
PPC and Community Consultation Session
Thursday, March 15, 2012 – 09:00 to 10:30
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: For those of you sitting at the back of the room or the side of the room, you are very welcome to come to the table, if you would like to.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I confirm. Please take a seat around this table. It is very important to have us in front of -- to have you in front of us, with us.

There is plenty of room on the other side of the room, and please come. Please go to the table. It's the only way we will be able to engage.

Okay. Please take a seat. We will start in one minute. We will be two minutes late, but I think the people are still coming in, and we have to figure out how technically we will give you the presentation, but as soon as it's done, we will start.

Great. Thank you very much. Everything is ready except a few people are still waiting to be seated but there is plenty of room for everybody. Please take a seat around the table. It is important. Really, please, take a seat around the table. The people who are far from us will be difficult to engage and we would like to engage you in some discussion today.

Okay. We are in the Public Participation Committee and community consultation. It is something that was set up a few meetings ago by my predecessor, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and I think it's important that when we talk about public participation, that we discuss and engage with the community.

And thank you very much to be here.

I will give you the agenda for today, and first I will talk to you about the members of the PPC. Some are around the table and some will be joining us in a while.

I am Sebastien Bachollet, the chair of the PPC.

Chris Disspain is on my right, and he will talk today and you will have time to discuss with him.

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.

I do not know if Thomas Narten is over there but -- not yet.

Gonzalo Navarro either.

Mike Silber is here, just on my left after Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

And Kuo-Wei Wu I guess will join also in a while.

Thank you very much.

Unfortunately, we have a very tight schedule and a lot of conflicting agenda items -- no, agenda meetings this morning and that's why maybe some are not here. Because I hear that there is something around IPv6.

Gonzalo Navarro joining us. Then the people -- the others may be at the IPv6 issues.

The agenda, its introduction by myself, that is what I am doing now.

Then we will ask Filiz Yilmaz, who is on my right, now that Chris left, and she's the staff in charge of helping us in everything around the public participation.

She will maybe give you a little more -- a little bit more of what she's doing outside of that, but she's very instrumental in what we are able to do in this arena, and I want to take this opportunity to thank her for the hard work she and her team are doing for us. She will talk about the public comment improvements update, and we hope that it will be 15 minutes.

Then Chris Disspain will talk about an update on future ICANN meetings.

And then we will go to the outreach where we will have two presentations, one by Kurt Pritz, when he will join us, and then about the ICANN academy proposal by Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

And for each item, I hope to have time to engage discussion with you, and I am happy that you are so numerous around the table this time, and we hope to have you engage in the discussion.

Then we would like to have some house rules. The first one is, not like me, you put -- no, it's on -- your mobile phone on silence.

This is an interaction session and we want to hear your feedback, and there is discussion after each presentation or briefing from the speaker.

I guess the best way to -- let's have you raise your hand. If you're on Adobe Connect, I will try to recognize you also. But the people that are in the room, I will try to keep a list.

Identify yourself with name and affiliation, and we will do the same for remote participation.

I guess -- who is in charge of the remote participation? Janice is in charge and she will tell us what is happening in the remote.

I guess that's all and I will give the floor to Filiz for her presentation. Thank you very much.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you, Sebastien. I hope you can hear me well.

I will use the next 15 minutes or so to --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Speak up, please.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Okay. I will use the next 15 minutes or so to give you an update on the recent public comment improvements, and I hope to hear your comments, further feedback, on these issues with the time left.

So what we have done so far, this is basically -- when I say "public comment improvements," I just want to make sure that we understand what we are talking about.

There were 27 recommendations that were put in place by the review team, ATRT team, in regards to stratification and prioritization of public comments, separate comments and reply periods to be applied for each, and having an annual list of upcoming issues, those issues that are going to be subject to a public comment period.

And these were all clearly identified and recommended to the board at some point, and the ICANN board approved the initial implementation plans and this is what I refer to as the public comment improvements.

Because we implemented these enhancements in the light of these recommendations.

Now, how it evolved, basically here you see a time line.

In February 2011, the final public comment period over these recommendations were still active, and as soon as it was closed, obviously ICANN staff started reviewing them, after they received the general consent from the ICANN community through the public comment period.

In April 2011, ICANN staff started planning and making some preliminary recommendations to the ICANN board how we could implement these specific recommendations.

In June 2011, ICANN board approved the recommendations, together with the implementation plans. This was announced in the Singapore meeting, you may remember, if you were there.

This was -- while this was happening, we also used some phasing which I will explain in the next slide.

We did some gradual implementations, and until then, June, we already started some work which was not directly linked to the specific details of the implementations, but providing some fundamental foundation for the implementations to be done as soon as the board approves these initial plans.

So in Phase II, there was -- this is where we talk about the June 2011 to January 2012.

We work with the community defining the details of these implementations and getting further feedback through several different mechanisms which I will also explain in a minute.

In January 2012, the new system became active based on these implementations, which means now we are using them.

So I talked a little bit about the gradual implementation.

As I said, until June we worked heavily on creating a detailed implementation plan and then setting a foundation for further implementations where real details of these implementations can be implemented based on community feedback, because we needed that time to gather that feedback, obviously.

What we have done in this first phase, we created new public comment pages and we created some certain data tokens which were very helpful to integrate the further implementations on them later on.

Those are basically new consistent data tokens such as purpose, status, consistent usage of times for closing.

So all of the public comments are referring to UTC now and in a certain format. We use the same format in order to avoid confusion.

We also completed ATRT Recommendation 21, which was about the upcoming public comments pages by publishing a list in this period.

Now, what we do, we collect feedback from SO/AC chairs and all community leaders, including ICANN staff, and we create a list of projections in regards to which topics are coming -- are thought to be coming for public comment periods, and we publish them over the Web site.

In June-November, we work with the community, and in December, the full implementation took place.

So what was our work with the community in 2011?

During July and August, we formed a focus group. We made a call to the SO/AC leaders and community leaders, and I actually want to thank here for the support we received. The leaders appointed us at least one person from their groups, and that group worked fantastically with us. They devoted the time and it was a tremendous amount of feedback we received, and all the further implementations were based on those details.

So I'm really grateful.

We wouldn't be able to detect those details in that level because we are obviously very much blinded in a certain way. We look at these things all the time, while you are the users and you are the readers, so the community was -- that focus group was very able and capable of spotting what works and what doesn't work.

And after that initial feedback, fine-tuning the implementation details, we went out with a wider feedback mechanism for the public comments on the public comments enhancements for another month and a half, actually, and the target was to get even wider community feedback to make sure that this works, what was received initially is actually the reflection of the wider group too.

So based on the further community feedback we received during this period, we published a report and we held several consultation sessions during the Dakar meeting, as well as community Webinars on other times. Twice between July to September.

And in December, the ICANN board approved the final implementations, as we recommended to them, after receiving the further feedback, and now, these systems, like I said, are in place.

What we have now, all public comments are consistent with categorization, which this means they are tagged, which refers to the ATRT Recommendation 15.

They have two cycles, referring to ATRT Recommendations 16 and 17.

We have a comment period and the period is set to a minimum of 21 days.

There's a reply period that will follow up -- that follows up the comment period with another 21 days.

Of course if there are no comments in the first period, there is no need to call for a separate reply period.

And as I mentioned, we are already publishing the upcoming public comments and maintaining this list, with the help of SO/AC chairs, supporting group leaders, as well as the ICANN staff.

We also did some extra work and thought process during this period.

While we were committed to implement the ATRT implementations as directed by the review team, some parallel thought process was going on in regards to can we make this even better.

So it wasn't an ATRT recommendation, but we are still looking at the technical improvements on the public forum interface, so that while the structure is there as recommended, while the process is there as recommended, can we make the medium, the interface that the user is actually interacting on a day-to-day basis with, a bit better too.

And this process or work has -- is going on. Community help was tremendous, again, for this part.

We had a limited wiki testing, which was our prototype system, together with another group that was appointed again by the support from supporting organizations, advisory councils, and supporting stakeholder groups.

And again, we received tremendous feedback, and at the moment, we are analyzing the -- what we have done and our prototype in the light of that feedback, and the next steps will be making another set of recommendations if this should be the new way to go, should this be implemented further, and we will seek, obviously, leadership and guidance from the Public Participation Committee.

Thank you. This is all I have to say at this point. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Merci, Filiz.

(Speaking in a non-English language.)

This is only to show you that you have interpretation in the room. If you would like to take the floor in another language, like in French or in Spanish, this will be interpreted into the other language. Just to invite everybody to speak either French, English, or Spanish during this session, as we have interpretation.

Yes, Steve, I see you. I will give you the floor. And Marilyn.

But I think it's important that you can use the tools that we provide you in this meeting, and we have interpretation going on. Thank you.

Steve, the floor is yours, and then Marilyn.

STEVE METALITZ:

Merci beaucoup, Mr. President.

If I may, I'm with the intellectual property --

This is Steve Metalitz with the intellectual property constituency, and I really have two comments on the public comment changes.

The first is that -- and we've raised this a couple of times in the comments on the ATRT recommendations. ICANN has to decide whether it wants the public comment period to only cater to individuals or actually to cater to representative groups as well.

The idea of shortening the standard public comment window from 30 days to 21 days really sends the signal that we're only interested in what individuals have to say.

If you ask me, as Steve Metalitz, what do I think about a particular proposal or plan, sometimes I won't be able to come up with an answer at all. But if I can, I can usually do it pretty quickly, because I just think about it and figure out what I want to say.

But if you ask the intellectual property constituency what does it think about a particular proposal or plan, it can't go through the same process.

Our constituency consists primarily of international associations. Those associations are made up of, in some cases, other associations, in some cases companies, in some cases individuals.

I represent a group called the Coalition for On-Line Accountability. It has eight members. Six of those members are institutional members. One of them has 425,000 individual members. Others have 900 or so companies, large or small.

My point is that in order to let people know what the question is, find the people who are going to draft the answer, have that draft answer vetted up and down the line, and finally approved by the members of the constituency, all those things have to happen before we can file a comment.

So to say you're reducing the period from 30 days to 21 days sends a very clear signal that ICANN is not very interested in getting comments from constituencies or from others that have to go through that process.

We can -- there are things we can do to be more efficient. There's no question about that. But shortening the period does not strike anyone in our constituency as an improvement.

Now, let me just say the way this has been implemented in practice may not be as dire as what I've just said, and I'll give you an example.

There was a public comment period recently in which the IPC was the only -- filed the only comment in the 21-day period.

There were -- then the reply comment period opened and there were a handful of comments filed during that reply period.

Not a single one referenced our comment. They were all comments on the original proposition.

Now, after the reply period closed, ICANN staff went out and solicited an additional comment which came in after the reply period was closed -- in other words, more than 42 days -- and that's the one that responded to our comment.

But it seems as though the staff is -- we're treating this as a 42-day comment period, not as a 21-day comment period and a 21-day reply period. The only situation where we would be cut off after 21 days is if no one comments in the initial round.

So you can see where this is headed. We're going to make sure that somebody comments in the first 21 days so that we actually have 42 days to reply, to submit our comment.

I -- again, I don't really see this as an improvement, and I think it's going to take some work. If we want to have a reply comment period, I think we -- it will take some work to educate the community that what is intended is you're supposed to answer the comments that came in in the first round and not simply treat it as an extended period.

But either way, I think the trend toward a shorter period to file comments is not a positive one from our perspective.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Steve.

Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you, Sebastien. My name is Marilyn Cade.

I am -- I'm going to make a broad -- I'm going to make a broad comment about -- at the of my comments about something that I am taking as learning away from our implementation of these changes and other changes.

I would echo much of what Steve Metalitz said. The business constituency has 51 members, if you count the numbers, but if you count WITSA, an association of 81 associations, 70% of which are from developing countries, and the ICC, which Ayesha is here so she can describe it, and other associations, we have such a deep set of both individuals and companies and associations. WITSA is an alliance of associations, so we have two layers there.

I was on the President's Strategy Committee and we, in fact, made the initial recommendation of the move to an APA-like approach to public comments, with initial and reply.

However -- and I see Jean-Jacques, my colleague who was on that committee with me. However, I don't think we envisioned that resulting in shortening the opportunity for the community.

I watch carefully all of the requests for public comments and I check on a daily basis to see if anyone has filed comments on the topics, and I'm doing that right now because I'm trying to understand is this process of public participation via public comment, is it working for us.

I will tell you that I do not think it is working for us.

And I think that's a big -- longer topic about --

So what do we need to do to improve the process so that more people will be able to participate?

In the short run, a longer initial process, I think, is essential. And then I think we have to assess this change we called for and almost treat these changes as a pilot for a period of time and then assess what other improvements.

And that is the takeaway that I have taken from --

We go through a long public comment process, we take input, we design a system change, we implement the system change. Let's not say we're done. Let's give the flexibility, when we're making that kind of change, to tune it based on comments like this that we are getting.

We must have more time in the initial.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Marilyn.

I guess there is nothing in the presentation to say that that's the end of the process to change the public comment period. You see even that there is some work going on. And I guess what it's done today was after the consultation of the community, I am very happy to have this comment today, but I would like, if you have some specific proposal to enhance the process, to send it to the staff or to send it to us as a member of the committee.

I will remind you that we are now out of the time for this topic but I will give the floor to Andrea and --

(Speaker is off microphone.)

No, I don't think so.

Then -- yeah, yeah, yeah.

Andrea, please.

ANDREA GLORIOSO:

Merci, Sebastien. As I understand Italian is not available, I will speak in English. I will try to be very brief.

First of all, I think that ICANN, both the board and the staff, should be commended for the work that they have done on trying to improve the public consultation period.

My apologies. I'm Andrea Glorioso from the European Commission.

At the commission, we are very well aware both of the importance of public consultation and of the difficulties of setting up a good public consultation system.

At the same time, I have to say I tend to agree, perhaps not with the letter but certainly with the spirit of the previous interventions.

For large organizations who represent other organizations, 21 days is an extremely challenging short period of time to collect the necessary information throughout the relevant constituencies.

It is not entirely clear to me what is precisely the difference between the consultation and the reply period, so you don't need to answer that but I will probably take that up bilaterally.

Two other questions, for my clarification -- and I apologize for my ignorance, if this was already clear somewhere.

Is there some way in which there is a way to verify the matching between the results of a public consultation and the actual decisions that are taken on the particular topic on which the public consultation is taken?

So an easy way to say, "Well, this decision has been taken on this topic, and in fact, this decision corresponds widely to the feelings that have been expressed during the public consultation" or not, or somewhere in the middle.

And the other question is -- again, apologies for my ignorance if this is clear, but -- in cases where public consultation is on a topic in which there are certain entities, part of the ICANN system, which actually take decisions on that particular topic, are those entities allowed to participate in the public consultation or not?

And I'm asking that because normally in the -- for the public consultation of the commission, even though I'm not entirely sure there are specific rules in place, but the practice is that, you know, when we make a legislative proposal and our member states in the Parliament actually discuss in the normal legislative process, they do not participate in the public consultation because they have other venues to make their voice heard.

So I would just like to understand better how this works in the ICANN system.

And just as information, the current best practices that we use within the commission is to have an 8 weeks' time for public consultations.

Thank you.

Minimum time for public consultations.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you.

Yes. Chuck, please.

CHUCK GOMES:

Chuck Gomes from the registry stakeholder group.

One of the comments that was put in -- I think I put it in -- with regard to the reply period is that it only works if it's enforced as a reply period, and I think Steve's comments indicated -- gave us an example where it wasn't enforced.

Secondly, with regard to overall timing, my personal opinion is that you could shorten the reply period a little bit and lengthen the initial period. That would probably be a way of addressing some of those concerns.

And last of all, whenever we set up minimum guidelines, we have to be careful, because in this dynamic environment that we're in, we're always going to run into problems with needing -- a need for exceptions. The GNSO is dealing with one of those right now where there's a very

time-sensitive issue, because of the new gTLD process, and if we literally try to do a 21- and 21-day period, it will be too late.

So one of the things that needs to be taken into consideration is some means -- we don't want to change process too easily, but there needs to be some guidelines for how we deal with exceptional situations, especially with regard to timing and so forth, which we will encounter again. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Chuck.

I have Siva, Mike, and Olivier, and I will close the list for this topic here, and --

Siva, please.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN: Sivasubramanian from APRALO talking as an individual.

I agree with what Chuck said about flexibility, and I think there needs to be a balance between procedure and efficiency. So if we keep it as a rule that every process has to go through this 21-day comment period and 21-day reply to comment period, every decision is going to be delayed by 6 weeks or more.

And so what I would suggest is to make the recommendation for a comment period as a recommendation for a comment and not as a rule, and build in some flexibility and offer a longer comment period -- maybe even 6 weeks or 8 weeks -- for larger policy issues that are not time-sensitive, and even think of reducing the comment period from 21 days further down on lesser issues.

And that flexibility has to be given to the board, which can make that decision in consultation with the heads of the ACs and SOs on -- issue by issue.

And the other thing is, if a comment period can't be reduced, we could at least think of a reply to the comment period which opens up another 21-day period can be reconsidered. And if a certain comment gets a response and there is no further response for -- after a certain period, it's not necessary to mandate to really wait for 21 days to close that period, so this is -- these are some of my thoughts.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Siva.

Mike?

MIKE SILBER: Just a couple of comments as a former PPC chair.

Firstly, the comments coming through are very useful. Just a pity that some of them didn't come through in the comment period about comment periods.

It's kind of difficult to now go back, when people didn't submit comments, and now try and reengineer a process once it's been adopted.

In particular, when there were a couple of comments that insisted on having the comment period -- at the end, that insisted on the 21 days. Recognizing, as Filiz mentioned, the 21 days is a minimum.

Yes, there is some flexibility built into the system.

What we can't go is go to the board, because if you're expecting the board to determine the size of the period, of the comment period, you're going to wait for a month for the board just to come to the determination of how long we should have a comment period for.

So staff needs to have some flexibility around this.

I don't understand why this organization wants to go to the board and then criticizes the board for being top-down.

Lastly, in my opinion, at least, all comments are welcome. One thing, though, that we've been struggling with -- and maybe this community can give some input -- as a board how do we give directions to staff in terms of the summaries we receive so that we ensure that all good comments come through in the summary, but more importantly, the comments of important stakeholder groups and representative organizations are highlighted, as compared to an individual or several individuals who may come through but represent themselves and their own views, as compared to the views of significant organizations.

And that's something that we are struggling with, because in a summary form, given the amount of reading that the board has to do before coming to a decision, or other communities, the staff summaries really are critical.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier and we close this time because I am sure that you have a lot of comments. And I would like really to receive those comments, but we have three topics this morning. And we need to, I think, go to next one. If not, we will be in trouble for at least one and that will not be fair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. I will be very short.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond, chair of the ALAC.

I will let go of the comments made by Steve Metalitz and also by Chuck Gomes. Of course, 21 days for us is not enough. We have -- we need at least 31 or 30 days. But at the same time, delaying the process sometimes is not positive either because some things need to get done quickly.

One comment that we are -- well, one thing that we are particularly worried about is that previously when we required more time to be able to respond, we were able to ask for an extension. It is not quite clear whether it is possible to ask for an extension to the first 21 days comments.

But what we will do and since we are able to comment actually on anything at any time and not wait for comment periods is to submit our comments within the original 31 days, if we are able to do so or if we wish to do so. But it would be really welcome to know if there is a way to extend the original 21 days. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will give the floor to Filiz to give some element in what staff is doing and then we will go to the second topic -- or the third topic with Chris Disspain.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Thank you, Sebastien. I will be very quick. Three points. First of all, about exceptions, I do understand the need for certain cases. But we

do really need good guidance from community in regards to what the exceptions should be because exceptions -- I will be very careful about what you define as an "exception" because if you come with a process where you say this needs to be consistently applied for fairness and transparency and try to inject certain amount of exceptions there, we need to be very careful in designing that system. And I would really like to design it with the acceptance coming from the whole but (indiscernible) process from the community itself. So those exceptions are recognized, and they are not seen as untransparent based to work around the system.

The second thing is you are right, we had a hard time coming up into the decision of how long should be the comment period and the reply period. The original suggestion from staff was 30 -- again minimum 30 plus minimum 15.

And the feedback we got from both the focus group and during the public comment process was that the second part, 15 days for reply, is too short. We need it longer for the same reasons that you are saying, that it's hard to collect feedback and channel it through a uniformed voice.

But then the second concern was if you make it plus another 30 days or 21 days, the combined elapsed time will be 50 and plus or even maybe 60 days. And that is not good for a lot of other stuff that needs to be done, as you said.

So the suggestion was keep it at minimum 21 days and supporting organizations or the originating organizations can always choose longer periods. In fact, I just looked at the stats before coming here. There were 12 comment periods and only three of them used the minimum 21 plus 21. All the rest, nine others, are beyond 45 and plus. So there is consideration in regards to which topic needs to be longer.

And if you think as your constituency or -- even as an individual, if you think the period is too short and you will not be able to present your comments on time, please send us the request, which is my third point.

Extensions are possible. In fact, most of the public comments so far have been extended as well based on the feedback we received. So minimums are really the minimums. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We heard you. I promise you. I will discuss that with the PPC in the next meeting, and we will come back with some element of discussion and put that into a discussion with the community.

I think there's a lot of element here.

I would like very much if the people participating today who have something to add to that, send us their comment, their ideas, and we will come back on that issue. It's not a closed item. We want the comment period to work well. And we will do everything possible for that. And thank you for your comments.

And I give now the floor to Chris Disspain. But before, I wanted to recognize that Kuo-Wei Wu came to the room and is a member of the PPC.

Thomas is here. Thank you, Thomas. Sorry not to recognize you before.

Chris, the floor is yours.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm just going to give you a very brief update on meetings generally. The PPC has formed a sub -- a meeting subcommittee to look at meetings. I don't have any slides, so no point in looking at the screen.

And I'm going to just go through the four main topics that this committee is talking about. The first is scheduling. And by "scheduling," what I am talking about is what slots into the sessions on Mondays and Thursdays and sometimes Wednesday.

The PPC has decided that we need a more -- a better and more known process of how that happens. It's currently not -- perhaps not documented as well as it should be. So we are working on that with the staff, and we hope to have that in place relatively quickly.

We hope to have it in place for Prague. But the challenge is, as Steve has said on a number of occasions in various fora during this meeting, this is one of the small-gap times. We have a relatively small gap between the meeting now and the meeting in Prague. So we may start hitting a few timing issues to get things done. But certainly we're

expecting to have a process in place that people can use to ask for things to go on to the agenda.

The second is structure. We are working on trying to structure the meeting in a more effective and efficient way. There are many challenges around structure. I'm going to ask Nick Tomasso to briefly just give us an overview of some of the difficulties that we're facing as meetings grow.

Nick.

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you, Chris. We are experiencing a significant increase in the scope of ICANN meetings, predominantly in the areas of the number of sessions and in particular the number of concurrent sessions.

To give you some facts, in Cartagena in December of 2010, we had 141 sessions at the ICANN meeting. San Francisco, the number was 146. In Singapore, we jump to 168. In Dakar, we went to 195. And we are at 198 sessions taking place here in Costa Rica.

In particular one of the big issues is the number of concurrent sessions. So I'm sure you have all experienced our tent in the parking lot. We outgrew this facility from the time we booked it to the time we arrived, and this is a significant issue.

So as we look out towards facilities for the future, we need to find facilities that will let us grow, let us grow in scale, let us grow in the number of sessions, the number of delegates. I'm not quite sure what new gTLDs are going to do to the number of people who actually attend an ICANN meeting.

I will tell you that while it doesn't go up consistently, the trend is up over the last couple of years. So as we look for new facilities, that's the challenge that we face. And we are outgrowing many of the traditional facilities that ICANN has been in for the last 43 meetings.

So when we look to the future, we need to be determining how best to handle that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Nick. One of the things that the PPC is fairly -- Was that about what he just said? Go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Chris. My name is Marilyn Cade. I would like to congratulate us on this success.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I don't think anyone is suggesting that it is a failure.

MARILYN CADE: I have something else to say.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I realize that.

MARILYN CADE: Really, I would like to congratulate us on this success. Being there when there were 40 GAC members and we barely had 300 people to come to our meetings, this is a problem we want.

I really would like to hear more. My members are extremely dissatisfied with the challenges they face in overlapping -- sequentially -- simultaneously scheduled topics that they -- so as you think about this, I'd like to offer a comment.

In a discussion with some of the other chairs this morning, we were all talking about these kinds of challenges that we all face as well as our needs to -- that we are adding to your request for meetings because we are increasingly scheduling our own work. At this meeting, the BC met not only on constituency day but on Monday and on Wednesday.

So I'm building your portfolio of requests. And, of course, since everyone wants to emulate the BC and have more meetings than I do, Nick, just to keep up. But my point is, I hope, turn to the chairs of the constituencies and the stakeholder groups and perhaps we can chat with you about how we can convey information.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, and we will. That's one of the next steps that we need to do, which is to talk to, as you said, the various chairs. I mean, there are some things that, you know, are kind of clear to the PPC, some things are not.

The venue challenge is clear and so on, but we do need to talk to you all.

I have got Ayesha, Andrea, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

My name is Evan Leibovitch. I am vice chair of ALAC but speaking as an individual who walks the floors and hears from all sorts of people how frustrating things are. Especially on certain days when the board is sort of doing this traveling road show going from constituency to constituency saying exactly the same thing and sometimes we find ourselves in At-Large on the opposite sides of that.

Has any consideration been given to having at least maybe one of the meetings per year focused on a subject basis rather than a constituency basis? As we go towards cross-community working groups, this is being debated now in GNSO and At-Large and elsewhere. I'm wondering if maybe this can be -- this can sort of filter up into the way that meetings are done and perhaps have meetings that are focused on subjects where you bring together everyone from all stakeholders on subjects as opposed to focusing on -- well, for lack of a better term -- the silos. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So no is the answer. No consideration has been given to that, but that doesn't mean that it can't be.

And, secondly, I just want to come back on the point about the board going from constituency to constituency and hearing or saying the same thing. That is absolutely incorrect.

We go, we talk to each of the individual SOs, ACs, constituencies and hear vastly different things, not the same thing.

We might say the same thing on a particular point to all of them. But I can assure you, we hear lots of different things. Ayesha.

AYESHA HASSAN:

Thank you, Ayesha Hassan, International Chamber of Commerce. Nick, I appreciate what you have shared with us about some of the challenges you face in trying to secure proper facilities and things that really work for everybody.

There are so many layers that go on, and hats off to all of you who try to take this on.

I just wanted to underscore something. There is the meetings part of the meeting and then there is the outside in the hallway part of the meeting. And I think it is helpful to consider in facilities arrangements that allow for the maximum amount of informal discussion so that people actually bump into each other and have an opportunity to cross each other's path. That's where a lot of good work gets done. And so just keep that in mind as we go forward. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

That is absolutely part of the equation. We're aware of that. It's -- we're coming to a tipping point where effectively we are going to -- we will really have no choice but to go convention center and surrounding hotels. There are challenges with that. But, basically, we're at that point. Finding one venue that's a hotel is almost impossible now, I would say.

Wouldn't you, Nick?

NICK TOMASSO:

There are --

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

In some countries, it is almost impossible.

NICK TOMASSO:

In some of our geographies, it is impossible. There are a limited number we can use, but it is a very small number and getting smaller.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I will take Andrea, but I need to close it because I have two other things I want to get through and we are running out of time.

ANDREA GLORIOSO:

Thank you. Andrea Glorioso from the European Commission. I will try to be very brief.

I hear what everybody has said. I think again, ICANN is to be congratulated in this particular area. We are trying to cope with very quickly growing participation.

I have two questions. First: Is there any criteria in place to evaluate whether certain of the sessions could, as a matter of fact, be merged? I mean, has there been any consideration whether some of the sessions are duplicative, in fact? I'm not saying they are, but is there a system to check whether they are.

Secondly -- and this is for my clarification. Even though I appreciate very much that members of the board are here to discuss the logistical arrangements, this is not something that strikes me normally as something the board would take care of. Since the board has a lot of things to do, some of them are a strategic nature, I am just wondering how much of the time of the board is actually focusing on choosing the hotel, choosing the rooms, et cetera, and more strategic issues.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

None, none. None of the time of the board is focused on choosing the hotel. Nick does all of that with his team and makes recommendations to the board. As much as I would like to fly around the world examining venues, unfortunately that doesn't happen.

Merging sessions, yes, in the sense that all of the sessions are being looked at and some things will -- some things may very well disappear from the agenda and some things may be merged and so on. So, yes, we are looking at that as part of the game.

I just want to move on and address two other issues because we are rapidly running out of time. The third thing that the PPC meetings committee is looking at is the budget. And this is not really -- this is really just for information rather than discussion.

There are currently some challenges with meshing the meeting-by-meeting budget with the yearly budget. It is a little bit complicated, and it is very hard to parse the numbers to be clear about them.

So what we're doing currently is an analysis of the last full fiscal year of meetings, which would have been finishing in Singapore. And when I say "we," Xavier. And we are going to look at that and start to alter the

way that the budget is done so that we can actually get more meaningful numbers about the costs and so forth.

Just to give you an example, I didn't know when we talk about -- there is constantly people talking about it is \$2.1 million a meeting and that's what the board said it had to be and all of that. People don't know what that \$2.1 million includes. It includes the travel, for example, which -- it includes stuff from the travel budget. It includes stuff from the translation budget. It includes stuff from all sorts of budgets. It is pretty hard to actually figure out what the costs are, so we're working on that.

Marilyn, very briefly if you wanted to comment.

MARILYN CADE:

I just want to say we are increasingly -- as we are broadening the participation from around the world, the affordability of the hotel rooms and the early scheduling -- and I apologize for the fact that we always mention this, but it is an increasing barrier. So just as a factor for us in increasing participation, affordability of a number of hotel rooms, as many hotel rooms as possible in a single facility or close. You already know all this. But we keep hearing it, and we know you're thinking about it as well and appreciate that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yes, thank you. Agreed. Convention centers do tend to have varying standards or costs of hotel around them. So that's an advantage. Costs in different geographic locations are vastly different. We all know that, as are standards and so on.

My final point is just to let you know that we are also looking at the overarching issues. We discussed this in Dakar, you will recall, of hubs and going back to the same place again and all of that stuff. We are looking at all of that. Nick is currently doing some work on the economics, how much would we save if we did a five-year deal with Hilton around the world, all of that sort of thing.

And so we hope that by the time we get to Prague, we'll have some -- more useful information that we'll be able to talk to you all about and let you know where we're headed with our thinking.

Now, in stuff like hubs and all the big stuff, obviously that's a matter of consultation with everybody. We're not going to make a unilateral executive decision. But we want to make sure we're ready to consult before we consult.

I'm going to leave it at that and pass you back to Sebastien. Thank you, everyone.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Chris. And thank you for your comments. You can see it is not the end of the topic today, and we will keep the community informed on what we are doing and we try really to concentrate on the strategic issue of the ICANN meeting to deliver better for the community participation and for the ICANN work.

I would like to give the floor to Kurt now to make his presentation on outreach.

Kurt, the floor is yours.

KURT PRITZ:

Thank you, Sebastien, and thank you, everybody, for taking time for this.

"Outreach" means many things to many different people. We receive requests from the community for funding for activities, for outreach. When we do our internal budgets at ICANN, we'll put -- departments will put a number down and then label it "outreach" and look at each other and say, "Outreach is important so we should do this."

Last year we tried for the first time to receive as part of our budgeting process requests from constituency or stakeholder groups or other ways the community combines for funding for activities, many of which were labeled "outreach." It was an experiment. It was a first try, so there are many things good about that. But there were questions about that, too.

There was uncertainty in the way the requests were evaluated, and that wasn't transparent. So we want to continue that process. We want to make it more transparent. And we want to provide -- ICANN staff wants to provide a roadmap for those seeking funding so that their requests have a better chance of succeeding.

So can we go back to the first slide? Thanks.

So that's sort of an introduction to this. So what we did was we sought to define "outreach." First of all, it is very important to say that ICANN's success is dependent upon this bottom-up, multistakeholder model. And that's why Marilyn was gratified that we're busier here and need more spaces for more meetings than we expected, that people want to come to ICANN and meet and need a separate meeting space.

And it succeeds -- ICANN succeeds through this board representation, not only that but that new people are coming into ICANN all the time and they're finding more -- they're encouraged because they're finding more and more effective ways to participate.

So for us, "outreach" is a few things. You know, it should encourage -- it should encourage participation. It should encourage support, and it should build capacity and encourage growth and involvement among the participants. But at the same time, we know our dollars are precious, and we know the time of all the volunteers is precious. So we want to undertake those activities that can be targeted at meeting these outreach goals.

And so what's outreach about? What's outreach about? It is about the people, of course. ICANN is about the people. And outreach is about getting new participants into ICANN. And you can participate in ICANN in a number of different ways. You can join as an observer to see what's going on, or you can be more of a contributor, step up to the microphone and speak or write papers or contribute as an expert. You could become a leader. You could chair a supporting organization or an advisory committee or a working group or a leader or facilitator. You could facilitate a meeting.

We've also sort of identified an ambassador level, those that understand the ICANN model and go out to seek the participation of others or promote the ICANN model as the preferred model for Internet governance and not the other models that have been proposed.

So ICANN -- outreach, we think one definition is getting people into ICANN and moving people up, not up hierarchically. But moving people into positions where they can be more effective contributors. There is not just one of these columns, right? There's many different areas in which one can participate in ICANN: In the various stakeholder groups,

in technical advisory committees, in At-Large, the GAC, ccNSO. And not only in those groups, of course, but we seek global participation. So we see all these different opportunities for participation, but they're not only opportunities, they're sort of necessary.

ICANN, I think, is working when each one of those columns is sort of percolating along with the right amount of activity. So we want to get to the right number of participants, but we want to continually have people moving into those columns as is appropriate and moving up or even moving across.

And so we see outreach as identifying where there's gaps in each of those columns. And then a good outreach activity is something that says -- there's not an activity that really facilitates moving people in or moving people up in this particular area, and so this activity seeks to address that need.

I just want to say parenthetically, too, that I don't want to connote that it is important for all participants to move up, to become contributors or to become leaders. You know ICANN is correct when people are participating at all levels. I'm just saying that there should be no roadblock to participants who want to grow in their participation.

So how do we use this model? I think -- well, not just "I think," but what we're working on is an activities inventory. This isn't for the community, this is for staff to -- we want to list all our activities so we can gaze across them, eliminate redundancy, prioritize the most effective activities, find the most effective home. There might be an activity right now being conducted by ICANN staff, might be more effectively done by the community.

We also want to socialize this model to the community so they can begin to use it as a tool for formulating requests for activities.

So to the extent you agree, we want to work with you to inventory our current outreach activities and identify the blanks in that model and identify new activities that would provide value and provide metrics.

So in some case, metrics can be numbers; in some case, not. But I think it is important for our outreach activities to identify goals and be careful not to be punitive in any way if we don't reach our goals, because it is good to aspire but rather use those goals to help identify important

activities and then to encourage improvement in activities as we go along.

So, finally, we see this budgeting process to be sort of an opportunity to be able to employ this model. But I just want to make very sure that the model -- this sort of structure is meant to be a roadmap for those seeking to fund activities or even without fund, engage in activities and not a roadblock. We're just providing a tool for those that wish, for you to engage in ICANN more fully and promote activities. We want you to use this as a tool, if you can, to help you identify what would be meaningful and beneficial to the ICANN model.

So I think that is that presentation, before we have any questions, is a prerequisite to go on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I will defer the questions to your presentation after the presentation given by Olivier because the goal of your presentation was an introduction to a specific topic inside the overall subject. Then I will -- No, I really want you to go to the next presentation because it's hard work done by the community, by part of the community they want to deliver to the overall.

And I know that there are subjects to be discussed on this presentation. It was already done by Kurt in a lot of different arena, SO/ACs, constituencies. And I would like very much to concentrate on the presentation of Olivier.

Unfortunately, we just have 1 1/2 hours. We could spend one day on discussing all these issues. Maybe it is a topic that we can have for one meeting, like it was suggested by Evan. But we will take the question from this presentation, too, at the end.

Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Sebastien. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond, for the transcript record.

I'm going to take you through a few slides about the proposal for an ICANN academy.

The whole idea started quite a while ago during the ALAC review process when one of the points that was raised was that new volunteers coming into the organization had somehow a steep learning curve to come against.

ICANN is indeed a very highly complex multistakeholder organization. The very fact that it is multistakeholder is something that differentiates it from a lot of other organizations that might be dealing with governance. And unfortunately, whilst there is very little literature available, it's very difficult to explain ICANN outside these walls. You really have to come in here to really truly understand how it works, and this is only possible during two or three ICANN meetings.

And in general, people that are newcomers and arrive here find things to be quite overwhelming. In fact, we've heard just earlier the number of meetings that take place in parallel, it's pretty much impossible to be effective.

Next slide, please.

So one of the problems is that there are several ways for people who reach positions of importance -- importance, in other words, be on the board or be on the boards of the SOs and ACs -- to be, you know, effective in there.

And one of the problems is that most newly appointed leaders arrive in the positions and they end up not being effective for the first several months because they have to try and learn from their peers and it's very difficult without having something -- some kind of capacity-building program specifically targeted at them.

Understandably, there are various capacity programs already in place. The fellowship program, for example, that you all know of is very, very good indeed for the wider community, but it doesn't actually go to the depth necessary to be able to be used by a leader for specific points. It just provides a more general scope about things, and therefore it doesn't actually meet the needs of the appointed officers and other leaders.

So whilst we were working on this, on the ICANN academy, a working group was created with Sandra Hoferichter as the chair, and it became quickly -- quickly understandable that it was not only an ALAC problem,

it was something that spanned all of ICANN.

And therefore, we thought, okay, something has to be done, perhaps expanding this program and looking at it on an ICANN-wide basis.

If we can go to the next slide, please.

And that's how the idea of the ICANN academy came up.

And so from that point onwards, the working group started working on a much more -- a wider basis and thought, well, we have to find a way to see how you could instill that knowledge into the new leaders but at the same time also try and help with having less of these silos that generally are in use over in ICANN.

If we go to the next slide.

And so the ICANN academy concept originated in -- based on two ideas, the first one being the knowledge transfer about the basics of all of ICANN's complex structure and policies, procedures, ongoing issues, et cetera, but also the socializing aspect which is extremely important for those leaders to talk to each other and to be able to take on their position and use those connections that they have, those social connections that they have, afterwards in order to bridge the communities and ICANN.

Next slide, please.

So the target group was identified as being board members, supporting organization council members, as I said ACs -- advisory committees -- and also possibly new senior-level staff that could be potential trainees. The fact being that staff also have this same uphill challenge when they arrive in the ICANN environment.

Next slide, please.

So what you have is a lot of different groups with very specific backgrounds, and the idea of the academy is to just convey a basic understanding about the common ICANN issues and also provide this basic understanding from different perspectives of each group.

As a result, the actual faculty members would not be appointed people. They would actually be people from the different supporting organizations and advisory committees that would teach the newcomers about their own -- their own world, if you want.

And that, on top of it, because it would be all in the same room, would foster interaction and dialogue among all of the different stakeholder groups.

Next slide, please.

So one of the key things is you have to keep it small for people to get to know each other.

15 participants is, in general, roughly the amount of newcomers -- well, new people that get appointed by the NomCom, by the SOs, by the ACs every year.

The idea is to have three days, possibly taking place before the annual general meeting -- ICANN meeting, so you're looking at about a Wednesday, Thursday, Friday before the ICANN AGM meeting.

Three days because in those three days, it means you've got two evenings, and the two evenings are there to really foster relations between the different people that are there.

If you only have one, well, the first evening you get to know each other, the second evening you really get to go a little bit deeper into interpersonal relationships.

And of course the second day and the third day, you can actually work together in a much more effective way possible.

And at the end of the week, of the actual ICANN week with the AGM, there will be a half-day wrap-up so as to find out what lessons were learned and at the same time also perhaps exchange -- exchange views on how the week went.

Next slide, please.

So the format of the academy is pretty standard.

One of the things that is important in ICANN is if you take a position of responsibility, you need to be able to correspond and function in English, so the English language is important.

An isolated environment is important as well, because of the distractions.

If people don't remain in a closed environment for these three days, they will wander off and perhaps miss some of the meetings, some of the discussions taking place, and we feel that the participants will not really take as much out of the academy as they would if they were in an isolated environment.

Very interactive. And also, you know, interaction outside and inside the meeting room.

I think a little bit like, you know, the -- and I'm just citing this organization just as an example of the way the technical things function -- Diplo. Diplo has got these, like, things that can be done on-line, and so here as well the interaction could take place on-line as well, and it's something that can be continued after the end of the ICANN meeting.

Next slide, please.

So the curriculum at the moment is pretty much very open. These are just the -- the foundations of how the group felt it was going to work. I'll be very quick.

These are just the foundations of how the group felt it was going to work.

What's really important is that nothing is cast in stone yet, so the -- the curriculum itself really has to be developed by the community. And when I mean community, I don't mean ALAC community or at-large community. I mean everyone around here sitting around this table.

Next slide, please.

Methodology?

Well, pretty straightforward. Lecture, debating. There will be follow-ups, Webinars. Lecturers, there will be at least one or two lecturers available for three days. Peer-to-peer mentoring really important.

Moodle. I've touched on it earlier. Moodle is this sort of system that you can use for interactive teaching.

And there could be, as an extension, multilingual support by translating documents, but it's not one of the core -- core points of it, obviously.

Next.

So what are the next steps?

The next steps are really what we're doing here.

The idea now is to engage the whole community. Think of what the At-Large group has done as just the foundations of -- you know, sort of the first seed of what the ICANN academy could be like.

Now what we need is to have the whole community in ICANN -- registrars, registries, all the GNSO constituencies, all of the advisory committees -- to come together, send a representative, and put together a working group so as to be able to first build the curriculum itself, and the suggestion is to try and be able to do it as a pilot in Toronto.

And I say a pilot because the 15 members -- just having this academy for 15 people is a pilot to see if that works.

If this works, then, you know, we'll have many voices from the community saying it should actually be expanded to a lot more people than just these 15 people.

But that, of course, will come after reviewing if the first suggested academy works well.

And then afterwards, of course, the idea is to have it as an annual ICANN academy.

So I think that pretty much rounds it all up. I think there's -- that's pretty much it.

Looking ahead, we'll have to devise a process where chairs and people sort of volunteer for this working group and move forward from there.

Open to questions. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier. Now, the floor is yours. I will start with Marilyn. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: Sebastien, I'd like to ask, please, as a point of order, that we start with a -- discussing the framework on outreach and participation, which is the broader question.

Because for me, while I may have comments about a specific possible pilot initiative, there's a broader question ahead of us. And the broader question to the BC --

I should say my name for the transcript.

I'm Marilyn Cade.

The broader question for all of us is, I -- I can't tell you today that the four categories that are being proposed are going to resonate to my community because they have not had a chance to comment on them in terms of what the label is. Tag line. Whatever we want to call it. I don't mean it negatively; I just mean category.

I think there's a broader question to us that we want to be sure is included, and that is, to me we have a requirement, a basic requirement, to generate broader awareness broadly about ICANN, what it does, and how to get involved, and then we have the next layer that goes -- the next stages of inducting people into the various other stages.

So I would probably add a fifth stack to our layer cake that Kurt presented, because my community of business users really needs -- and particularly small businesses from developing countries -- they really need the broader information and outreach.

Outreach and participation to us must actually not be turned into the tip or the apex of the pyramid. I think we would say we should start in the middle of the pyramid and go up, over time, and go down, over time.

Because we want to reach the broadest number of people as soon as possible to enable them to know about ICANN, to become involved in ICANN, and to participate in an informed way in ICANN.

So I welcome the framework.

I will make another comment.

Through the budget process, the SOs and ACs and the SGs -- acronym buster, SO, supporting organization; AC, advisory committee; and SG, stakeholder group -- are -- constituencies submit a budget request for outreach and participation to build and strengthen our participation, outreach, et cetera.

So what we have going on, as far as I can see, is budget requests that are publicly available about those activities. We have a broader communications budget that ICANN seems to be developing about broad communication that I'm not fully up to speed on what could be in that that could support outreach and participation. And then specifically, it looks like we have now another separate request.

We have asked, in the BC, to have a coherent understanding of the landscape of what is going on today, not only funded by ICANN and supported by ICANN, but that that is today being funded by the working groups of the constituencies, et cetera, themselves so we could all look at it coherently and say, "Given the challenges for ICANN's future, here's sort of what's going on, here's what needs to be strengthened and here's the time line to get there."

So now I will make a comment about the academy.

I'm not able to support a -- even a pilot at this time for a project like this until I first see the delivery of on-line training materials, information materials, and Webinars that can be more broadly used urgently, between now and Toronto, to educate and inform our existing participants and reach more broadly.

I feel very strongly that we must do that first and we must do it with priority.

In the long run, I think the academy idea is interesting. And I don't mean in 10 years.

But I -- I am looking at this as an urgent "Let's do some other" -- sorry, guys -- "Let's do some real stuff now that we can do" and that we can so easily make it widely available. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Marilyn.

Next? Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter, ALAC and chair of this ICANN academy working group.

I'd just like to answer in response to Marilyn that indeed, one of the outcomes of this working group was that "ICANN academy" is quite a very broad term and it should include all types of learning methodologies, including e-learning as well.

Whilst going through this process, we discovered -- or I think everybody here knows about it -- that ICANN has already quite a lot of existing capacity-building provisions like Webinars, like the fellowship program, and lots of materials on-line.

The gap we see here for the moment is a face-to-face program for incoming leaders, and another gap we discovered in our working group is that all of the offered capacity-building provisions, they need to be harmonized, structured, and maybe made more available, because a lot of things are already in place. It just needs to be developed.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Sandra.

Go ahead, please.

TINJANI BEN JEMAA:

Tinjani Ben Jemaa, member of the academy working group.

The sessions for the newcomers is just a response to the need of the staff.

The ICANN academy project was thought as a global means for learning in ICANN, which, as Sandra said, will include all kinds of learning action.

So the ICANN academy is, for us, something that will harmonize any action aiming to educate or to train any kind of contributor or participant, et cetera.

The ICANN academy is not a luxury thing. It's something which is very, let's say, necessary, because there is a lot of actions, a lot of effort at education, but they are done without any coordination, and we can make use of all the means used now and coordinate them so that we can make these education actions with the minimum of effort, minimum of resources, and in a harmonized way. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Tijani.

Evan and then Olivier.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Sebastien.

Marilyn, regarding your comment about the lack of Webinars and other kind of information like that, actually I want to respond by thanking ICANN for the initiatives it's been doing regarding Webinars, podcasts, beginners' guides, and so on.

The work that Scott Pinzon has been doing for us is nothing short of spectacular and I wanted to give a public thanks for what he's been doing. And I would also imagine that the kind of work he's been doing in concert with At-Large would also be applicable to other communities.

But the short answer is, in regard to not supporting the academy before other Webinars and public information is available from ICANN, I -- at least as far as we've been working, that's already started.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Evan.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript.

Actually, Marilyn, in response to your comment, I think we should see the whole outreach and teaching and capacity-building as a big puzzle, you know, and at the moment, we have very few pieces in there and I think it's absolutely dreadful. In fact, I've heard throughout the week, everyone keeps on saying this, we need more people, we need more involvement.

There are bits of the puzzle that are there. They're working extraordinarily well already. The fellowship is absolutely fantastic. I think it's doing a really, really good job.

And, in fact, we have benefitted directly from the fellowship. We have received new members, thanks to the fellowship. We've seen, you know, they've arrived here and they've joined at-large.

However, a lot more needs to be done.

The problem is in which order do you do it? Do you start with the wider community and then focus on the leaders or do you start with the leaders and then focus on the wider community?

The problem is, without the leaders, the organization will not be able to function well enough to be able to extend this over to the wider community. And this is why we thought the leaders are the first ones that need to be brought up to -- brought up to speed.

And I'm sure you agree with that, because we've had several conversations on the fact that we need to have an organization that functions well.

And unfortunately, there are -- in my own personal view, there are way too many small dysfunctions that make the whole thing a lot more difficult to manage.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:
FELLOW >>

Go ahead. And then Marilyn. Please.

Thank you. Well, if this -- there's a possibility, I will speak in Spanish for the first time in ICANN, and I will enjoy it. So please use your headphones. Okay.

On the one hand, I wanted to ask a question associated to the fellowship program.

I wanted to know whether everything you are thinking of the academy, you are thinking of it in an integrated fashion with the fellowship program efforts in place.

This is my second fellowship meeting. I see people with a lot of potential in the program. Coming to three meetings alone is not enough. Many people will need more support, and when they come back to their countries, in order to convey awareness -- I don't know the word in Spanish, the lady says -- to bring awareness, you need more time to develop this and the like.

So if you are involved in outreach efforts through the academy, to please integrate it with the efforts already in place and consider the great potential of the fellowship program's members and Janice's leadership. There is a lot of exchange prior to and after the meetings, and it would be important to support all these people so that they can keep on working.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. I think that what you have said is great. But that is an overarching snapshot, and that is the reason why we have these meetings today.

ALAC has been working on a portion of the subject that seems to be more important than the others, but it doesn't mean that the figure doesn't have any other portions.

At the end of the day, what we want to get is there.

Marilyn, and then -- no? Okay.

MARILYN CADE:

I'm glad Kurt is back, because I'm going to repeat.

I've learned that it's sometimes very difficult for information to filter sideways, so in the discussion about outreach and participation, in the GNSO's council, which focuses on gTLD policy, the business constituency and others have asked for a survey -- I want to make this not a -- this is not a poll, this is a quick gathering together -- of not only the outreach activities and materials that ICANN is doing.

So for instance, in ICANN's inventory of what it is doing, there might be "holding a registrar liaison meeting." But this needs to include the outreach and participation that is being driven and is being done and today is being funded by the various groups.

Because I think that will give us quickly -- and I think we can get it very quickly -- a snapshot of what is being done today.

As a business person, I'm going to share a quote that my father gave me many years ago. If you don't know where you're going, any road will get you there.

And I think it's really important for us to -- and again, I'm saying we need to understand what we're doing. Now I'm going to speak about the budget.

In the budget request that was submitted --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sorry, Marilyn, but there are other people who want to talk --

MARILYN CADE:

Okay. Sorry.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

-- and we are over time already and I am a bad chair of this meeting because we are already one minute late.

I would like to give the floor to Gonzalo, who asked that, and if there are any last-minute talks, I will give you 10 seconds to express yourself and then we will finish.

Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you, Sebastien.

Well, the whole intention was to take advantage that the people was using headphones to speak in Spanish, but...

[Laughter]

GONZALO NAVARRO: No, but I can do it in English. It's fine.

Okay. (saying name), the thing is that, well, okay, you're right -- (speaking in a non-English language.)

I'll shift into Spanish.

I think you are absolutely right, and what Sebastien was trying to say is also true, that there should be an integrated policy.

These are not isolated subjects, but I understand your concern, the concern of the fellows.

The effort of coming to three meetings without getting to know the organization and the efforts of the organization, sometimes you end up voting somewhere with too much feedback.

But as Sebastien said, this is part of an integrated subject, not as an isolated effort. Thank you very much.

KADIAN DAVIS: Good morning. I'm Kadian Davis from the fellowship program and I'm from Jamaica.

With regard to the framework model, I think it's a good initiative. However, in ICANN, I've been observing that sometimes the Caribbean is not included in the model.

For example, you're mentioning Latin America but I believe it should be Latin America and the Caribbean. Sometimes I feel as if it's excluded.

In addition, with regard to the ICANN academy, I believe it is a good initiative. However, three days prior to the actual ICANN meeting is probably cutting it too close because of the steep learning curve, and probably the board members or the fellows, if you decide to include them, might be a bit overwhelmed with the information.

So I believe that the e-learning approach would be very effective, probably a month before the meeting, give them exercises, et cetera, and then they'll be able to come participate with the knowledge of the whole multistakeholder community. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much.

We will take your point, and Olivier, you have some answer, but I want to close the meeting because there is another meeting starting now since three minutes and some of us may be there already.

Then I would like to really thank you very much for your participation. It's great to have this attendance to discuss all these issues.

I would like very much that we don't wait for the next meeting to have an exchange on that. And if you have feedback, additional questions, feel free to send it to me or to Filiz. We will be happy to try to answer all of them.

I would like to thank Kurt, Olivier, Chris, and Filiz for their presentations and for all the questions you give us today. Thank you very much and have a good end of the meeting of ICANN.

Thank you.

>>> END OF SESSION <<<