot of it is going to fall to how we can take that question out to our members. They don't have the background and many times they just don't have the language. It's going to be up to the people who are doing that to figure out how to communicate that. That's the hard part, as far as I'm concerned.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. It's definitely going to be difficult and I think that one of the things we're finding inside the CPWG is that we can't just have a call

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

and expect that everyone has read a document and is prepared to discuss in an organized way. I think we're trying as much as possible to boil questions down even for people that are experts on this topic, that that's necessary. So, that's for sure the case.

The other thing I want to clarify is I'm not talking about the At-Large only speaking up if it's got some proposal that no one else would be interested in. I don't mean that. What I mean is a unique perspective to bring to the discussion. In other words, we're supporting something that the IPC is proposing because of this perspective of end users is also fine. The question is are we adding to the discussion something that's not already being said? Or, if we're not, we can do a five-line comment that says, "We support X, we support Y." But, if we're going to go through the work of doing a real comment, it should be because we have something unique to add to the discussion. That's the point I was trying to make.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani is next. I can ask each speaker to specify whether they want a response or not. We don't really have the time for responses for everything.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I propose that you take all the questions and you answer at the end, because otherwise time will be lost. Second—

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard [inaudible]. Go ahead, sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I didn't hear you. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It doesn't matter. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. If all the At-Large members can be members of the CPWG, I would sign and say yes for everything, but I know that is not your intention because it is not possible [also] and because it is not effective. So, since it is like this, I have two comments. The first one is that the opinion of At-Large is not the opinion of the CPWG. So, yes, we can work on CCWG, but as you said, we have to consult with the regions, with the RALOs. And this consultation should be effective. It means that even if we don't have [inaudible] immediately, if someone one day finds that he didn't comment but he wants to draft something, we don't have to restrict taking the pen only for the CPWG members. It must be open to everyone.

And second, everyone can make comments even if At-Large or ICANN made public comments. It is open for everyone, so it is not a problem. We may disagree, but we have to be consistent and diverse. We cannot choose between them. We have to be both.

ALAN GREENBERG: If there is no response, John is next.

JOHN LAPRISE: Let me put on my Social Media Working Group hat for a moment. We've been doing something similar in the sense that we've devolved some of the responsibility from the [global level] working group to the RALOs and we've created working teams in each of the RALOs as leads and they look at local language, local content, shared content, at the RALO level. And then at the top level, staff and the working group find content that has global import and then share across global channels. I'm not sure if this is particularly useful, but it's something that we're using right now and it's in the early stages. We're seeing some success. It's a work in progress. No response required.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, first, I would like to thank the leadership team of the CPWG and then I would suggest putting a bullet after the first one. Firstly, staff would [bring] the new comments to the CPWG and then the Consolidated Policy Working Group would ask for comments from the RALOs and then we collect those comments from the RALOs and then comes step number three with the CPWG making recommendations whether to comment or not. So, I would propose one extra step before the recommendations made with regard to a certain topic, which would involve an input from the RALOs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, how much time should we give the RALOs to respond?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It doesn't have to be much. It could be like five days or six days and that's it. But they should have the chance.

ALAN GREENBERG: That may be a quarter of the whole comment period.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, two days.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next on our list is Dave.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: First of all, I want to thank the co-chairs of the CPWG. I think the CPWG will be as a catalyst, as an enabler for the commenting on the policy development process documents because the CPWG can, first of all, do the groundwork, decide whether this is [related] to the At-Large because [inaudible] of the At-Large community, so they know exactly what they're going to be useful to comment or to not. They do the groundwork. Then, they come with recommendations. After the recommendations, even they do the drafting. There is no harm if the draft is individually motivated because when we ask for comments, a

draft can be rejected. It will provoke discussions, so there's no harm having a draft and then having discussion on the draft and then finally we come a final document. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I had myself in the queue. I'm just responding quickly to Satish, Tijani, Marita, and several others. The problems we have right now with getting input is the people don't know what we're talking about. They're not necessarily interested. The people on our lists are not necessarily the right people and that's the whole subject of number two in the At-Large review. Get the right people to be listening to us. Next we have Maureen and that is the end of the queue. Alberto took his hand down. Olivier just raised it. If you have the time, fine. We are out of time in four minutes and we have Greg sitting there who is going to give us a half-hour presentation.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to comment on the diversity versus consistency issue. When we do have – especially if it's an issue that's very much end user related, there may be two really strong views. Because the … For example, I'm thinking about with Asia-Pacific, for example, there's some very diverse kind of areas and might have completely different views. That the examples of the impacts on those specific regions that actually create those strong feelings, those examples were very much appreciated by the board and former statements and stuff like that, when they can see that the impacts are actually – the diversity of the

impacts actually are important to the end user, that it's important [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That was the end of our queue. Olivier raised his hand afterwards. We have two minutes before the break. We of course can go into the break, but without any technical or translation support. I'll leave it up to Jonathan to either give Olivier the floor or not or make any final comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll just say briefly that this is a difficult issue and I didn't expect universal consensus the minute we talked about it. I think, as we went through the whole accountability process with the board, one of the things that came to the surface was that we are far too often putting the board in the position of making decisions on behalf of the community. "Well, there's this and there's this and we can't reach consensus so you do it for us." Then, we get mad at them because there's board encroachment on what should be community powers.

So, I think we need to stop that to the extent possible as a broader community, and I think being At-Large, stopping it as At-Large is the first thing to try and do because the board's position ought to be to simply figure out whether or not the community has followed its procedures. That's supposed to be the entire purpose of the board, not to hear that there's this interest, and this interest, and then they decide how to resolve those interests. That ought to be the work we're doing.

And so I feel like it's too easy to say let's just put out a diverse set of opinions because then we're saying let someone else make the decision how to weigh those efficiencies and I think that we ought to try to take that responsibility back, as hard as it is. That's all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. It's going to be very quick. First, I support what you're saying. Second, the work flow here that we have is not a linear work flow. Things have to happen simultaneously. This is the theory. In practice, it never works like this. When I was ALAC chair, I used to send things to RALOs, [inaudible] outside. No response for five days. Then, the last day, it's like, "Oh no! I don't like this." Then everybody says something else. We have a total cacophony and it was totally impossible to find a solution.

So, the first thing I would ask is for the RALOs to make sure that they have somebody on the Consolidated Policy Working Group. If you don't know who your members are on there, please find out. Otherwise, you're out of the policy thing. I don't even know what you're doing here. You need to do policy. This is a really important thing. So, first thing.

Second thing, talk to them. Make sure that everyone is synchronized and is going to be synchronized very fast because we only have usually 30 days to respond to these things. And I've run out of time and this is exactly what happens when we have to respond to public comments. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Just remember, if we get 400 people interested in the CPWG, no one will be able to speak. We don't want to be too successful but we do need to make it work. There's lots of discussion to be held. I'm still chair this week, and as far as I'm concerned, every ALAC member and every regional leader should be on the mailing list to at least be notified there's going to be a meeting. They can choose not to attend. But, if you're not there, if you're not aware of what's going on in policy in ICANN, why are you here?
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	And use e-mail and the Wiki to discuss things. Don't just wait for calls.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Olivier say what happened when he was chair. I'll add a word about my chair. People are completely silent until the statement is written. It's going to a vote and, "But, but, but I don't agree!" Where were you the last 30 days?
	I'd like to apologize to Greg Shatan who is here to give us a presentation and we've completely wiped him out. At this point, we believe there is still an opportunity for a session during one of the wrap-ups. If that does not get eaten by something which is deemed to be higher priority, we have invited Greg back and hopefully – he said he's available. Hopefully, we will not eat his time again. Thank you, Greg, for being flexible with us.
	Coffee break. When we come back, what are we doing?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Policy. Policy!

ALAN GREENBERG: After the break, RSSAC. Please be on time. We have guests and I think we want to hear what we're saying.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018