

#1 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-1-07mar10-en

Cheryl: [Speaking begins at 00:27.4] Good morning and thank you all, ladies and gentlemen. My clock measures 30 minutes past the hour so we will begin our formal proceedings.

We have a few housekeeping matters to discuss so with apologies to those who may be listening to the transcript or .mp3 later and who are in remote participation mode. I would like to remind people who are in this room today that we are having a working lunch. To that end, there is a menu going around the table for you to pre-order and pay for your lunch which we will have sent over and organized to come back to us at an appropriate time for us to continue working through.

We have a couple of additional meetings that are not listed in the ICANN meetings schedule. You should have these in your packs. I think we should all take a moment to thank our staff for this great tool. It's been hugely, hugely helpful and I think rightly received from all of us. Thanks very much, Heidi and Chase. That's been absolutely brilliant.

Just so we know, we have an at-large new gTLD work group informal meeting with interested members of the GAC happening today between 12:30 and 1400 in Meeting Room 106 on Level 1. The conversation in that very informal meeting is Morality Public [inaudible 1:59.2].

Allen: I should take my name off the menu then, since I'm going to that.

Male: Yes, okay.

Cheryl: Take your lunch with you.

We have an informal LACRALO meeting on Monday, the 8th of March to be held, again, in Meeting Room 106 on Level 1. That will be running from 1500 to 1600 hours local time.

We have an ABSDT workgroup meeting, meeting on Tuesday, the 9th of March between 1530 and 1700 hours in this room, Tapia, which is listed as "Minus One" but I think most people would call it level ground. Although I do gather that if you do get in a lift and push Minus One you will end up exiting somewhere out in the service entrance down there, but at least you're on this floor.

The topics there will be discussion of draft texts for the rules and procedure, discussion of draft text statement of interest and items for the next meeting along with any other business.

We have an At-Large new gTLD workgroup meeting to be held on Wednesday, the 10th of March from 1600 to 1700 hours, in what seems to be now our room, Meeting Room 106 on Level 1. The discussion there will be discussion of draft application guide book version 3 and discussion of the EOI. Olivier, I trust you have had your ears pricked up when you heard that as well. Thank you.

And on Wednesday, between 12:30 and 2:00 we have the very, very important but never listed on the public schedule meeting between the ALAC and regional representatives sitting around this table and the Board. That is luncheon in the Ball

Room, Wednesday, 12:30 to 1400 hours. We will continue our table talk discussion that we started in Seoul which is to look at how we, as an asset, the At-Large community, can be better involved and better integrated into ICANN activities in a post IOC world.

Female: What did you say again?

Cheryl: That will be in the Ball Room. I'm afraid I can't tell you what level the Ball Room is on. Heidi?

Heidi: It's one level up. We will be going every day; we'll be announcing that day's meetings.

Male: Could you say that all again?

Cheryl: It's Wednesday at 12:30 to 1400 hours, 12:30 to 2:00 pm.

Female: Tazabo. The name of the room is Tazabo B.

Cheryl: Dezabo?

Christina: T, Tezabo B.

Cheryl: Tezabo B, Tazabo is the room. Any questions on the housekeeping that we've discussed?

Male 2: Sebastian says it's not on our schedule but apparently it's on ICANN's.

Sebastian: It's not on ours...

Cheryl: So...It's best to use the microphone. I really...can't....go ahead.

Evan: Thank you, Cheryl. I've noticed that the discussion about the EOI to take place on Wednesday. However, I shall appear on the panel on Monday morning to discuss the EOI. I would respectfully ask whether we would be able to have some time today to actually discuss it, perhaps towards the end of the session. Thank you.

Cheryl: I'm sure that would be something that Evan would be in absolute agreement with. I think it's one of those key examples that we can use in this afternoon's work. Yes, go ahead, Allen.

Can I just say these microphones sets...are not...going to be stretching to everyone. I guess One to two is not going to happen. We've got Allen having to...

Allen: I'm on a panel on the new gTLDs' intellectual property issues tomorrow afternoon I believe afternoon, although I'm not 100 percent sure. So if there's anyone here who would like to give their input on what they think of the various documents that were released a few weeks ago, specifically on the URS and trademark clearinghouse, I will try to factor those into my comments which will otherwise be personal ones.

Cheryl: Thank you, Allen. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: Allen, is that going to be any different from what the two – what you and Olivier have already done with the STIs? Has there been any change since then? Or is it going to be basically that?

Allen: ICANN has issued their proposals for what will be included in the applicable guide book. They have made some changes; some significant, some not. So, the question is, is there anything I should be saying in this public forum, on behalf of other At-Large people?

In the absence of that I'll talk on my own behalf. But, I mean, it's a public common period also out there for the next month. But this is one opportunity.

Cheryl: Further comments or questions on those two very necessary side conversations that we need to have between ourselves and both Allen and Olivier?

Any questions about any general agenda items for today's one-day workshop?

Any items other than requested of Olivier and Allen have put forward to be added to our agenda?

I would very much like to welcome those members of the remote participation community whose names are too small for me to read. So, I have no idea who you are in the Adobe Room but welcome whoever you may be. If I see a little waving hand, hopefully sometime I'll be able to – oh, I can sort of look across to a computer. That's even better. We are the world. We are one. We are everything.

If for those in the remote participation, what's happened is the screen saver on the computer with the Adobe Connect Room is – has come on and I'm looking at an image of the earth from space. I think that's highly appropriate for At-Large. It does make it a little bit challenging for us to work with the Adobe Connect Room.

Okay. For those of you who are going to be using our interpretation services, and if you haven't worked it out already, Channel 1 is English, Channel 2 is French, Channel 3 is Spanish. And nothing will go through to the interpretation booths and come from the interpretation booths unless they go through these microphones. Okay?

There is no mechanism other than these desk microphones for any information to go through the translation loop. Therefore, if and when we ever get the Adobe Connect Room back up and functional, at least for us to view in this room, if someone has a question or wants to raise a matter, and they either type it in the Adobe Connect Room. Or, use the Adigo Bridge, even with the use of the Adigo Bridge, one of us will have to read to the record, so it goes by the interpretation loop.

Therefore, I will rely on the native French and Spanish speakers around this table to act on behalf of any French or Spanish remote participants. I know that will add some time to our day and complicate our logistics but the team here doing all the audio/visual and remote participation have worked really above and beyond the call of duty to try and get around this issue. We just have to make the best that we can with the equipment that we have.

So, I do apologize. Everything will have to be read through to the record. Yes, Olivier.

Olivier: Okay, Cheryl. I noticed on the meetings page there is also a chat room in addition to the virtual meeting rooms. Will that be used or will that not be used? And how can we make sure that if it's not being used, people will not use it? Thank you.

Cheryl: For that, I'm going to toss to, I think Mateus is the best one to answer that because I understand it, one is a low-bandwidth equivalent of the other. Mateus, if you can find a microphone, which causes extremely difficult perhaps looming over my shoulder might work.

Go ahead, Olivier, again...

Mateus: I'm sorry. Ask the question again.

Olivier: Okay. Yes. I've noticed that on the meeting room there are – on the meeting room page there are two chat rooms. There's a virtual meeting room, which is on Acrobat, and there's also a chat room, which seems to be sort of a localized –

Mateus: It's IRC.

Olivia: Is it IRC? Okay. Well, will that be monitored as well?

Mateus: Now, the problem is that the chat room, the IRC chat room that feeds into it, Adobe Connects, we can screen that on – we can connect that on the screen. But it is not possible to enlarge the font size, so it will be very difficult to read on the screen. I will have a look at it from time to time. I have it on the other screen so I will make sure that somebody is listening but you won't be able to see it on the screen.

Olivier: Okay, is there a way to maybe to point people out onto the...or something? Send a message out for anyone who is in that chat room to perhaps use the other room instead?

Cheryl: I think that's excellent planning but I think the other thing is we do need to make sure that one staff member at least – it looks like Mateus has lost that. Give me the – looks like he's the lucky winner on that one. He needs to keep an eye out on that.

Okay. In the absence of any other information and questions about logistics and how we're going to be running our meeting today, we're going to begin with the first items on our agenda: The At-Large Review, Implementation, Inclusive of My Strategic Planning, Review of Regional Planning Activities, and Identification of Intersections between the Operating Plan, Financial year '11 and the Strategic Plan 2010 up to 2013 as well as the IOC.

This is that information that most of you as regional representatives were asked to think about and bring. We will be doing a Round Robin, looking from each of the regional perspectives as to what sort of planning and activities you believe we need to look at...what's the problem?

Mateus: It means it's caught up in the rooms...

Cheryl: Right, okay. Fine.

Mateus: [Inaudible12:59.3].

Cheryl: Thank you.

Is there any time required by the regional reps around this table before we start diving straight into this activity? Have you all had time to plan, think and consider?

Okay, well, then, the very first thing we're going to do and hopefully it's something that you've all appreciated being in your pack. They should be and as a reference material for today's exercise.

A3 copy which is absent from my pack but that doesn't matter; an A3 copy of a simplified At-Large Improvements Implementation Outline. Oh, if it isn't – it's not in the packs? Okay, sorry. My error. It's not in the packs. You're getting a tablecloth of paper now. It's probably bigger than being able to see on the screen anyway. So, many trees have been felled today to put these out.

We're going to be using this resource on pretty much the whole day. This is our slightly modified master plan of the At-Large Improvements process. It lists the 13 improvement-point items. When you as a regional rep or ALAC member looking at the topic, this Micro-Strategic Planning Exercise, looking at regional activities and where things are going to intersect.

If it can be linked to something we're supposed to do and the operational plan, and the strategic plan, then that gives us a strong argument in terms of funding and budget requests.

So, do we need any discussion or clarification while these papers are being handed out, as to what purpose of this morning's exercise is going to be?

No? If not, I will ask if someone – I see no hands up in the Adobe Connect Room. Is there anyone on the Adigo phone bridge who wishes to raise a question or make a comment? I assume silence is no. Would it be appropriate for me to give you all a few moments to have a brief look through this documentation? Is that the will of the meeting?

Yes, go ahead, Sebastian.

Sebastian: Yeah. I have a...a modular [*not sure of word* 15:50.2] question. It's because it's written as a link between what we have to do as an At-Large, there is a strategy planning and the budget planning. I already asked for that but I don't know if we get any answer. I really would like to know what's from At-Large perspective comments was included into the final strategic-planning documents?

Because when you compare to the draft of strategic planning, it seems that nothing from At-Large were included. So that means we can spend a lot of time working on the train to have a regional activities. We did budget for that? Usually the answer from ICANN staff, it say, "If you want budget, you need to have that included into the strategic planning."

If when we make comments and strong recommendations as those comments are not taken into account in strategic planning, I don't know what we are doing on that matter. Then my first question before to say that we are losing our time. I would like very much to know what was included from At-Large comments into the strategic planning?

Thank you very much.

Cheryl: Thank you, Sebastian. I don't think a single person around this table who is in any way, shape or form able to answer that question.

Vander: I can make the question fit.

Cheryl: Thank you, Vander, if you would like to just for the record, let everyone know?

Vander: What I can do is just make the questions inside the, to Kevin on Adobe in this matter. But I believe that this – they have shown probably is mostly the general marks for the budgets, not the details there, and probably inside of the budget we're going to have that. I haven't seen...but I haven't asked.

Cheryl: Thank you, Vander. Allen?

Allen: I can appreciate that the specific line items are not in this strategic plan but it will be useful for them to tell us, preferably in writing that the things we identified have been incorporated or have not been. And if they have been, tell us which generic item so that six months from now when we go back and say we want to do something, when they say, "Where is it in the strategic plan," we can point to it.

To be quite candid, I appreciate Vander taking responsibility for asking those questions. We shouldn't have to go through our board liaison to get those answers.

Cheryl: Thank you, Allen, very good points indeed. I see Tazhani shaking his head in affirmation of those sentiments. Did you wish to speak, Tazhani?

Tazhani: Thank you very much. I wanted to second the – what Allen said. I had exactly same concern about the strategic plan and the comments. We worked long time on it. We participated. So if nothing is taken into account...

Cheryl: Well, of course, what we probably need to do is ensure that if we can find Nexus, that that strengthens our argument. And whilst I do understand and fear that in a budgetary-restrained environment of the FYI 11 financial year what these regional and ALAC exercises will be seen as is somewhat a no-win game that we will be going through instead of processes with the very small likelihood of financial backing and budgetary support.

It's always good to have shown a year before you are successful, why you've had the long-term planning and commitment for such activities. So, I would like to encourage the regional reps to make the most of the opportunity that we can. But also to mention that on Thursday we will have Kevin Wilson in the room. I gather that he has been forewarned about this question. He has every opportunity to come prepared to answer it.

So, we may in fact be able to, if we highlight a couple of key areas and we've gone around our table this morning and drilled into regional requirements and global requirements. If we've got a smart-looking, short-list plan of high-level objectives, we may in fact have the best-equipped person, Kevin, to show us exactly where the Nexus is, where the intersection is between the current full view and reviewing community budget and the existing strategic plan.

That said, Sebastian, we do recognize that it might be seen as a, I guess, a waste of our time, but do you have a proposal that's an alternative to what we should be doing with our time in this matter?

Sebastian: Definitely, no, it's the best. I'm sorry. Definitely, no. I think we need to try to do our best with what we are. But I think we need to say and to repeat it and maybe I would like to ask the Chair of the ALAC when she will make the speech about the ALAC work during this week? That this is a new brought-up item to be brought to the attention of the community, the ICANN community and to the Board because we really are working with quite difficult organization as the At-Large one.

We will see during this week of work, how many difficulty to have a board liaison to have all of the organization working, how it is difficult if we don't have feedback. When we make work and hard work, and I agree with Tazhani. It was hard work from all the region to do this comments on strategic planning.

If we don't have any feedback, it's, it could be seen as the worst of time. And then we will have the opportunity to involve the member of the ALSs as it's our ultimate goal in that work to participate in the ICANN arena. That's something I can vote and that I need to know.

But I have no other proposal to be agree with you that we need to pull on our work today.

Cheryl: Thank you. I'm opening the floor for any other comments on this particular matter...? Then what I'd like to do is ask the meeting based on the request from Sebastian for the report of the Chair at the Friday morning meeting in our formal reporting to the community and the Board.

Is it your wish that one of the highlights that we discuss in there is not just our achievements and telling everybody exactly how much we've managed to do in our meeting? But also, to indicate that there is a concern in the community that our voices are being sent out into the ether and we trust they are being heard. We hear informally, which I am happy to agree to the record here that, for example, those who are involved in all of the strategic plan holds would absolutely astonished and impressed with the professionalism and degree of work put in by all the ROLOs.

To raise, Kevin and everyone who are involved from the ICANN staff point of view. I have quite literally stopped me in the corridors and gone, "Wow, we had no idea of the depth of knowledge and involvement that was actually going on out there."

So, the fact that you're told informally is not good enough. You want it to be very, very clear, that we would like a more formal and appropriate feedback where identification in major documents, such as the strategic planning document, whether or not things that our communities have put forward are accepted, rejected or denied. That at least they're recognized as having been considered.

Is that the will of the meeting? Does anyone wish to disagree with that way forward? In which case, I will undertake to make sure that with the ex-com we have appropriate words and that is a red-out highlight, because you do realize the report we prepare at these meetings is much longer than the three minutes that we're allowed to have on stage.

So, it would be my belief, and I think reflecting of your views that that's one of the features we need to make a statement of in public. Vander, if you can pick up that and suggest to them the mood of this meeting was far from warm and fuzzy on this matter. I think that would be very useful.

Anyone else wish to speak to this matter then?

Okay, if not, then remembering that in our own At-Large Improvements Implementation Outline, there are a couple of clear places where much of what is going on in an ICANN strategic plan and any regional micro-planning has a nice fit, things like education and engagement ALSs.

I suspect when we start our Round Robin in a few moments, that much of what regional is interested in doing is this sort of outreach activity to educate and engage ALSs. Our mandate's clear. It's Recommendation 4 from the At-Large Improvements process.

We also recognize that under Recommendation 3, the existing ALS RALO and ALAC structure has been affirmed at least to ALAC's review. So like it or lump it, disagree or otherwise, this is the model we have to make work. We have to make it work better. That is going to involve resources. It certainly involves commitment. And again, in our Round Robin I suspect that most of the regions will things that will have a meeting point there.

If we also look at the matters of translation and interpretation, there's been discussion in a number of the lists recently, certainly in LACRALO with the matter of Portuguese being a very important language for the region has come up. I'm also expecting and it's appropriate at this time that that sorts of within regions-specific activities, planning and desires might be brought forward to the table.

So, hopefully, I've given enough people enough hints now, that if I start alphabetically and will I go from the A's down or the Ns back? Will we start with NARALO or AFRALO?

Male: Backwards.

Cheryl: Backwards this time? Okay. Let's go backwards this time. The Round Robin will begin with NARALO Concepts. What I propose is as many people will probably be doing me, too, so I would be very surprised if they weren't similarities in what most of the regions want generically. If we can capture those, Heidi, as global interest-areas and then have another column in our notes for anything that's specific, that might be particular meetings or something.

So, if I'm assuming you've got your things poised. You not, Valene, that's going to bite this bullet. Right? No, no? Okay, she's saying, "You're the one." Evan, go ahead. Thank you.

Sorry. Just to note, Vander has been dragged away by the Board of Commitments. Thank you very much for joining us, Vander.

Vander: I'll come back, as you know I can.

Cheryl: When they let you out...

Vander: Well, I would have a...at least at the end of the day we can meet again.

Cheryl: Yes. Yes, we very much look forward to that. Feel free to let the appropriate people know how happy we are about some things in this room.

Okay, go ahead, Evan.

Vander: Thank you.

Evan: I guess I don't have much to say because it's already been said so many times before. We've had an outreach plan for two years. It was presented to Nick. It's been presented to other people. Basically, what we've wanted to do has been well-known in terms of identifying meetings, things that we want to do and effectively do outreach at low-cost to ICANN, make heavy use of volunteers, get the word out, get new ALSs.

There's not a whole lot more to add. We're working on – we've got people working on French and Spanish versions of the AFRALO Brochure for use in North America. But that's about it. There's nothing new to add because if the old things haven't been done, then what's the point of thinking of new ones?

Cheryl: Okay, thank you, Evan.

Sorry, Heidi, you just pinged me, is that a time-critical question? No? Okay, thank you.

Any comments or questions other than rampant agreement from all of the other regional leaders, I suspect? Evan, we do however, if we can just formally dust it off again and bring it out again and just put it in, not literally right now, but as a result of this meeting we'll just table the same old stuff.

Go ahead, Evan...

Evan: Well, I'm looking forward to Tim Cole's visit later today. While I've already promised not to dwell on old things, there definitely is a need to talk to them about moving forward and doing some things together and coming up with some ideas that will save cost, extend outreach and perhaps leverage some of the work that ICANN is already doing in other areas.

Cheryl: Allen, go ahead...

Allen: Just a quick comment. Yesterday I heard a number of comments which mapped to, "We learned a lesson in Toronto. We will not forget it."

[Applause]

Cheryl: Sure. That's music to our ears.

Allen: What the follow-through will be, I don't know, but...

Cheryl: Okay, for those in remote participation, Carleton has joined us. He's had a very traumatic trip getting here and is been held up all over the place. So there's much delight in the room to have Carleton join us.

Go ahead, Sebastian...

Sebastian: Yes. Yes. The question of outreach, it's very important. It's one of the things I would have which to have from the strategic planning to the budget planning and to the realization. But one thing, we need to take into account and because this is very

clearly was the people in charge of that it's that four months outreach period about new gTLD process will be a very good time for us to be involved in outreach in our region.

I think we need to have ICANN taking, factoring all the outreach they need to do, and I'm not just talking about new gTLD. But also about what At-Large is doing and how At-Large is organized. If not, it will be a lose of NLG in time. We have to take this train, even if it's not the train we wanted to have at the beginning. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you, Sebastian. I'm sure we have nothing but affirmation, particularly from the regional leaders around the table. Going backwards, might I ask who from LAC ROLO? Dev, you're the one who's going to be responding to the Round Robin?

Dev: Yes, from the AFRALO side what we are more concerned about is the – on the engagement and the education of the ALSs, we think that okay. ALAC should give a priority to have firstly more ALSs recruited. Secondly, we want ALAC to be able to go on capacity like – unfortunately we are not able to do it, to have the capacity building program in Nairobi.

But I would recommend that the ALAC goes on capacity building program, especially for AFRALO, for African ALSs so that we have ALSs which are able to understand the issues that are – the issues butting into At-Large and ICANN.

So from the AFRALO side, I think that it's important that we have education of ALSs and then recruitment of much more ALSs and to build the capacity building. Thank you.

Cheryl: Okay, thanks for that, Dev. Can we also put a marker on that for discussion later in the day as well, because I think that's one of those areas which we may be needing to revisit a couple of times? Write down to things like outreach material and how we can – work smarter, not harder, and share resources. Look at with the new radio plugs, how we can perhaps have information going to the excellent work that ICANN is now undertaking to try and get communication as a closed loop, as opposed to a one-way direction which seems to be the issue now.

Sylvia, go ahead...

Sylvia: *¡Ola!* [34:36.9 - *En Español*]

Male: The French interpreter is not here, only Spanish...

Cheryl: Okay. Technical issue. We have no problem for the Spanish coming through into the English Channel, but the French Channel is not getting appropriate translation.

Male: The interpreter is not here.

Cheryl: Right now I'm listening to the English Channel and hearing the Spanish, I believe. Oh, yes.

Sylvia: [35:39.3 - *En Español*]

Cheryl: [36:26.5] Time out. Time out. A little towards the end of that conversation, we got multiple language coming through at least the English Channel, and right now I'm

hearing Spanish as well. So there is something going disastrously wrong. The French channel didn't happen at all.

Sylvia, I apologize so much. It is difficult enough for people to sit around tables and present and to do public speaking. I think that we know that public speaking is one of the most feared things for people. And I apologize that these technical glitches on Day One, we can only get better.

I'm quite sure that they're working very hard to make all the magic happen in the booths. But I am going to have to ask you to at least the later part of what you were saying, to try again. My apologies, they are working their hardest though. Thank you.

Sylvia: It's okay. [37:31.2 - *En Español*]

Cheryl: [38:22.7] Allus, go ahead.

Male: *¡Gracias!* [38:31.72 - *En Español*]

Cheryl: [39:05.2] Okay, thank you, and I think it's a very important topic and one that, whilst I recognize is going to be an almost universal need through each of the regions. It is as big and as an important topic as we have had since we began in this multi-regional model with ALSs.

It's an ongoing challenge. It's one that we can only do our very best to try and meet. But these enormous opportunities now in a post AOC world, that weren't in exist in several years ago. It's one of those situations where those of you who have been around this table for a while, please don't feel, "Oh, here we go again." Sometimes we do have to hasten slowly and continue working on some topics to eventually get through.

Okay. Can I ask for LACRALO? Dev, is that going to be you? Or Carlos? Or Andres? Who is going to throw some of the LACRALO micro-strategic planning and desires to the table? Dev? Go ahead. Thank you, Dev.

Dev: Thank you, Chair. I think what has also been mentioned, outreach is very important to us. It's one of our key goals, is to get more ALS representation in countries because out of two of three countries in LACRALO region really have ALSs from two teams, one tree country. We're looking forward to hearing what Sylvia and Carlos have to say about engagement and outreach and what together we can do to relieve this global, not just for the LACRALO region, but for all the global At-Large.

Cheryl: Thank you, Dev. What might be interesting, if we can, I'd really appreciate a little tally from each of the regions on countries within your regions versus the countries with ALSs in your regions. It builds on the work that Rudy and Ron are doing with the ccTLD community.

But it struck me when I was looking at Africa, that you actually have 50 percent penetration in a continent that has a huge number of countries. I'm not sure that message has gotten beyond these rooms, and we might want to market that a little bit more intelligently.

Who is going to throw the EURALO cards on the table? Sebastian. Thank you. Go ahead.

Sebastian: Yes, I guess we have the same questions that the other region, how to have more ALS especially in a country where we have no ALSs today. That's practically true for the eastern part of our continent. We're open by the beginning of two years ago and one year ago it was that we will have new ALSs coming from those regions, from this region but it's not yet is the case, even if we have individual – we used to have individual involvement from those regions.

We need to work on that. The fact that there is no real program for outreach that we need always to struggle to have any meetings at the original level or any participation from our leadership to any meetings going on at the regional level. It's very painful.

I am sure that our African colleagues make a very good job here during this meeting and we will see that this evening. But I know the amount of effort they have to put to organize that and it's not fair. We need to have smooth possibility to organize what's our African colleague will organize today and what we need to organize for the Brussels meeting and what our colleague from LACRALO will have to organize for the end of this year.

Really, it's absolutely mandatory. It's why I was struggling about the question of the strategic planning because everything is starting from there.

My second point and I am sure that a lot of our colleagues from other regions will support that we need more involvement of woman. I apologize that I have to say that here, because in Europe I don't see too much leadership from woman today and for tomorrow.

Because what we have to prepare, it's the next generation. The next generation even without the generation next to us, three years, a lot of us already in this loop of At-Large from two, three, four, five years. Maybe that's the time for father [*Not sure of word* - 44:03.3] to come. Where are they? And especially woman are not there. That's a big concern for us. I guess that's the main point.

I would like to add one. It's I really would like to factor the work done in the different region about the leaflets, about marketing tools, about whatever you want to call that. Because I don't think we really need to reinvent the wheel in each region.

And furthermore, I think there are meetings going on in each region who concern the world. That means that in each and every regional document, we need to have the other region because I just want to take one example. When there is a IGF consultation in Geneva, we and Olivier and [*Inaudible* - 45:06.0] who was there and Rudy was there. We had a lot of conversation. Even with possible ALS, not from our region.

I think it's good except if you say, "Just take care of your region," which why to engage every possible ALS from the world. But we don't have the material. When we say, "Hey, you can go," "Yeah, but it's to EURALO," and that's not good. I guess you have the same thing in your region. We need to find a way to have something done at the world-wide level and something at regional level. I think it's important.

Thank you very much.

Cheryl: Thank you, Sebastian. I think there's a couple of macro take-homes there and something that as in a moment I'm going to ask Mandy when we undercover from

double partnerships. She's a very brave and wonderful woman whom I love dearly, and is good enough to drag herself from the audience and sit in the hot seat unannounced, and unplanned. So, we do appreciate that, Mandy.

You and I should talk later about drowning. That's an in-joke and I do apologize. But what I would like to do is continue on to the other regions. But just take a note. That word "IGF" came up there, and that's something that Global Partnerships is very, very involved. I know there is so much opportunity with the regional IGFs when they occur.

For example, as we will hear from Tazhani from Africa, that is another golden opportunity for what couldn't happen here to still happen in this regional Internet ecosystem that we are such an important part of. So I think if we just highlight those as one of those macros and we should be putting in standing in our micro-strategic planning that we are to be considered part of that natural process of being involved in local IGFs.

Before I go to AFRALO because I did say I would go in reverse alphabetical order, I think AP is going to be the next cab off the rank. So, Les, as your specific...it's all up to you.

Hopefully we have a microphone that might work...Okay, just stretch...We'll just say China and the Pacific islands work very closely now.

Les: My apology. Thank you, Cheryl. APRALO faces a particular challenge which is – hello?

Cheryl: I'm sorry. We actually have French coming through on the English Channel. Can I ask is there someone here from Translation? Okay. Anybody seconds somebody who is going to be explain this dog's breakfast to me might be able to explain to us all what is going on and what challenges we may need to meet and what we will have to do to get around it.

So, if we could have English through Channel 1 and we can have French through Channel 2 and we can have Spanish through Channel 3, that will be a start. Back to you, Les.

Les: Oh. Apologizes for that delay. Yeah, APRALO faces a particular challenge and I think it's peculiar to this RALO and that's diversity. We've got about the same as others. We've got 21 ALSs but we cover a large geographical area. We've got multiple languages and cultures. We've got multiple scripts. We've got vastly varying populations in the countries that make up our ALSs belong to.

And finally, we've got different access problem or different access challenges which of course we have fortresses and non-fortresses. They're very newsworthy at the moment. These in turn drive our focus on what we'll be doing in the next - over the next period. Or it could be the next financial year which is July 2010 to June 2011.

One of the most importance we see is the importance of IDN. We must address that; in addition, the new gTLDs and the new ccTLDs. The great problem in scripting variables must be addressed. We've got harmonizing ALSs. We've ALSs which are – come to the table with quite structured, formalized approaches and we've got others who are take pride in their individuality. We must address both of those. We must harmonize both of those.

Of course, one of our challenges is to increase the ALSs and perhaps finally, we've got to adopt an outreach program, which we are doing, which is to engage with a partner at other international and regional meetings. And start to work with participating in global events, perhaps within a booth somewhere at one of the Expos.

We're thinking perhaps working closely with Apricot; again, to promote the presence and the good work and the principles of ICANN. So, I think that's sort of a rather a busy agenda. Certainly, a busy wish list. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you very much, Les. Do we have the interpretation issues...? Okay. Here we go. Whenever the magic happens the explanation will shortly follow. Les, one of the issues and I know I'm going half on this and perhaps Hong would like to come in on this particular item. So I'm slightly removing my Chair's hat into my Asia-Pacific role.

When Les outlined the diversity in language and script, please, those of you who work in large lumps of countries that do all happen to be rank and file or not, imagine the challenges in Asia-Pacific. We have billions of new Internet users going to come online. We have, if memory serves, the other side of 50 entirely discrete official languages.

It is a plethora or Pandora's box, depending on how you look at it. Hong, some of the challenges that we have in terms of variance and what Les was saying about IDNs and variance, I was hoping you might pick up on and explain a little bit of why that is so important to the CJK, the very, very vital core of Asia-Pacific region At-Large organization at the moment.

And why it's also important to those countries that will be coming online as we do our outreach. So, if you don't mind, Hong, I'll throw to you. One moment...

Hong: Thank you, Chair. I guess Les made a very comprehensive presentation from a regional perspective and [inaudible – 52:45.7] intervention is absolutely terrific. It captures two key issues. One is on how to do outreach in such a diversified region. Another one is importance of internationalized domain name to enable more people to more effectively use the Internet.

For outreach, I can see this is true from task. One is to engage more effectively with certified At-Large Structures. There are totally 21 of structures in a region, not all of them are very active in our regional organization activities.

Another front is to reach out to the regions and countries. There is no At-Large Structure that exists. For outreach, for engagement, what I can see the translation or interpretation is of extremely important issue. Cheryl correctly referred to the huge diversity in our region. There are so many language scripts, cultures, regions. ICANN's translation into British interpretation policies so far has [inaudible - 54:05.7], when it is applied to Asia-Pacific region, especially for interpretation.

When Theresa went to El Dorado for public consultation I raised the issue, I guess I was in support from Cheryl. That is for document translation. Of course, it's important for us to acquire information and for people to participate, to speak out. It will more effective to have the translation, to have the interpretation available.

So far, we have in this room with French, Spanish translation. Where is translation for Hindi? That is a big limit for the Asia-Pacific people to participate in the policy debate. So I do hope the interpretation policy could be improved tremendously.

Another front on this International Domain Name, Cheryl is very, very right. Very different from the European or the Latin scripts in Asia-Pacific region, especially in Asia. We have some special scripts and Latin script is totally different from that. I guess English is not the prerequisite for people to be in communication on the Internet.

But this has become a kind of digital divide has become a bar for Latin people if actually used the Internet. We were happy to see that ICANN's new Fast Track gTLD idea, gTLD initiative and so far, full idea, Fast Track TLDs have been approved. Three from the Middle East, one from Russia; no one from East Asia, especially from CJK group which needs IDN in a most pressing way.

So, I guess this is another key issue we really want to raise to ICANN. What is the reason for the delay? This is worsely delayed interpretation of Internet in these not Latin script-using regions?

The last point I want to raise is that in Asia-Pacific a lot of marginalization. APRALO, we are now thinking about use Internet tools, the new technology to attract young people to engage with our illumination, which is ICANN's issues, especially used the Google, the Internet, the iMac [inaudible – 56:38.9], the Twitter or FaceBook because it's a fast-growing Internet population. Most of them are very young. So, I guess new technology is what attracts them.

We've learned, that there is some regional IGF meeting happened in possibly in Hong Kong, before Brussels meeting. But we haven't got any briefing on that. I hope the people who know the information will tell us what is going on and who's hiding that?

Right? Thank you very much. Back to you, Miss Cheryl.

Cheryl: Thank you, Hong. And of course, the irony of discovering something as important as a regional IGF happening in the Asia-Pacific smack bang in the last quarter of an already finalized budget raises obvious issues. So what we may need to do is look at future planning and contingency planning based on what our recommendations for ALAC improvements say we need to do.

So, it's very clear that if a type of activity is running in a particular region, we have an interest and at least the potential for us to attend. I have Allen and then, did I say Dev? No, I saw Adam. Sorry. Go ahead, Allen.

Allen: Just as Hong was talking, I suddenly came to a realization. We've always talked about how unique Asia-Pacific is and that it covers a huge geographic range. I suddenly now understand why it was set up this way. It's allowed us to take all the difficult languages, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Arabic and a whole bunch of other ones and put them all in one region.

Now one can question whether that was to make it easier to focus on or easier to forget about.

Cheryl: Thank you for that very amusing and depressing thought.

Allen: Sorry. And Hindi.

Cheryl: Well, there's a lot more than Hindu and we've got 22...

Allen: I missed that one.

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you. Adam, while I'm giggling away, and then we do have Christina in the room and she's going to explain to us how we need to do the care and feeding of the interpretation for this meeting.

Adam, go ahead...

Adam: Oh, good morning. It's Adam, and very quickly about the Asia-Pacific IGF. Like most things that start with volunteers, they start with volunteers and they've got to start somewhere. So, if you people got together and decide to organize in a regional IGF for the Asia-Pacific region and the first meeting is really to discuss that well to Apricot about a week ago.

So the reason you haven't heard about it is because you can't hear about something until something has been spoken about, kind of thing. So it's just a matter of fact that this is a very new process. It will be held, hopefully, the 15th and 16th of June in Hong Kong, and that's about all the information I have. I'm supposed to be a member of the core team.

So, yeah. It's early days. So you'll hear more as we know more.

Cheryl: Thanks for that, Adam, but it's actually very flatly important what you said, because what I'm hearing in there is our need to plan both strategically in the micro-strategic planning in our regions and the At-Large advisory committee needs to do. And how we have input and hopefully, some output from budgetary planning at ICANN at some level of spontaneity or reactivity.

At the moment, we have this crystal ball-gazing activity and really good ideas being responsive and fast-changing thing called the Internet just don't fit into 31 July, 30 June puddles, let alone 12 months out of that very neatly. So that we might need to look at some form of general ability to be more reactive and responsive to various things that might be happening.

Christina, can you come and tell us how we need to make our lives so much easier with French and Spanish and English and things?

Christina: Okay. I do apologize for what's going on today in our meeting –

Cheryl: I hate to tell you but you're actually going to have to use a mic.

Christian: Oh, I [inaudible 1:00:45.5]...

Cheryl: No, no, no. Nothing – we have remote participation and we also don't have any chance of any of the interpretation happening unless it goes through one of these mics.

Christina: Okay. So sorry about that.

Cheryl: That's okay. Begin.

Christina: First of all I like – can you hear me?

Cheryl: Yeap.

Christina: Yeap? Okay. I'm sorry for the difficulty on receiving the right interpretation. What's going on, is although it might sound simple when I explain it to you right now, it is actually very complex.

The settings here at the – the settings here at the KICC are very old, are from the '60s. The problem with that is that the –

Cheryl: Now, I suspected these don't work. That was part of the challenge. Take that and put it somewhere.

Christina: I'm okay. It's like I'm talking to my children, like I'm trying to convince them not to do something.

Cheryl: Fat chance with this crowd. Go on.

Christina: Well, the problem is as I was saying that the settings here are from the '60s and while we are lacking in the settings is the interface that will allow from one booth or from one language to the other to receive the English feeding back to be able – for example. When somebody is talking here in Spanish, they receive it in the one booth, the Spanish booth and they be able to interpret into English.

But the English is not going into the French booth because – thank God she's not there. We're working on that. We have contracted other people to bring us more sophisticated booths, let's say. So, hopefully we'll be set up later on with everything arrives as we hoping. They will arrive and we'll be able to set up everything so that problem won't happen anymore.

So sorry about that. We are kind of limited to what the country infrastructure was offering. That's what we're trying to deal with right now but hopefully for the days to come, you will be listening and being able to hear all the translations and interpretations.

Okay?

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you very much. We do appreciate the efforts. Many of us were in this room yesterday and saw the heroic efforts that were going on to try and set up. Let's hope by the time the main show starts –

Christina: Yes –

Cheryl: All the bugs will have been ironed out with the At-Large community. See? We are useful for something. Before I toss to Mandy I would love to give our host region AFRALO, the floor. Go ahead, Tazhani...

Tazhani: Thank you, Cheryl. To save your time, I will not repeat what the other region said. You know now, I think that participation is one of the very important and one of the main concern of ICANN.

So, the ATs, one of them, most of the main concerns of ICANN, we now have both committee participation. That means that it's very important. I hope that you would

be integrated into actions. We don't need only to be concerned about it; we have to do things to make it implemented.

What all the regions said, I agree, concerning the participation. I especially want to second what was said from Peru concerning the participation of the ALSs. We have also 21 ALSs but how many one are really involved in the ICANN process? I don't want to give a figure because it's a shame.

#2 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-2-07mar10-en

Alan: Hard to understanding what the implications are of not being to play in the ICANN game. And as we start seeing IDN TLDs and a variety of other things it's going to become more visible, I think that's what we need to focus on. How do we get information out to the people who are close to being receptive to it, and close to being able to understand? Admittedly, we still have too many buzz words.

So, I think we have to be careful not to try to focus on educating everybody in the country, which is a nice long-term target. But we have a short-term desperate target of getting the active technology people and leaders involved. That's the step I think we have to work on really hard.

I think Global Partnerships and doing it in conjunction with other local and regional meetings and piggy-backing on things are the only way we're going to hit those people. Because in general there are already meetings in countries that focus on these people and those are the times we have to hit them.

Cheryl: Back to you, Olivier. You'll have the final word.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. I was actually going to make a point or ask whether actually it was the appropriate time to discuss this, because it's something we can discuss *ad infinitum*.

We've discussed it I think every single session that we've had so far, and I haven't seen any movement from ICANN on this. I would like to see movement on ICANN. I'm really sorry to push but let's be a bit controversial here and get something done. Either, whether it's going to be a campaign through the RIRs and through the Registrars/Registries and actually informing their clients.

But ultimately, it's ICANN that they should be looking at if they want to actually have something to do with the governance of domain names. Or, through another way and I think we might require a session to discuss this because there must be a potential of other ways. I mean, maybe a media campaign in newspapers, but then Alan is saying that that's going to reach the general population and maybe not the right people.

So, anyway...let's think if in our future meeting we can have something, maybe a first step and discuss this further. Thank you.

Alan: I'm going to object to occasionally reaching the masses and the large number of ordinary people. It's just I don't think – if that's our focus, I think we're going to waste a lot of resources. And it's not the more critical one.

Cheryl: I do think we need to recognize that we're actively working with various ccTLD operators and there's a lot of stuff that can go on both within the ICANN part of the Internet ecosystem. But also many of the ALSs are actively involved in RIRs and in regional activities.

What's important is that we all have at least have some idea of what each of us are doing because right now we're really not working very smart or very effectively. I'll try one final time to toss it to you. I do not – oh bad – oh, you're bad man. You know that, don't you?

Very brief, go ahead.

Male: [*En Français* – 03:11.6]

Cheryl: [4:29.8] - Absolutely. Yeap, yeap. Absolutely, and it brings me back to a moment at an Apricot meeting when Australian ALS worked with the Internet registry, the regional internet Registry, and running in parallel with APRICOT. We did a session, a one-day session. It wasn't technical. It was about how to talk to decision-makers, how to interact with governance and to protect people even being able to speak in a way that gets that 30-seconds interest from a decision-maker.

There's all sorts of skills that in fact our At-Large Structures have. And again, it brings back to being resourced. Go, Mandy.

Mandy: Okay. First of all, thank you for the opportunity to be here. I know that my boss, Theresa Swinehart will be here in the afternoon also to talk. I think that many of you know something about our department, but I will give you the one-sentence summary.

As you know, ICANN is made up of constituencies, and most of those constituencies have specific staff tasked to them. Global Partnerships tries to support all the internal departments and all the external departments because we work on a geographic basis. We are a younger department.

I have heard a lot of very good ideas, a lot of energy and a lot of frustration at this table about the number of times that you have made requests or sent things through and not seeing a direct tie.

We, as staff, like you as members of the community are bound a certain processes and budgetary push-back. The challenges we're all facing are the needs to creatively leverage resources. That means better coordination between us and you in the field. That actually means some very specific discussion of calendar items.

What meetings...yes, we need more outreach. We need more education. Parenthetically, I will say we now – she is not formally on-board yet, and I don't even know if I'm talking out of school whether she's been announced. ICANN now has a Vice President of Communication and Mass Media Marketing something. I'm not entirely current on her title.

But this is one of the issues is looking at those resources. We now actually have someone to focus those. In all of these situations, always, it's going to be a matter of being able to show result, cause and effect. I think as a starting point, now that Heidi and I are both there – for instance, some of you may know the RALO for sure.

My team and as Hong talks about the challenges in the region, we have one staff member covering – he's supposed be Australian/Pacific-Islands. He took on 11 additional countries to that territory. We are in the queue trying to get the staff to put them into the field.

This is a great challenge right now in this current budget. The more we can show need and push – I'm being selfish here and I'm asking for some support – the better that is. So, but, the EURALO for sure in its translated form is on our USBs. Any time our guys are in the field for any meetings, that that's distributed with the idea and PDPs or any of the other ICANN materials, that's in there.

Our USBs come with folders, by language. So, if the Bahir hands it out, at the Arab League, they have those materials in those six languages present. That is something we can work with you to get more of your materials in those places.

Talking to you about what do you see as critical? This is a painful decision-making process because I realize how large and diverse your regions are. We're looking at the same thing.

What is the most key event for the three top ones for Fiscal Year '11 that you see? Because where we can leverage having you at a meeting with materials, rather than trying to argue for staff to be there, or if I have one person, I think many of you know Anna Shell, but Anna Shell has the entire African continent.

Cheryl: It's huge.

Mandy: She is an extremely talented person with technical and cultural skills and multi, multi-lingual, but she is only one human being. So, where we can partner, where we can strategically talk and some of that may mean being on having a regular schedule so that when the EURALO does a call, somebody from my department is on that call.

So, I want to say that I'm here to be supportive, to give you specific answers, I need really specific questions, because we are fighting the battle of we need the average money. We need global participation and engagement as our bailiwick. I need to be able to show – I mean, the Fellowship Program comes under us, for instance.

So, my challenge in dealing with the Board and the Finance Committee is not just to show them the geographic and linguistic diversity that we have brought in. They then want to see that those people are now going through the NONCOM process. Those people are now active in the ccNSO. Those people are now at home organizing regional meetings, or attending the IGF.

We have some of those stories, but that's the kind of documentary proof that we need to argue our case. We were on the same side in this case.

Cheryl: Okay. I've got a speaking order at the moment.

Mandy: Sorry.

Cheryl: At the moment I've got to – no, no, no. It's fine. It's because we've got so many technologies. I've got people remotely putting up their hands and in the room they have put up some hands. The order is as following: We have Evan, Sébastien, Olivier, Hong and then Carlos. Okay?

Go ahead, Evan.

Evan: Hi. Mandy, quick question. Will there be anyone ever assigned to North America ever again? I say that as somebody who was actually recruited by Jacob Maltose, Darlene, some others within the North American region or indebted his involvement to get us there.

I imagine in certain instances that North America's considered probably to be over-serviced by ICANN in some ways. In some other important ways this is not one of them. So, I would just ask that perhaps there might be some attention given to that.

But in terms of what you've already mentioned, the North American region has had those three meetings presented to Nick for the last three years. So this is not something that we need to come up with. I can even tell you the meetings right now because we've had them in our queue forever. So, this isn't a matter of go back and think about it. We've got this all ready to go.

If you've got the resources or the ideas on how to do this, we're ready and we've got volunteers ready to do it as well, standing ready to help.

Mandy: To directly speak to that, and not in any criticism of Nick, tell me, because I'm Global Partnerships. The other is, will there ever be a North American person assigned? You are referencing one of my dearly departed former colleagues, Jacob, who handled the Caribbean and Canada, because he was Canadian.

So, you can imagine the territories –

Cheryl: Interesting.

Mandy: We used to joke that responsibilities were alphabetically assigned. And I know how hard he worked and what a great celebration we had when we got you guys on-board.

I think that in the short-term, because we are trying to address Asia and China, India and the languages there, that what we can do is have more direct things to the people who are currently in the NBR office, for instance in the Washington office. We now have Jaime Headland who is Governmental Relations for the Americas.

Our Global Partnerships for Latin American and the Caribbean are working actively with him and I would say that we just need to bring North America in under Theresa and myself and deal with it that way.

Evan: I realize there are other regions that are struggling to get one ALS per country and I mean on that level, we certainly don't have much to complain about. It's not I'm saying we need to have staff thrown at us, but if you're saying that if we've got volunteers that you can work with –

Mandy: Yes.

Evan: We're ready.

Mandy: Okay.

Cheryl: Thank you. Next. Sébastien.

Sébastien: Thank you. I will be a little bit – no, not a little bit. I will be too rough but sorry for that. I apologize for that.

We can't coordinate ICANN staff. We already put all our ideas on that matter under strategic planning, on the budget planning last year on the RALO lease discussion, under-staff dealing with us. It's done, done, done. Now we need the money to go.

The second point is I – it's very difficult for us to hear that each time we ask for something we need to have more staff. No, no, no. We need the money to go to the ALS, RALO and the At-Large. We don't need to add more staff. We are doing a

large part of work. And if each time we are doing work we need to have somebody to take our work to be, what? I don't know what.

But, it's not what we are asking for. We are the region. We cannot support from the other side of the world. But what we need to do is to be sure that we have the material, we have the support, the money to travel and to be in the right place to do what it is that needs to be done. Not for outreach for At-Large, but also because we are not just focused on our single question, what could be done for ICANN in general?

We are open for that, but please, we start with strategic planning and we already say all that. Then I know that you are not the right people or the only people, I must say that. Sorry that you are here and I say that here, once again.

But that's my feeling today about all these questions. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you. Next was Olivier and then Hang.

Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. Of course, I'm going –

Cheryl: Olivier, Hang, Carlos. Now I see Tizani. Okay.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. Of course, I'm going to echo some of Sébastien's points. But we do hear this on a regular basis and one concern I have, in November there was a small conference which happened in [inaudible 17:01.5] IGF. I don't know whether you've heard of it. I'm sorry to be aggressive in this way, but the poor showing of ICANN at IGF was particularly annoying for those people who actually attended IGF, thanks to being sponsored by other organizations.

We either represented other organizations or we actually were there in-person. I know of some people who actually had to pay for their own participation. I was not that. One of these people thankfully...but anyway...

The portioning [*posturing?* 17:37.6] of ICANN and IGF is something which I think is just a major mistake. ICANN did have a booth over there, but there was just one person attend for all of ICANN. I thought that usually we get about, 1300, 1600 people at an ICANN meeting. Having one person on the booth is not particularly great.

There was absolutely no documentation at all regarding At-Large. You know, I'm sorry. It's just sounds like a fly-by-night operation. If you want to actually have an impact and actually reach out, you have to put the money down. That's one thing.

The other thing is I do appreciate that you're trying to find out...the resources are limited and you're trying to find which meetings you want to attend. The problem is that you're going to find the usual suspects everywhere. The usual suspects are just going to pass by and, "Hi. Yeah, yeah, hello," and whatever.

You don't just go there and reach out by having a booth. You reach out there by either sending a team, a comps team that will go out there and engage participants. I'm not saying that you're going to need to send women in bikinis or hunky guys or something. I don't know.

But you're going to have –

Cheryl: I can assure you we won't be doing that.

Mandy: No...

[Laughter]

Male: [Inaudible.]

Olivier: Chippendales, etc., I don't know. That's for you to work out.

Cheryl: Why are you talking like that?

Male: It got our attention.

Olivier: So, now that I have your attention, yeah. You do have to put the money down. I think that we have on several occasions provided details about what we wanted. I do hope that this time the message will be received. Thank you.

Mandy: I'm sorry to hear that the ICANN open forum at the IGF and the staff that we had on the ground – there was one person sitting at the booth, that's true. But the booth is a mechanism but it isn't the primary mechanism we use though. There were Board members at the IGF. We did have staff at the IGF and we did have some community furnishing –

Male: [Inaudible].

Mandy: I heart this – no, At-Large.

Cheryl: Okay.

Sébastien: Our Chair, but not as At-Large. Not ICANN At-Large and that's what's a pity because she is our Chair. That was really a pity that she was that on our behalf there. Even she spoke very well about us.

Mandy: Okay.

Cheryl: Okay. I think we're hearing some similarities about trying to work smarter, not harder. I think we need to be very keen to move forward. I think considering with all the complaints about the foundation we're working from, my heavens. What a benchmark. We can only do well.

Mandy: That's right. Everything will be up – yes, only uplands from here on. And I will say one other thing. Yes, the regional meetings are incredibly important to us and we do do those. We're not just looking for more places to put staff in the field. Obviously, the difficulty – I'm not going to talk about the difficulty in the budget.

Cheryl: No.

Mandy: You all know what the difficulty in the budget is. I share the frustration. But, part of what we need to do is look at where can we put members of the community? Where are you going to be anyway because of multiple hats that you already wear, that we can then put – if we cannot come up with travel money to send your members to

various places, if there are things that you are already doing that we can leverage by getting you the materials, by getting you translations, by getting you outreach by maybe helping with the media buy, something to increase the profile.

Those are all – spread the word – those are all useful. They may be more accessible financially, in the short-term. But we want to talk about all of those ways as well. I know. I'm not just looking at you got to hire somebody to be your interface. That isn't it. And things like APRICOT and APNEK and all of those regional meetings. We do try and leverage – of course, somebody else has already got the infrastructure in place. Can we do a workshop? Can we do a presentation?

The only other comment about the local IGF, the experience we have had with doing workshops in the past, because there are so many counter-programming, we'd have four people in attendance. We could not rationalize that. We just couldn't justify that.

So, there is the open forum that is normally done. We have people on the ground that are trying to interact. We need better coordination about getting both the ALAC message but also what members from the communities are already going to be there. So that there can be on-the-ground war room strategy.

Cheryl: Sorry. Just turned myself off which is a terrible thing when I was about to speak. First of all, I want to note that Evan and Sébastien still have their hands up. I assume you're not trying to go round again...? You are going around again? Okay, well, that's fine. You get on the end of the queue.

I have Hang, I have Carlos. I have Tizani. I have Adam. Who else do I have if I don't? Okay.

Male: [Inaudible 23:04.2].

Cheryl: And then I have...okay. We've got Andreas. You're going to...okay. Carlton? No. Okay. Hang, go ahead.

Hang: Thank you very much. This Global Partner project is very important and very challenging. We do understand that. It's only one staff in Pacific region. I guess it's even though he's very brave, I just met him in APRICOT. He's a great person but it is not possible for this one person to get all the things done.

So, he needs volunteers.

[Audio abruptly ends]

#3 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-3-07mar10-en

Carlos: [*En Español*]. ¡Gracias!

Cheryl: [0.35.8] Thank you, Carlos, with the view to moving forward as opposed to looking back. We need to learn by our history and build on it. We've had similar issues raised from North America in a Canadian meeting recently. So, I'll move the mic to you but I think we can only assume that with better partnership and better communication we won't be repeating these slightly regrettable and disappointing things.

Mandy: Yes, and on a truly global calendar where we know that whether the Registry liaison is in the field doing something that they would have communicated with you all, but also with us, similar to the Registrar liaisons. I think I know what meeting is being referenced by Toronto. I can but say that Cindy was in our department and I didn't know about it at the time.

But I appear in your message. I am writing it down and adding extra stars. Yes, we need better coordination within the organization, within all the constituency groups. There should be an information blast. If the new gTLD outreach people are going to do media event and they're looking – that's the other part of this is that we need to have all the aspects of ICANN looking to you all as conduits for those initiatives, regardless of what department is initiating them.

[Light smatter of applause]

Mandy: I will try. I will carry the message home again.

Alan: Delightful to hear that from someone else.

Cheryl: We do believe we are a resource. And just to let you know, Mandy, we continuing the breakfast we had in Seoul with the Board. The table topic was, "Well, here we are. Don't you think you should be doing something with us?" Now we're going to drill down a little more over lunch. So, we're attacking from all sides.

Mandy: By the time you get to dinner I think there'll be specific set of tasks and a framework in place for sending out –

Allen: They don't have to do this...

Mandy: Oh, wow...Perhaps Brussels will anchor that or the Latin America meeting in December.

Cheryl: That sounds like an excellent plan. Tizani, then Adam and then Andreas and Sébastien. Do I have anyone else on the list? Then we will close for much needed break.

Go ahead, Tizani.

Tizani: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to recognize here the great work done by the staff. I can speak about the staff of At-Large. They are wonderful. They do a huge amount of work and at the right time. They are always responsive. They're always there, and

always present at any time. And when they are sleeping, they are play as soon as they would come. So, thank you very much, Heidi, Mateus and Gisella.

Second point –

[Light smatter of applause]

Tizani: Second point. We had a project with the budget with everything. We presented. We were [inaudible – 3:56.3]. It's not on the budget. We can't – you have to put it – to put this kind of things on the strategic plan. We did. What was the result? That's the question.

So, we know and we do the job as it must be done. But the problem is resources. Resources must be foreseen. So, with the main question now, the strategic plan and the budget for the next year. Thank you.

Mandy: Yes, Tizani, I know about the proposal for this meeting. And regretfully – well, we've been on many of the same conference calls. The lead time involved is a challenge. I know you've all done the work with the strategic plan. Now, it's the heavy-lifting between now and the Brussels meeting about getting that prioritized and translated into the budget.

I know that you all feel like you're banging your head against a brick wall sentiment that I can –

Cheryl: Empathize –

Mandy: Empathize with. Those are wonderful – even with the Fellowship Program, for instance. Because of the amount of lead time involved to get through the Selection Committee and to be able to have people to have time to do their Visas and everything else, you're looking at needing to, for instance, the Brussels has already closed.

We can work harder to get information out to all of you when the Latin America meeting is going to open, when it's going to close. Let us leverage your networks to get that information out into the field so that those individuals will actually apply. I mean, the disappointment in the particular event you're talking about with the 26 people you identified. Only three had actually applied out of that.

It's a competitive process. There are 119 people in the pool. The Selection Committee made other choices. But that's...a learning opportunity and now there's a framework. There are things we can leverage them forward. Don't give up.

And the strategic plan was a critical first step. I know that Sébastien is looking frustrated. But we have some real challenges in the next few months to get those things concreted into the budgetary thinking.

Cheryl: And we will keep working on that, because tenacity is one of our keywords.

Adam?

Adam: Yeah, I wanted to say something quite similar to what Carlos said. I won't repeat it but really, it's coordination between staff. It seems extremely important. Hopefully

that can improve from now on. Thank you for being here. I wasn't saying you particularly or to raise your own thing.

But I think there's been a feeling of perhaps At-Large, and for example, the Fellowship Program hasn't been as closely linked as it should have or could it be; there's similar people, similar regions, similar interests. Hopefully that can improve. It does seem to be.

I'm very concerned about your – I keep hearing rumors that your budget's been cut. It doesn't look like it's being cut when I look at Global Partnerships. What is the concern over budget in particular? I know you have enormous amount of work to do. There are a lot of vacancies.

Global Partnerships has had probably the most successful outreach program ICANN's ever done in the Fellowship Program. So is that being cut? What's happening with the rumors around Global Partnerships and budgets and that sort of...? That's one question.

And just to throw in, I don't know, something mean. It's ironic that Evan would mention extra budget and staff for North America when we seem to be getting offices popping up in Northern California costing a few million dollars that don't seem to go through normal processes, but that's just a thought. Don't really need –

[Applause]

Adam: You don't have to comment on that.

Cheryl: I was going to say there is no way that the Chair would allow a response on that second question. But on the first perhaps, Mandy –

Mandy: Oh, I so wish that I could.

Cheryl: No. You may not.

Mandy: Yes, because you want me to still be sitting in this chair –

Cheryl: Exactly.

Mandy: In a week's time.

Cheryl: I value resources so you will not answer the second question. Go ahead.

Mandy: The first question was, what are the rumors around the department's budget? I really don't know how far out of school I'm talking. You understand that the – we do go through a budgetary process. We have all now been asked in the current fiscal year to go through a cost-restraint exercise because of downturn in revenue, and some perhaps, some anticipated expenditures. That's as close as I will get to that.

We have also been told currently that Fiscal Year '11 has to be flat with Fiscal Year '10. That raises a series of internal challenges because within Fiscal Year '10 new commitments have been taken on. So you have a constrained pie with new commitments within it, and there will be a series of animated discussions and negotiations taking on internally about the budgets that the departments have presented.

And so, there is definitely the possibility that certain things that we have been trying to do, we will be asked to postpone into another financial cycle. Or, we will be asked to take something that would have been a 12-month higher and move it back to six month higher. I really don't know whether I'm allowed to –

Cheryl: No –

Mandy: To even say what I have said. We are, all of us facing global economic change, downturn in revenue, ever-increasing demands. We need to be as responsive as we can, which is all about the need to work smarter and leverage all of you and leverage the cross-initiatives that exist within the staff. We do have people who are now doubling up as to be completely frank because of internal changes that have taken place and new things that have to happen.

So, this is a challenging time for all of us. I'm sure it's a challenging time for all of you. We will work on better coordination and we will make as zealous a representation of the importance of our work as possible within that process.

The more community push that comes, and the more online comment to the budget document – and I know that you feel that you do this all the time. We need a tidal wave of response saying, “This is all well and good, but these are our priorities in the community.”

I, as a member of the community, want the Board to rationalize to me what resources are coming here versus here. That's the only thing I can say here, unless you're actually writing me a check out and there's a question about your ex-sponsorship. We can work on that.

Cheryl: Actually, just to put a placeholder in that, we will need, ladies and gentlemen, to talk a little bit later about a direct sponsorship because as we discovered with the APRALO planning, we do need to get a little formalized agreements and understandings about how we can get local sponsorship or not, what type of – we need some performer information.

It's again, it's generating a knowledge base and a set of tools for us to use, both internally in ICANN and extend in the community. I do have Fatam, Andreas and Sébastien but in also in direct response to that last – it can wait? Okay, then, Evan, you will be the last speaker.

Go on. It's all yours. Here's the mic.

Fatam: Hi, everyone. I'll just introduce myself. I'm Fatam Bashawa from Pakistan. I'm like participating for the first time with you guys.

Cheryl: Welcome to one of our newest ALSs. Congratulations.

[Light smatter of applause]

Mandy: Program...

Fatam: Yeap, yeap, yeap...

Mandy: Very happy to see you here at the table.

Fatam: Well, this is one of the ideas I wanted to discuss. That for example, this is a way to understand Pakistan has entered into the ICANN process like this. Our fellows to the ICANN but we never had direct engagement of the country or its community At-Large into the ICANN process.

Now, we have a huge Internet community in Pakistan. For example, one of our stakeholder groups is [Inaudible 13:49.0] but is comprised of all telecom industry. Then you have another group who is 200 people, which is one of the newest members. They are like 200 people who participate in national policy, Internet policy, telecom policy.

Then there are other groups. But the basic problem that we are having is that if I have to explain to them what a thought is, I can't. I can talk about Board participation in ICANN. Exactly. That participation is solved. That is what we're looking for. I was searching for the language and of this version. Yeah.

The Fellowship Program itself is a great opportunity but it's not just for one region. It's for all the regions from different parts of the world.

Now to get those stakeholders from Pakistan which actually contribute to ALAC and I'm only the facilitator. The group [Inaudible 14:41.5] because parts are spreading other ideas and I'm on the American IGF and then I'm with the NCUC. I'm trying to understand the ICANN at this moment.

I'm going to demote misconceptions within the idea of itself about ICANN. There's lots of things going on that we are trying to get to but once again, I don't want to be that usual suspect you see attending house.

So, in order to get the right people into the process, I would like to say if we can have some other Fellowships maybe, like for South Asian region, we can [inaudible - 15:14.1] throughout the year. Like one week you can have a Pakistani there for their At-Large community. But then next year you give it to India, Srilanka, other countries. It keeps it [inaudible - 15:23.7], some other geo - I don't know what budget aspects. I'm still learning. I just heard from you the constraints. So, let's end that.

Number two thing is within the Open Source community we've fortified and one person contributes a resource in this country. That listed on the Wiki Board of the larger community. So, we can always depend on all these materials [inaudible - 15:45.5] materials and so forth which we can secure in our region.

Now for Pakistan, we have a huge Hindu-speaking community. But you will also be - what you call it? The same in northern India, the majority of people who speak Hindu is also very close to Urdu.

Then in India itself has a very large population which speaks Urdu more than Pakistan. So that means that if we work on Pakistan's outreach towards community, that actually gets transferred to what you call it? India. That would also work for like if you work on Mandarin or you work on Chinese it is a compilation of other countries.

So, that's the amazing part about South Asia. That is so...it's just like Latin or Portuguese and like it goes really far. So that is one area, if we can do maybe

associating would be a really good idea. So, there at least in the next one year we can get people participating in the ICANN process.

The guiding, the IGF, the case which was discussed that there are too many fellowships going on, we're looking into that. If Theresa would have been there she would have been...

Female: [Inaudible – 16:51.5]

Fatam: Yeah. She will actually clarify that to you. We're trying to figure the similar workshops into like larger workshops or super workshops so that the participants can be like, what you call it? Taking part in large numbers. But there's also problem, a small problem that the idea for groups like the ICANN meetings.

So you never, for example, if it's going to be in Brussels now, in Latvia, in September. I cannot guarantee you whether there will be a large participation in developing countries. Why? Because in your opinion in these processes already very strict one for developing countries, especially for South Asia and so forth. So, you wouldn't have a larger participation.

So, these are some critical issues which also come with a socioeconomic environment of the industry.

And finally, I'd like to say that...

[Murmur in room]

Okay. I'm done.

Cheryl: We weren't cutting you off. We were alerting the booths that there was a technical issue. So...thank you very much for that.

Andreas, then Sébastien, Evan and then End.

Andreas: [18:02.4 to 19:31.7 - *En Español.*]

That's it.

Cheryl: Okay. That is very clear, and thank you. There was a little delay because the interpretation needs to catch up with some of your more energetic moments. So, there was a little tiny delay. We might take this moment to remind people to be kind to the interpreters and just slow down a little sometimes. Is there anything you can say to that?

Mandy: I don't have the details of the specific event that's being described and I think that sometimes we do have siloing within the organization, so that they are targeting a particular part of the constituency. They say, "Well, we want to provide this kind of information," and they may be, in their heads, the organizers may be predetermining who they think the audience should be, rather than saying, "Let us do a very wide-scale notification."

I don't know the detail and I don't know the specific meeting. But if, for instance, they think someone has tried to set something up where they want people to be aware of the new gTLD program, and in their heads, they've identified that it's trademark

lawyers or IP people of large corporations. So they've taken their small piece of resource and they've leveraged it by trying to partner with a group. They are seeking a specific audience.

It isn't necessarily that they – they're just not conceptualizing that a broader band group should know about it to participate. They've gone in with perhaps a preconceived notion.

So, yes, we need to have better coordination, communication so that you know that these things are happening that you can flag for us also. "An invitation ought to go to this individual. An invitation ought to go to that individual." Even on a certain – just on a cultural courtesy level so that the right people are aware and involved, even if they are not interested.

So, again, I don't know the specifics of the event or the individuals involved, but I'm – I think that may be one of the issues that we face in the failure to actively involve society in some of these meetings.

Cheryl: Thank you, Mandy. Alan, just has a particular response to that particular place. And we have Sébastien and Evan and coffee is then waiting. So, if that doesn't motivate Sébastien and Evan, what doesn't? It doesn't help Sébastien at all. Maybe it'll motivate Evan. Go ahead.

Alan: We said before that you need communications between people in ICANN. That addresses part of what you just said. It doesn't address at all because even when we've been successful in catching people's attention, then the result – the answer is sometimes and I'm paraphrasing to use your example of, "This is coming out of our budget. We want to talk to IP lawyers. We don't want our budget being used for coffee for the rabble or something equivalent."

So, it's not only catching people's attention, there's also budgetary implications. And everyone has constraints there so somehow it's got to be spread around a little bit.

Mandy: I'm convincing them. In that instance because they've predetermined what they think their target audience is. It's, as you say, we need to convince them that they should have a broader target, or, except that perhaps maybe that's – I don't want to paraphrase what you're saying and change your meaning.

Perhaps we should talk separately off line.

Alan: Yeah. I think that if we're targeting multiple groups, even though the event was originally rationalized because of new gTLDs. They may be budgeted but from the other parts of ICANN because they are now going to bed...

Mandy: Yes, if they have the budgets and we can get them –

Alan: By leveraging the tie, by leveraging the single event –

Mandy: Yes.

Alan: There are implications that are not only staff, but budget.

Cheryl: Yeah. And I must say, I'm smiling so sweetly because this is the example that we've used as a hypothetical. Of course, if we had not only shared diary, issue, calendar and

shared understanding and an open communication, of course, other parts of ICANN might know exactly what talent we have around this table.

We could probably outdo on pure numbers, the number of IP lawyers and connections to real, meaningful IP law outreach in most countries. Yeah, we actually also need to share what skills and connections we have. We know very little about each other without experiencing and sharing. There's something to be said for that as well.

Sébastien, and then Evan and then coffee.

Heidi, what is it you want?

Heidi: [Inaudible – 24:26.2].

Cheryl: Go ahead, very quickly.

[Murmur in background]

Alan: Somebody talk.

Heidi: Just a quick question here. A few months ago we tried to get the regional liaison events where you were going to be in our external calendar. But we found that there was only one month prior rather than getting it three months, four months where we can actually start planning events, where we can might be there.

So, any way we can start getting regional liaisons to identify those meetings are going to be at, three to six months down the line?

Mandy: Yes, we can – yes, we can definitely try. What we publish when we do our department monthly report which shows where people have been in trip reports and outreach and other kinds of things, we publish the next month's calendar.

Heidi, yes, I absolutely hear you. We try and have a planning calendar so that we – because we have to allocate our own travel resources. There are also – we need to have a shared calendar about what your events all are as well. Where you as...so, Heidi, you and I will be – we're just going to institute – we're going to sit down once a week and look at everything.

Cheryl: That is music to my ears and I suspect to most people around the table.

Sébastien, Evan?

Sébastien: Yes, and I wanted to suggest that we can share with you what is in our calendars at the regional level about even we want to talk about or we want to participate or whatever.

I want to make one proposal and it's not in the budget. It's in this discussion with no cost. First thing I would have hoped that a government, it's not above an ALS. It was not the case last time to see if ICANN came to Paris. You went to make an interview to the Minister that never talked to us during this time.

The second point is that when he came to sign an agreement with NSCO, that it's quite important for our community. We were not invited, and I was not invited most

as an ALS from the country and as Vice Chair of the ALAC. I think it was a mistake. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you. I think that's one of those "so noted" things because Mandy's definitely noting it, but it's possible.

Evan, go ahead.

Evan: Mandy, I have a question about budget considerations in terms of long-term approach, in terms of yes, there are short-term budget issues. But is there – to what extent is there any long-term thinking going on?

I say this in relation – I'm going to invoke the "S" word – the summit. The summit was a very, very major event. It was a very, very expensive event. And in –

#4 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-4-07mar10-en

Evan: Not only that but as I'm hearing you talk about this year's coming budget and the constraints, I was sort of hoping for some kind of longer-term planning that wouldn't have any one year's budget make as much of an issue on something that is so long-term and doesn't happen that often.

Mandy: We are asked every year to make a case.

Male: [Inaudible – 0.28.1].

Cheryl: Sorry.

Mandy: So if we have something let us say that I have in the budget a specific initiative event staff-lined, whatever and I am told that I must constrain it and I can't have it in that budget year. I don't get to say, "Okay, then it's automatically in the following budget." I have to make the same case all over again because it's a [inaudible – 0.51.8]. We all start fresh.

I think that this is a creative suggestion that could be added to that process, but as I said, part of this then is the Board Finance Committee and the bylaws and the financial rules that the organization has to live under and report.

So, I don't know whether it's technically, legally, financially possible. I think it's an interesting suggestion and it should – we need to make sure that Kevin hears about it and whether there's a way that this can be discussed with the Board Finance Committee as well. But it's...

Cheryl: Mandy, it's nice to have possible solutions as well as the request. We are all very happy to look at possible solutions and I think from this morning's conversation, I mean, you've got a bunch of people here who have skill sets and abilities, capabilities and energy and it sounds to me like we're recognizing need, purpose and possibility. So, I don't know about everyone else, but from my perspective, I'm very excited about the possibilities of next steps.

What I'd like to do now is encourage each of us to take next steps towards the coffee which may indeed disappear and have you all back here no later than 11:00. Yes, I've cut it down to 10 minutes, but there you are. I'm not meant to be kind. I'm the Chair.

See you back here at 11:00.

Mandy: The coffee is down the ramp.

Cheryl: [*In distance...*] Watch your step.

Mandy: Yes, watch your step down the ramp.

[Members leave room with the recording running until end of this audio. Nothing else discernable is said]

#5 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-5-07mar10-en

Cheryl: Bridge?

Female: Bridge is on, yes.

Cheryl: Bridge is on? Bridge is open. Thank you very much. Adigo operator, are you there? Adigo operator, are you there? Maybe...not.

Okay, if the Bridge is connected, let's hope that all the magic is actually happening.

Well, I'd like to take a moment to open the floor and get some feeling back from particularly the regional leaders, but also the ALAC in general about what was going on this morning? What we were hearing, what we are perhaps looking at as possibilities of next steps.

Because what I came away with from our discussions this morning was very exciting opportunities but hard work to be done. To that end, I think we need to rely on the regional leaders working in close coordination with the ALAC members in each region, regardless of their status – if elected or noncom to really sit down, perhaps inside session during this meeting. And start fleshing out some meaningful possibilities from this morning.

One of the things I discussed off channel with Mandy – and thank you, Mandy, as you leave, I think we are more, more than pleased to have had you here.

[Smattering of applause]

Mandy: I'm not running away. I'm going on the next thing, but, I am here. And happy to have off-side conversations and come to meetings and other kinds of things.

Cheryl: Well, what we're going to try and organize is a slightly orchestrated get-together from our side so that what can come to you is not a whole cacophony of different ideas. But a few people have got together and reviewed what we said this morning, and perhaps what's the next step opportunities together to see how we go.

Mandy: Okay.

Cheryl: One of those things however was something that very much trips back into the regional and something we'll be looking at a little later with the dashboard, for example, that LACRALO has put together. We have an inability for the ICANN, the wider community in ICANN to know and recognize what sort of talent, what sort of connection, what sort of skill sets we actually have.

So, I think there's a piece of internal strategic planning that we might perhaps spend some time in our next session looking at. Not just at what can ICANN do for us and what we can do for ICANN, but what we need to do for ourselves to market and promote ourselves more effectively and more efficiently, first of all, to meet our regional and local needs.

But also to ensure that the incredible wealth of talent and potential that we have, not just in the ALSs and their stature and their connectivity, but the rank and file members of some of these organizations. These are very, very valuable assets and

yet, we're not listing of promoting them. So, some of the things like the shared tools that Mandy was talking about...

And we seemed to have lost audio totally...something's definitely gone wrong...can we just test – okay. We seem to be back on again. Thank you.

That one of the opportunities I think we have is to do a little bit of internal review, meet our local outreach needs but also make sure that that could work and what we are doing is in some form of a repository, not just publicly available; but available specifically for parts of ICANN and ICANN leadership to look at.

Now how that happens, I don't know. But where we can stick it in terms of relationship with our implementation plan is our own choice of collaborative tools and how we do education and up-scaling of our ALSs. So, I think there's a couple of opportunities where we can say, "We are meeting our improvement planning process by doing that."

But first of all, I'm opening up the floor to general thoughts and comments about this morning. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan: I have the luxury of speaking not as a regional leader. This morning's discussion was unbelievably encouraging from my perspective in that we've heard back from Mandy the kinds of things we've been saying for the last couple of years.

It comes with a caveat. Don't make promises you can't keep because we're going to be measured on how well we do the first few things.

Cheryl: Indeed.

Alan: So, if you're going to involve people make sure that they understand that we need to deliver on what we're doing, because otherwise I don't want to be the one sitting around two years from now saying, "Give us a try again. This time we'll do it right."

So, without casting dispersions or implying anyone will not meet all of their commitments, we know how hard real life is. Let's deliver – let's do cooperative things but make sure that we do deliver.

Cheryl: Thank you, Alan. I'm sure that's something that particularly when we get excited about how much we could do and what we'd like to do, we might have to do a prioritization exercise, both within region and from our global multi-regional perspective.

We also need to make sure that we don't have needs and desires that are competing interests between or causing riffs between regions. So, if we do get together and do I think perhaps with your regional leaders, having regular regional leaders and secretaries meetings.

If some of these activities can be focused on there to make sure that the needs of the many aren't out-weighted by the needs of the few. That would be a very, very good thing. Perhaps having that feed formally into an ALAC and regional leadership meeting, I'd like to think we might be able to formulize having one of those, say, mid-points between the close of this meeting and the Brussels. Because I think we're missing an opportunities to work more closely with each other.

Any other people wishing to speak to what we covered this morning, before we launch into our continuation and next steps? I see Carlos and Andreas' hand is still up in the Adobe Room. Is this new? Okay, tell us. Go ahead.

Carlos: [*En Español* – 7:42.1 to 8:28.6]

Cheryl: Thank you, Carlos. Andreas.

Andreas: [*En Español* – 8:36.7 to 8:45.9] I'm being slow.

Cheryl: Okay.

Andreas: *Beuno*. [*En Español* – 8:55.1 to 9:25.8]

Cheryl: Absolutely not okay.

Female: No, because he's talking, talking, talking... We're getting two words at a time.

Cheryl: Exactly.

Female: Like this is not translation.

Cheryl: That is exactly what I'm about to raise. I think we need to ensure that what you understand we're hearing is accurate, and what those of us in English...

Alan: What we've heard so far is you've said several times you want to comment about what he said, yes.

Cheryl: Yes. So, Andreas. All we have heard is – exactly – all we have heard is your wish to comment on what Alan has said and an awful lot of “okay”. I'm quite convinced that you said more than that.

So, what I'm going to ask you to do and I do apologize, is if we could run it from the top, and this time let's be very certain that we have language coming through slowly enough but also that we're hearing more than just what we know is obviously not what you're saying. So, try again. Sorry, Andreas.

Andreas: [*En Español* – 10:36.5 to 12:04.2]

Cheryl: Thank you, Andreas. I think when we move this afternoon into how we're going to more effectively engage the ALSs in not just outreach, but effective policy development. We're going to find that not just LACRALO but many of the regions are going to have some very similar needs.

When it is identified similar need or facilitation that's required, I think that gets escalated to something that the ALAC needs to keep up and help you with. I really, really want to focus on making sure that regional things happen regionally-based. We're here to help wherever that goes across regions.

But it is important that we get ALSs involved and that probably means, rather than having regions take responsibility, for example, with briefing calls on topics that that's handled at this high level. That's a better use of resources.

But we need to, I hope at the end of today establish who gets to do what, who's main focus and role, rather than duplicate effort. And also look then how we can ask for our specific support or funding where it fits within our implementation of ALAC review outcomes. Because there are a number of those recommendations where building those regional engagements will fit.

Sébastien, go ahead.

Sébastien: Yes, it's a question. When do you want – I think we need to discuss on the budget planning because I think if we don't get –

[Talking in background]

Cheryl: Go ahead.

Sébastien: [Said joke in Spanish – 13:54.5 to 14:09.2]

Okay, I will talk to English, if you would. It's just a question, I think we need to work on the budget planning because even if it's not inside the strategic planning what we asked for. We need to see how – what comments we need to do on that. I want to say something about that but when it's a good time to do it.

Cheryl: Any other conversations following-up on this morning's work? It's a good time to do it now. Go ahead.

Sébastien: Okay. Thank you. I tried to really not read this all this document but I try to find the word "ALAC", "At-Large" three times. I like to one to say about last year. One about by was about the budget. Then very, very blue when you talk about Registrar, 31 times and the Registry something more even.

I think we then need to also know that there is no RALO. Once again, it's only a contractual relationship between ICANN and our organization. It's at the RALO level. We, as ALSs, we when we made the pages of formation of the RALO, we signed a contract and agreement – m-o-u, I don't remember the name of it, but something.

Then we are contracted parts in ICANN.

Alan: Our relationship isn't financial.

Sébastien: No, no, but we...but yeah...you are taking the financial side. When ICANN or MOU was development of commerce, it was something.

Evan: Sébastien, may I intercede? Just be careful for what you ask for. In the other contracted parties ICANN expects money from them.

Sébastien: ICANN, once again be careful, but we are to leverage the fight that we signed something with ICANN. It's not – I feel it's not done and I don't see why because I am taking the word of contract and some money will flowing one way and not in the other.

To come back to one of my points, is that we really need to discuss this document and maybe the right place could be the finals coming to the At-Large or ALAC to do

some part of the work with the regional leader. And as a joke, I hope that she will find this a joke, sorry, because it's in English.

It's I tried to word find the word "Alice" and there's a lot of Alice somewhere but a lot is coming from go because I cannot have a lot of go. I would like for this to be write "Go Alice".

Male: Thank you.

Female: Sounds good.

Female: That's good.

Cheryl: Very clever. The proposal there was and it's one that we should formally discuss now at this meeting, that the existing financial subcommittee, the Budget and Finance Subcommittee of the ALAC take a role working directly with regional leadership. That's Sebastian's proposal.

What's the thoughts around the table? And I understand the matrix but I also at a high-level documentation. I'm a little less concerned the number of times names and words are mentioned. I think if we do continue to show clearly by what we put in in public comment and the amount of work and thought that goes into what we say, we will get higher profile but we may not get it overnight.

So, what's the view of any of the regional leaders on that concept of I guess having an *ad hoc* side activity during this meeting, remembering that yeah, we have to actually get this commentary and feedback done in fairly short order. So a lot of work has to be done while we're together here.

Nobody has any comment at all? Evan, your light is still on, so I'm going to make you talk.

Evan: I wasn't going to answer but to raise something else. It actually goes back on what Sébastien said on – I actually think it is a little bit interesting, not specifically engage in a word count, but I think we are starting to see in some people in our region, some real cynicism creep in. It ends up being we talk and talk and talk and there's so few results coming back.

I think...I don't know who to talk to. I don't know where to talk to but there's just a seething frustration. When we come out with policies and there's no mention of it. When ICANN talks about all their stakeholders and their discussion starts to sound more like an industry association than of a public interest body.

This has a very disconcerting effect on people that have stepped forward, put forth policy, given their time and then see very often not even so much as an acknowledgement of what they've put in.

This is, I mean, I want to be optimistic like Andreas says but it's becoming very difficult. We have both a blessing and a curse in North America of having some very, very long time people involved with ICANN, many of whom have been dropping out. We have – I won't name names. We have people within the North American region who have been involved as individual members who have unsubscribed from our mailing list. They have basically said they have had enough.

These are people who contributed significantly to what we've been doing. I don't know who to talk to within ICANN to say, "At least acknowledge us, okay? If you're going to say 'We've listened, we've heard but we disagree', that I can live with."

But to have things to have like the DAG without and at one point, Nick went through a very good long list of differences from one DAG to the other saying, "Well, these are things that we've asked for."

But just so much as when they're going through, "Here's the list of comments that came in and..." I don't know if I'm putting this very well. But it's just a very, very general sense of frustration that I think is happening. When I hear the comments that we had this morning about more engagement and outreach and things like that, there is a part of me thinking that we also need to consider in-reach and that's making sure that the people that are already here continue to be engaged in something and less reason to be cynical.

I don't know if I've made my point clearly, but...

Cheryl: Okay. One of the things I noticed because now Mateus has managed to put a screen close enough that I can actually see the Abode Chat Room. I've got a small chance that I'm understanding what's a red X and what's a green T because Adam's in absolute agreement with what you're saying.

I suspect that if we did a quick poll, we'd find most people would be in absolute agreement with what you're saying. We also need I think to recognize that whilst in many of our cases, our levels of frustration are need-critical because of, in some cases longevity and in some cases because we've felt like we've bashed our head up against for so long on similar subjects.

It's probably important and now is not a bad time to do it; if not now, but maybe later this afternoon. To take stock and look at the very positive changes we haven't. Let's look at it. Let's look at just 12 months ago, three At-Large summit compared to now. There is really quite significant changes. We didn't have Global Partnerships or staff outside of those we had tethered and tied like contractual relationships to have to deal with us, coming in the room unless we had some good reason.

Mandy was here not because she needed to be here this morning, because Global Partnerships were genuinely interested. And so, I see this as not just light at the end of the tunnel, but a real opportunity.

The other thing I think we should probably take stock of is when was the last time at the major introduction to the meeting attendees but CEO, you had paragraph two, if you ignore the words, "Welcome to Nairobi and ICANN 37th international public meeting," being paragraph one.

Look at At-Large. That's what it does. That is huge. I think we need to appreciate that that's happening because of the work that all of you around this table have done. And clearly, by demonstrating with the policy development processes you're involved with, that the ALSs putting in work group ethics and energy.

Some of you know how many hours so many people in your regions put into teleconference calls and workgroups. I wonder how some of you are actually earning your daily bread with the huge of amount of – some of us are not exactly Rudy. You're correct - with the huge amount of volunteer hours.

We might feel like we're under appreciated at times but the evidence is showing me different. I think if we can just throw out these little bits of positive back out to the community in the edges to make sure that those with energy and enthusiasm can [inaudible 24:57.5] and respect the fact that volunteers are volunteers and some of us will pack up our bat and ball and go home for a different times and for many, many different reasons.

But if we show progress, if we keep developing and if we put into place everything that the At-Large review improvements say, it will be a much more integrated with mainstream ICANN outcome.

So, I hear what you're saying, but by the same token, it's only a few words on the front page but you wouldn't have found the words "At-Large" or ALAC. I was in a diagram of the structure of ICANN. There you would see the ALAC as an advisory committee. But this is talking about At-Large, the real grassroots end of spectrum. I think that's really exciting.

Can I open the floor for comments there? Are you feeling within your regions that something specific can be done or needs to be done? Hopefully not North America but then North America is also being engaged for a very, very long time. Adam is either waving to me or saying "yes". So I see Adam and then I see Andreas.

Go ahead, Adam...

Adam: I think the point about whether ALAC's comments or At-Large's comments take into consideration is very important to follow-up and we should talk to David Oliver about it.

It was an outcome of the summit and everything. Everybody wants to see how IAF's comments take into consideration if don't tell us why they're not acted upon. That's all we need. It's only good policy practice. It's good governance of the organization and it's not being implemented and we've asked for it for 18 months. We're not the only ones who've been asking for it.

So, it's about they did it. That's about it, really. We should follow-up with David.

Cheryl: Yeah. I think we need to know the day David will be dropping in about 1:00 o'clock. Some of us including me will be in a smaller, informal workgroup meeting for new gTLDs on specifically morality and public order. But, I think that's the sort of conversation while David's here; he does have a formal time with us on Tuesday.

But I would like to think that's exactly the sort of mantle he should be taking up and forwarding on our behalf, because it's not just us. It's way beyond the At-large community.

Andreas, go ahead...

Andreas: [*En Español* 27:11.7 to 30:02.1]

Cheryl: Okay. I really do not believe that we have captured efficiently on the English Channel the majority of what you were saying. But so to let's check on this, I'd like to tell you what I heard you were saying, okay? I heard you call for structural change...

Andreas: [Inaudible30:29.8]

Cheryl: Okay, to analyze the possibility of structural change, but what we heard was a call for structural change. We would like to explore then what the meaning and at what level you were referring to because it did not come through clear.

We also heard that there was a need to elect those who were willing to do the work, and from that I don't think what you were saying and what we were hearing was accurate. So, I'm very concerned that those in English and in French may not have accurately captured what you were going to say.

Again, I apologize, Andreas, but it's important that we understand what Latin American/Caribbean is saying.

Andreas: [Inaudible – 31:14.8]

Cheryl: Go ahead.

Andreas: Well, in the first concern was our lack of capacity of containing the people who are highly qualified and that have been in participation for a lot of time, which are not so much America. But we have five or six extremely qualified people who have been involved from before when like LACRALO exists.

But they are on the least when they say, "Well, this costs more than policy. Let's hide the bar. Let's do more efficient job." On the other hand, we have some people that they are engaging, they are increasing their ability or their capacity so it's great for us. This is the amount of – this is the focus where we feel like we are going forward.

But they also a group of persons that from their mouth, they said that the amount of information that is available for them, the amount of work, the amount of changes and structures and things you have to understand, it's a lot. So every email on the list blast every change in the workspace, plus every teleconference or every workshop.

So, for them, it's a lot. So, they were asking us to put some different levels of information in order to get them more brief information but more precise. So, I was just suggesting the possibility of the very low and in a very – I was not calling for a change of structure. No. It was this to be understand very clearly because in our last teleconference where you were participating, Cheryl, in LACRALO, the translation was tricky to us. Yeah? I don't want this to happen again, yeah?

But usually the translations services are so good so I have to be fair with them. Yeap? In this particular matter, to explore the possibilities, perhaps we don't have the answer. Perhaps another RALO has done a better job. So I want to look at the APRALO board and how they arrange their information flow.

But also, I don't know if we have the answer, if any RALO has the answer of how to get more involved the people who are really highly qualified in order to get more policy development input because those people gets tired when we discuss three hours about something and we have no outcome. We do a lot in our region, and I guess in all regions.

So, there are three different points of talk. The people who are not so engaged and don't have a lot of time so they want less information but more precise. The people

who are starting to be engaged that we are trained to – I think we are doing a good job there. The people who don't need more than discussion and to put their opinions, that we are not so successful in that, containing those people also.

So, there are three different needs that we can identify and we are not being so precise in their answer to get the three different types of needs to satisfy those needs. So perhaps a change in-between the five RALOs or ALAC and RALOs could be become a better outcome of this need. I don't know if someone else also shares my vision because perhaps your vision is another one. Thank you very much.

Cheryl: No, thank you and thank you for taking the time to repeat because I was very doubtful of what we were hearing was what you were meaning. I do appreciate that. I know it's not easy working in English so thank you. It makes a difficult to think and speak in one language and then have to repeat as accurately as possible what you've done in another one.

Andreas: Just more slowly.

Cheryl: No, no, no. I see a number of points of agreement but I also see a number of people wanting to respond to that question. I think the order is Dev, Bedouin and then –

Male: [Inaudible 35:49.3]

Cheryl: So, Adam's first, then Tizani then Evan? Is that right?

Male: Yes.

Cheryl: Okay. Adam, Tizani, Evan...then Bedouin then Dave, and Rudy. If we could use one other technology and did either of them work and do good? Go ahead, Tijani.

Tizani: Okay, thank you. I wanted only to say that we share exactly the same concern in our region, in the African region. The structure – I don't know if we can tell it in English but in French we can tell it to make the information in different manner and with different details for people, for our ALSs, for people who want them to be with us is one of the concern. It is, I think it is one of the most barrier to make people participate efficiently.

Cheryl: Thank you very much. Evan, Rudy, Dave, in that order...

Evan: Following on with being in violent agreement with Andreas, I'd like to propose the use of a term that we should consider as part of the strategy and I'd call that "in-reach". That is the concept of retaining the people that we have as much of a strategy as collecting new people, because if we can't engage the ones that we get, then getting new people is just going to enhance the problem.

Cheryl: Yes, yes.

Evan: So, I'm going to suggest – Pardon?

Male: [Inaudible - 37:38.2.]

Evan: In-reach, as opposed to outreach, that we consider the idea of something that is the design from the beginning, to engage the people that we already have, the ALSs that are here. Right now we're not doing enough for them. So, if we're not doing enough

for the people we already have, bringing in more doesn't help the problem and may only get the new ones cynical. They come in. They get bored and we never hear from them again.

So, I'd like to suggest that almost as an explicit strategy to go alongside an outreach program to have – in business it would be a matter of retention as opposed to getting new customers, retaining the ones you already have. So, this is sort of understood in business circles. I think we can apply that here.

Cheryl: And just to make sure we're all looking at the right points, what that is doing is going immediately to outcomes of recommendations, three-recommendations, four from our improvements plan. Yeah, they are clearly talking about an ALS focus, existing ALS focus, not an outreach on new ALS focuses.

Tizani's work and the group that he put together with such [inaudible - 38:57.4]. The AFRALO outreach was very much about – it was called Capacity Building but it was continuation in-service education and out-skilling to improving engagement of their existing ALSs.

So, I'm sure it's going to be – everyone's going to be in great agreement with each other. What we need to is now get that somehow into some micro-strategic planning from the regions into an ALAC strategic planning and into the bigger picture.

Rudy, and Dave and then Bedouin. Okay?

Rudy: Thank you, Cheryl. I agree with what Andreas brought up and I support his proposal. That sounds like it will fit into what we will try to propose as often and trying to get out to our ALSs and to understand what the ALSs are doing, especially in the domain of working together or trying to work together with the ccTLDs. It's one part of the ICANN world.

I hope that we could change what happens between or what happens in each RALO and exchange the ideas of how to work together as a RALO, first of all. And work together all the RALOs together. Because I think there are quite a lot of differences between the way ALSs are working in certain regions, especially when I look to how ALSs are working together or try to work together with ccTLDs. It's completely different from what I see, for instance, in Europe.

Another aspect I would try also through our project, our questionnaire which we will bring up is try to know who is representing the ALS because we've got the ALS being selected and certified at a certain moment, but we don't know if the people actually representing the ALS are the same as the ones we find in the package.

So, I think it's quite important to have an overview of all the representatives of ALSs as they are today. Because I think that if you send out a mail to the old one, they probably will not respond anymore. And we will lose a lot of information as it will not be challenged from the previous person to the other one.

So, I think it's quite important at the RALO level we should understand better how the ALSs are working in the region first of all before we can catch them up and say they are not working for us or not working with us.

Cheryl: Thank you, Rudy. And of course, CD is very much a method for the RALOs although it does go to the next step that we do realize out of the At-Large

improvements process we need to meet. That is the next step is a requirement of order and bringing everyone's information and such back online.

There is of course what we've been waiting for since, let me see...I think it was the Los Angeles meeting...our member-based system which will apparently answer all of these problems and needs. We've used our ability to update and change information and for a stall have micro-spaces. I'm glad I wasn't a betting woman and I didn't put any money on that ever coming home because so far I'm very, very disappointed.

Next we have Dave and then Bedouin and then Wolf. Go ahead, Dave.

Dave: Yeah. I am totally able to what Andreas said, he mentioned. I think that some ALS do not participate because they lack the knowledge. They lack – they do not – they are not being able to understand the correct issues. When we talk about policy development basically they are at a loss.

What I think that is important is the Capacity Building program or the outreach program of the ALAC is immersed. I think that the ALSs should be empowered first so that they are able to understand issues and so they can participate in the discussions.

For example, I can say that right now we have the Diplo Foundation doing a workshop on Internet governance. So, we can, out of the same model by At-Large and then on each ICANN meeting we have a workshop which will be used exclusively to empower, to train or to make the ALSs more convincing, more aware of the issues that pertaining to the ICANN.

Cheryl: Thank you, Dave. There is of course, more opportunity than just at ICANN meetings for that to go on. I think that's something we probably need to be fairly cautious about, not just thinking it has to happen three times a year at an ICANN public meeting or twice a year at an ICANN public meeting. There are opportunities particularly at the regional level where I think we can do better leverage work and effective outreach.

I now have Bedouin, then I have Wolf, Hang and Sylvia. It would appear to me that I'm going to then pass the chair over. Alan, are you going to handle the next section through the working lunch?

Alan: [Inaudible – 44:47.4]

Cheryl: I can give you two minutes. That's fine. Okay. Go ahead, Bedouin. Go ahead.

Bedouin: Yeah. [*En Français* - 44:58.0 to 45:23.3]

Alan: [Inaudible – 45:23.5]... in English?

Bedouin: So fast. Okay. [*En Français* 45:34.2 to 47:02.3]

Male: Slower, please.

Bedouin: *Oui*. [*En Français* - 47:06.1 to 48:38.3] *Merci*.

Alan: I'm going to put myself on the speaker list for just a moment. The comments that Bedouin just made are interesting. They're interesting in a sense that the problems

he's describing in Africa are just as true in Montreal and New York City and San Francisco and Los Angeles, getting people involved and getting them to understand the so much interwoven technical issues are a problem. It's not only restricted to the lack of materials in a given language. It's just that the environment we're in is very complex and very hard to get there.

I think we need to talk more. It's not good enough to demand that we get materials and stuff. We really have to think about how will we get people involved in the process. There has been a similar discussion going on in the GNSO. Bill Drake is one of the people who have said we need ways to formally integrate people into the process. It's not just the lack of material. It's really understanding how we can get people to go in – to get involved.

Back to the speaker list... Wolf.

Wolf: Thank you. It was mentioned before regarding capacity building for ALSs. I would like to repeat for our friend I mentioned that's a Diplo Foundation. Currently it's launching several causes on capacity building. The next summer causes that it be one cause for Europe, that it be several for international level again.

I would like to encourage all of the RALOs to pass the information to your member ALSs because I can highly recommend capacity building have broken off the Diplo Foundation. I see several people here around the table who participated at this programs. This is a very helpful means to empower the capacities of our member ALSs or of people we know in our environment who are interested in general in Internet governance issues who can then promote their knowledge by ALS causes. Thank you.

Alan: Thank you. Hang, next.

Hang: Okay. Two points, first one is not reach another one on capacity building. For outreach is sort of pathetic. But we are going back to the old question of engagement of At-Large structures again and again in many meetings.

Well, apart from all the wonderful suggestions, the measures has already been mentioned by our colleagues from different regions. I want to go back to the point that has been raised by Evan, the previous session. That is, is it possible at all to have another large summit? It is a source of obscene or gravited [*Not sure of word - 52:17.8*] to talk it.

Think about the enthusiasm that was stirred up by last summit, and think about the success of the meeting of the people around the world in one space. We don't have to tie the summit with ICANN meeting. Actually, we have a separate one, if the budget could permit.

There's one point I'm not reaching. For capacity building and follow what Wolf said, there's Diplo foundations training for future leaders in either governance. It's very good one and actually I'm on the advisory board. I strongly encourage the students, the young trainees to join this project to apply.

Another program is also on capacity building is a summer school on governance. Now is available in Europe and Latin America. They have a source of a flying faculty, a group of people flying around the world to train the young people about issue on Internet governance domain name. ICANN is one of the subjects.

This year in Europe the summer school will be held in Meissen, in Germany. In Latin American and I guess the summer school will start very soon, probably in May or sorry; in April. All right. I get it somewhere else. It does that. In March, really? So, there's another very – oh, that's great. We'll have a great team here. I have nothing else. Go back.

Alan: Andreas asked for a very short intercession before Sylvia.

Andreas: *Gracias*, Alan. [*En Español* 53:53.3 to 55:11.3] *Gracias*.

Alan: Thank you. Sylvia.

Sylvia: [*En Español* - 55:21.6 to 57:47.4]

Alan: Thank you, Sylvia. I think Fuoud was next.

Fuoud: Yeah, sort of like earlier with my – it relates to my African colleague was saying that we come from a developing part of the world. Sometimes, for example, you must have seen during the open mic sessions with the Board. When an Asian comes up to speak, first there's part of respect which goes into opening his discussion, and then they humbly start to speak and then slow at speaking. So they usually require like three to four minutes to get the message out which is cut short to two minutes.

Similarly, when we are communicating amongst our communities, our way of communicating with our people is a bit different from like what you call like regular English communication. And to convince them in every region, literally there's a different language more is a different way to tell them how things run. That is where looking content development comes up.

Similarly, if we look at the broader discussions that happen at ICANN advisory committees, you'll find a lot of developing country people left out of the discussion because most of the topics, they gather round like global issues which are mostly influenced by the developed part of the world, right, in the Internet policy making. So this is one thing we have to realize.

And then there was an example of the Diplo Foundation course in the Euro, summer school Internet School of Governance. Both of these groups specifically have people dedicated to – the source is dedicated there to manage the community networking online.

Since I did the program in the Diplo program in 2006, there's a regular person which communicates with us all these through the years. He keeps us connected. He ensures that we participate effectively together doing the IGFs. We show up at the Board. We are going to the meetings. We participate in the award ceremonies, say, Nigeria had the awarding ceremony of last year's program.

So, you see, there's an element that goes into instructing such an outreach program whereby over the years you build up these communities from specific countries, say we have South Asian group of people. They can easily communicate with each other.

So, if you have a person dedicated to look after South Asia, he will be able to look after South Asia, the eight countries. Similarly if you have a person dedicated in South – sorry, Asia/Pacific, that person will be able to – right now we have a very big communication gap between South Asia and Asia Pacific. If you look at, I think the

organization there is APRALO? Asia/Pacific, right? How many people from the eight countries of South Asia do you have in the upper realm? Just forget that.

That is a first – you can identify from there how big the communication lagging is. So similarly, we have to start in such a way that we have maybe one person from these regions, or two people who can coordinate activities and they can be present in both regions.

If you have only programs, the interesting part is the program has capacity building material available in multiple languages, almost international languages, all of them. The book used for Internet governance is translated into Chinese, English, Russian, Arabic, French, Spanish – imagine that.

So this is something you will have to put in.

Alan: Thank you. I think Tizani, you're hand is up?

Tizani: Thank you, Alan. I want to second what Sylvia said about the ALSs. Sure, we have to do a lot for those ALSs so that they can participate at the shelte [Not sure of word 1:01:55.0]. But if an ALS don't send and be on the list for months, for years. if this ALS never participate in the conference call, we have to ask question about it, and we have to find a way to reconsider that interpretation of ALSs if they are really that not active.

Alan: I have one comment on that, but is there anyone else on who would like to be on the speaker list first?

My only comment is an interesting one I hope in that as you all know, the methodology that we are proposing for selecting the At-Large board member includes a component of votes that will be directed by or selected by the RALOs which means the ALSs. One of the questions that the community will without doubt be looking at is how do we authenticate that community? To what extent does it really exist?

I suspect we're going to have to be able to answer that over the next months so Sylvia's comments are timely. Because whether we like it or not, it's probably something we're going to have to do one way or another. In fact, is referenced in the At-Large review that we'll be talking about after lunch.

So, it's something that probably because of the At-Large director position we are elected to have to do sooner rather than later. To anything that the ALS, that the RALOs can do to start preparing for that, I think would be wise moves.

Do we have any other speakers? The lunch is supposed to be here shortly, but I haven't actually seen it yet. Adam?

Adam: Yeah. Something that doesn't seem to be happening that we keep on talking about is a flow of information from the ICANN community generally that we can send in a digestible manner to the ALSs. I don't think that that's happening in an effective way, a regular way and short digestible amounts that an ALS might be able to look at sort of coalesce or focus their involvement around, which is not getting good information from ICANN to the ALSs in a format that I think is sort of appropriate for them.

We've talked about it a lot. Evan's put forth templates years ago about this, and how we actually communicate with ALSs, how they meet their commitments that they signed up on and all kinds of things. But I think it's basically the information flow about all the different policy issues that are going on isn't good enough.

You can't expect them to go to a website. I think it has to be driven to the ALS level, partly because that's part of the commitment that ALSs make when they join, that they would have information made available on their websites. I think that information should be provided by ICANN.

Alan: I think your point is well-taken. I'm going to follow it up with a question though. With the possible exception of the parts of the business constituency within the GNSO, At-Large is the only group that is not here essentially as part of their business. All the other constituencies, all the other groups, are all involved essentially professionally for profit or not, depending on who they are.

Therefore, we're the largest customer of the kind of information you're talking about. I'm not sure we can get away with demanding that it be given to us. But somehow we need to find a way to work with ICANN to identify exactly what it is we need and be in the loop of the process of deciding what's the highest priority? What's the lowest priority? And how do we structure this?

I'm quite sure how to do that but as the largest customer of such information where the bulk of the other parts of the ICANN community don't need that, we can't – I don't think we can simply be on the demand side. I think we need to get involved in the process.

I readily admit, I don't know how to do that. The kind of discussions we had with Global Partnerships today is promising. We need to enlarge that into other areas, I guess.

Adam: I think we've spoken a lot about it. It's very simple guides to any piece of policy development that's coming out, whatever it may be. Then a one-page guide that can go out to the community and allow somebody an entry point to say, "Yeah, I'm interested in this. I will go and look further."

But it's simply to inform the ALS and anybody else of course as it would be public information but it would be to inform anybody that there is such a process going on, whatever it may be and it gives them a taste to say, "Yeah, I'm going to investigate further." And give them an opportunity to provide feedback. This should be a two-way loop. Information should be going out to the ALS and the end user. The end user should have an opportunity to comment back.

I think that's not what we're doing very well at the moment. We have a lot of information going out. It's not very digestible. It's very hard work to wade through. We're not encouraging users to participate.

Alan: Tizani...

Tizani: Pardon. I am speaking about the newsletter of the ICANN. That is all the information. You have all the process in the newsletter of ICANN. So, if you are thinking of something like this, it exists already.

Adam: Not really. I'm thinking, yes, that is one example of the type of information. But ICANN a particular policy issue that may be on our agenda today, or the agenda of the week. Why is there not a one-page or one and a half page introduction to that issue?

It's not very hard to write impartial one-pages. You can employ technical writers. There are technical writers who do this and they can be translated and they can be sent out to the ALSs. It seems to me that if you want the ALS to be able to respond on a set of issues, they have to have information presented in the most simple form.

Then anybody who is within that group who wishes to investigate further can go to the comment pages, can go to the full document, can go to whatever it may be. But we're trying to take people who are not necessarily even interested in a Linux organization. They're not going to be interested in every piece of information that comes out of ICANN. But one member might be.

The important thing is to identify and encourage that one member to then provide feedback on those issues. I don't think the newsletter does that particularly effectively. It doesn't have a feedback loop. It's not part of the process, if you like.

Alan: Heidi.

Heidi: Adam, I thought your comments were very interesting. I'm just wondering, we currently have these podcasts that are being planned for about once a month, English-only but once there's distinct evidence that they're being used and there's going to be some consideration of doing other languages.

But in the past, I know that they've also developed one or two-page briefing pages on particular topics. Are you saying that would be more useful to do, in addition to the podcasts?

Adam: Yes. I'd like something along the lines of the briefing papers on every major policy issues that comes out. Podcasts are interesting, I think helpful. But a briefing papers that are pushed out to every ALS will form a body of a record of the policy development process. That's one thing. Podcasts are not particularly accessible on an historical basis.

But it's really being – pushing the information out to the ALS. I think we're seeing that we've already spoken about ALSs that have disappeared off the map. You want to keep them engaged. You want to keep pounding with information, if you like. Not massive, not 30-page or 100-page dags or whatever it would be, but simple, digestible pieces of information that they can say, "Yeah, I am actually interested in this. I may actually get further involved."

I think, as I said, there's a template that Evan developed a long, long time ago on this. Sending it out – and it's actually part of the commitment that ALSs make when they join. There are simple criteria that everyone has signed up for when they joined. I'm not saying that you punish someone for not having met the criteria until you've given them the opportunity to participate.

So, I don't want - Counton's not here. He would have jumped down my throat had he been here. The point is that you have to give people the opportunity and the information to participate, and to get involved and to contribute back.

Alan: I think there's a whole number of things involved. In terms of the commitment of the ALSs, one can go to a number of amazing ALS homepages and not even find a reference to ICANN on it, never mind the detailed stuff. That, too, is a commitment.

I'll give as an example of something that I'm not pointing fingers at anyone else because I'm the lead person. There's currently a policy development process going on in post-expiration domain name recovery. We have had – I'll make a very pointed statement – pathetic At-Large involvement in this. This is an issue that involves real users. The rationale for the PDP is to put in place policy which will “protect” users and registrants.

To be honest, it never dawned on me nor did anyone suggest in this group that we should put together a one-page handout to try to attract people. I take responsibility for not thinking of it myself. But despite the pleas I've made over the last six months for contributions, no one else has suggested it either.

You're right. It would have been easy to write should we – had we decided to do it.

Adam: You see, I don't think it should be done by you on *ad hoc* basis. I think this should be a matter of process, that every piece of policy development that comes out of ICANN should be having short pieces, descriptive pieces that allows somebody to say, “I might wish to get engaged.”

We're already somewhat expert. We know what we're doing. But ALSs are not DNS-specific organizations, or very, very few of them are. Whether it's an ISOC chapter or whatever it is, it's going to be – we have to hope, though, that within that ISOC chapter there's going to be one person who would pick up on what you say.

Alan: Yeap.

Adam: We're trolling for information.

Alan: I wasn't saying it shouldn't be capped automatically. I'm just pointing out in a particular case where there are several ALAC people involved in the process, everyone has heard me give the speech, and no one suggested that maybe this is a good opportunity to do the first one. That's telling a story, I think, and I don't know how we learn from it. But I think it's an important message.

Male: [Inaudible – 1:13:52.8]

Alan: Okay.

To the extent people want to keep on talking we can try, but I suspect that maybe we just need to...

Male: [Inaudible – 1:14.14.4]

Alan: And we will now take a break so the interpreters can take a break also. We are...we are – I believe we are back at 1:00 which is 25 minutes from now. so, we'll take a formal break until 1:00 o'clock. But 1:00 o'clock sharp because we do have someone coming in to talk to us and it's not someone we want to miss.

#6 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-6-07mar10-en

Alan: I promise we'll all be nice to him today.

Male: [Inaudible 00:07.]

David: Alan, thank you very much. Sébastien, I appreciate the time to spend briefly with you to introduce myself. Also, greetings to Cheryl. I know she's been tied up in some other meetings. I did see her on my first day of arriving on Friday. I had a brief chat with her and it was a pleasure to meet her in addition to learning a little more about work here at At-Large.

I just joined ICANN on February 15th. I am here in Nairobi and I thank you for joining us here in Nairobi. It is a new experience and a busy experience for me though I'm not new to ICANN in that sense. In my past experience in industry I did participate through the business constituency at ICANN.

Early on, we were involved as corporate leaders in something called the Global Internet Project in 1996, which was a group of people to promote the use and development of the Internet worldwide. Part of that activity was to support the creation of ICANN later on in 1998.

So, that has been my background with ICANN, though I've had experience in the diplomatic service, 20 years in the ICT industry. I'm happy to bring those years of experience both nationally and internationally to work here at ICANN.

I'm fortunate to have a strong policy team. You have two representatives here in Heidi and Mateus and the others who support the work, policy work of At-Large. I hope to build upon that.

Having said that, I'm here to listen and learn, listen and learn from all of you. Your concerns and your priorities as you go through your work program and your activities in the coming year.

I'm looking forward to the Tuesday round table to talk more in-depth and you can talk loudly or softly to me. I'm happy to hear and listen to anything you wish to say.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll – shouldn't that be enough?

Alan: If you have a few minutes, are there any particular questions or things that want to be raised now? I don't think we're looking at substantive ones. But if anyone here would like a minute or two, then please...

Adam: We have another go, yes, David, don't we?

Alan: Okay, I think on behalf of everyone, I'll thank you for stopping by and we look forward to talking to you on Tuesday.

David: Thank you. The Tuesday session will give me a few more days to prepare. Thank you very much. Thank you for your attention.

[Light smattering of applause]

Alan: Seth, it's Alan. Can you hear this clearly or is this mumbling, too?

Seth, if you can hear me, can you talk or is somebody send him a message on whatever messenger system?

One, two, three, testing. Can anyone in the rest of the world hear us?

Female: Can you hear us?

Seth: I still can, yes.

Alan: I heard someone's voice.

Seth: Alan, is that you? Alan, it's Seth, can you hear me?

Alan: Seth, we could hear you but it wasn't loud enough. If you can keep on talking maybe we can get the volume up a little bit.

Seth: Sure, sure. Let's see. Unfortunately I did miss the last few minutes so I was lucky enough to hear David but I haven't heard if I'm on yet or if you are still giving your remarks. Am I on yet, Alan?

Alan: You'll be on as soon as we get the audio working in both directions. We may have now done.

Seth: Oh, okay.

Alan: It sounds like –

Seth: I'm not particularly eager, so I'm not minding this as much as you probably are.

Alan: No, no. That's fine. Okay, it sounds like we have the audio working in both directions. We are now going on to the section on ALAC Improvements, the Next Steps. This is the follow-on to the ALAC Review. As you all know, we have put together rather an extensive plan. Everyone here at the table should have received a copy either in A4 format or in A3 format.

If anyone doesn't have one you should get hold of one quickly. Compared to the meeting, the last one – last meeting we were at, this form is actually legible even in the small form. So, hopefully we can all follow along.

Seth Green is the newest member of the ALAC At-Large Support Team. We'll let either Seth or Heidi do an introduction of him. Then Seth will lead us through this document, looking at some of the strategic areas that we need to focus on right now.

Heidi: Yes, Alan. I'm very happy to introduce Seth Green to all of us. He's been a fabulous amount of work on the ALAC improvements I think – Seth, I believe it's been three weeks now since you've joined us?

Seth: Yes, three weeks.

Heidi: Seth has fantastic experience. He's been an editor. He's been a head of communications. He's worked with the World Bank on micro-finance issues. Seth, I'm not sure if I'm doing an adequate introduction to you. If you have anything more,

some more details about your background that you would like to share with everyone?

Seth: Thank you, thank you. No, I think that's...I think that's more than adequate. Thank you.

Heidi: Okay, so, Seth, if you want to just a few introductory words on perhaps of what this simplified version that we're all looking at. This simplified version again is the goal behind this was to make a) legible for everyone. And also just to make the steps, the 13 Recommendations involved in the At-Large improvements as well as the various tasks that are associated with each of these recommendations much more clear.

So, Seth, I'm going to hand it over to you on what your Next Steps are going to be on this and what's the role of ALAC and the regional leaders as well as the working groups will be on this.

Seth: Great. Thank you very much, Heidi. I'm very happy to be here. Or, I should say, happy to be participating.

I, as Heidi said, I am like David also new. You probably heard somewhat a little less about my arrival than about David's, I imagine. The document that you're looking at, one of my first things I've worked on under Heidi over the last few weeks is going to guide us through a discussion hopefully of some of the hot-button issues, as I've heard Cheryl refer to them, regarding virtually each one of the recommendations.

So, given that we have about an hour and a half, I think maybe we'll limit that to the hottest of the hot-button issues. This will be a prelude, a necessary prelude actually to the work that's about to be embarked upon by the working groups.

So, let me just talk about what very broad steps are going to be tackled in the overall improvements project over the next few months. Let's see...first, is the creation of a project plan, including a budget, an accurate budget. The aim is to have that approved by the At-Large community and to the structural Improvements Committee within two months, by its May meeting.

That's the first of these steps that you should look for right after Nairobi. Second, is the strengthening of the At-Large working groups, since as you know they were given the mandate in December's community call to carry out the actual work of implementing most of the At-Large improvements.

Now, we're going to start this reinvigoration of the working groups with a call in about two weeks which will be for the working group chairs, the vice chairs and the ALAC focal-point personnel. The topics will include – certainly this new mandate regarding the improvements project, ways of monitoring the working groups' progress. I should say even self-monitoring it, and the steps through which the working groups can be repopulated with new members.

This is all toward the goal of reinvigorating their activities. Then the third broad step, after the budget – after the project plan including the budget, the starting of the working groups on their way. Is coming up with the - sorry. I'm getting some feedback. Heidi? Alan? Can you still hear me?

Alan: Yes, we can.

Seth: Oh, you can? Thank you, Alan, okay. As I was saying, the third broad step coming up, the Advancement of the Overall Improvements Project is actually going to largely be done by the working groups themselves, with, of course, the support of staff.

They're going to be responsible for allocating among themselves a – and this brings us back to somewhat complicated, simplified At-Large improvements implementation outline. They're going to be in charge of allocating among themselves that list of tasks along the left side of every page of that document.

After that, the working groups will divide those tasks into manageable action items. And as we said, monitor their own progress. Again, we'll be helping them out, of course, along every step of this process.

So, those are the overall actions to look for in the next couple of months which actually brings me now to a suggestion hashed out by Cheryl and Heidi, of course, regarding the meeting's discussion over the next and I'm not sure what we have left, an hour or so.

As I was saying, the working groups in fulfilling their new mandate, obviously, as beyond the ground soldiers are going to be truly kind of grappling with what I said. I said are the hot-button issues regarding many of these recommendations, things that the community does not share one mind about. Things that sometimes that are even somewhat controversial as I've gotten up to speed somewhat I found this out.

So, I did think, hopefully, that we could take the next hour and if we're strategic in picking some of the more important ones, actually hash out some of these issues. I was hoping that having looked them over – well, let me first direct you. On the, and I'm at a bit of a disadvantage. As I think some of you who were reading the screens earlier realized that I can't see the screens that you can read.

The document is just in everyone's hands, I suppose, not on the screen. Is that it? Everyone has it, right?

Alan: It is up on our screen but we can't read it. So effectively, it's just in our hands.

Seth: Okay.

Heidi: Seth, we also have it in hard copy. Some copy is on A3; some copies A4. So, everyone will be able to work through it.

Seth: Great, great. If you look at the top right of each recommendation in the purple type, we've listed the topics that if we hashed them out before the working groups actually have to start dealing with them on their own, it'll be an enormous help to them.

In an earlier conversation with Cheryl and Heidi, we thought that if we turned to Recommendations 4, 5, and 13. Actually, Alan, I wouldn't mind adding if we have time, perhaps we could circle back and deal with Recommendation 3 as well; so, 4, 5, and 13 and 3.

I think that would be a terrific goal for the next hour. What do you think the easiest way to do this is? I'm...with my three weeks as Heidi pointed experience. I'm happy to attempt to help us through this discussion. Or, Alan, certainly I invite you, too, or Heidi, if you'd like to. I leave that up to you. What's the thinking?

Alan: I think my preference, not to treat this as immersion by fire is to have you start and Heidi and I will interject as necessary. And certainly anyone else in the room who wishes to break in should indicate that. But if you wouldn't mind starting, we'll see how it works.

Seth: No, certainly. Let me, sure. Let me give it a try. I'm happy to. I'm just getting it up on my own screen here. Terrific. Okay. Are we, let's see. All right, let's turn I suppose to – let's just start with Recommendation 4, one of my own favorites. And if we, let's see. Education and Engagement. If we look at the top right, what you – well, you can't read on the screen but hopefully can read on the hard copy.

The type I assume is large enough to be readable. This recommendation, educating and engaging the ALSs, which we've already actually begun to talk about before the last break, I would say, should be an immediate priority. Okay.

In this discussion with Cheryl and Heidi, what we hashed out as the most useful topics to be discussed and perhaps if we could, if a consensus existed or at least the different voices could be make crystal clear, would be an enormous help to the working groups are the ones listed there.

Cost benefit analysis has improved, and education outreach. Well, let me not bore you by reading it for you. Does anyone have – what are the beginning thoughts about the questions right here? The consequent benefits, the fact that they'll be shared by the ICANN community? Are we going to – what – not that we need to get down to percentages, but where is the funding going to come? Who's the cost going to be shared by? Is this an At-Large loan item to be tackled?

How should the work groups actually approach this thinking? Needless to say, I can't see that everyone in the room has their hands raised. Heidi, Alan, would you mind just helping me out here?

Alan: I have my hand raised. Sebas-, Fuoud, Sébastien has his paper in person. Anyone else want to be the speaker with us right now? Not yet.

My question is the one that all of us financial people ask – presented by request for cost-benefit analysis, it's moderately easy – not very easy, but moderately easy to come up with costs. How does one put financial numbers on the benefits of educating ALSs?

Typically you say you do a cost-benefit analysis because you don't want to spend a lot more than you're getting out of it. I don't have a clue how one can assign any numbers to the benefit part of this. How do you respond to that because I don't see how we can create a cost-benefit analysis unless we understand what the metrics are that we're going to use on the benefits side?

Seth: Sure. Now, I see your point. Perhaps by cost-benefit analysis I – perhaps cost-benefit analysis here can be taken in a more qualitative way than usually is used. As I've been told following the – when was the summit was in March of 2009? Within just – is it true that just within just a few months of that, the output of policy advisories went up 200 percent? Now, while that allows me to start with a number into my statement it doesn't actually in any way prove that we can do this. As you say, it's very difficult to put a value on the output.

I guess qualitatively speaking though, the clearly what we know is that the benefits falls beyond just At-Large. Is that an issue that's debatable? Is there a – is there more than one opinion to that, Alan?

Alan: I don't want this to be a one-on-one debate. My quick answer is I think if you look at pre-summit to now, and it's not clear how much of the difference you can attribute to the summit and how much to the simple development and maturity of At-Large.

If you look at the number of people who are contributing to policy statements prior to the summit, you don't have to add a lot more people into it to double or triple that number. Because before we were talking about a very small handful. I think that's really the measure.

If we can double and triple the out – the involvement in activities by some sort of outreach, is that going to be an effective – perceived as an effective benefit? Well, that's my answer. Sébastien has his hand up, if he wants to either answer that question or ask new ones...

Sébastien: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, I am margin your question – can you make an error on ICANN? If somebody can does that, welcome a way to that for At-Large, if not, I don't know why we are taking our time on that. We spent, this morning to explain why we need money from ICANN to perform the tasks we are supposed to bear from, at the original level and of the world wide limo[? 23:35.6].

If once again we are going to spend time in trying to explain why we need that, I guess this morning's session, it's a good answer. And we don't need to do something else in addition to that.

We need to not to try to explain why. If ICANN staff, if ICANN board is not able to understand what At-Large its use for, then we need to ask them to close it. But not to ask us to spend our precious time not pay people, to try to explain why we need to go to a meeting, why we need to explain what is ICANN, why we need some money to print a document, why we need to meet in the ICANN meetings.

Therefore, I have no answer of what – how to do that. But on the question, who should pay cost of this improvement? It's not a question. There is only one answer to all that because one budget in ICANN. Nobody else here have money in this bucket to put in this work. Then it's ICANN as the general organization.

Then I hope that we will consentuate [*Not sure of word?* 25:05.1] on substance, on how to improve our work, not how to explain why our work is important. We are giving up with this question. Thank you.

Alan: It's Alan. I have a very short comment and then we'll go on to Olivier. I guess one of the answers on return of investment or/and the cost-benefit analysis is under the affirmation of commitments ICANN has a global responsibility to look at the interests of users.

It's written there, right in the front, the very first review under the ALC. We're talking about as transparency and accountability. In fact, there's a third phrase in the title of it in the ALC and that's looking at are we defending users? Are we working on behalf of the users?

At this point, At-Large is the only part of ICANN that has that as its mandate. Part of the rationale which is either easier to say than put the case around is that if ICANN wants to be credible in presenting itself as an organization that cares about users then the only part of their organization they have At-Large that was looking at this, has to be provided with some tools.

Olivier...

Olivier: Thank you, Alan. Actually you've said part of what I wanted to say so I'm not going to repeat it. But I will add the part which is that ICANN is a bottom-up organization and I guess that we're at the bottom.

Male: [Inaudible 26:51.9.]

Olivier: Exactly. We're very close to the bottom and...but in a bottom-up organization the bottom is really what's most important in my view. And I hope it's in ICANN's view as well because otherwise ICANN would not be a bottom-up organization.

When you ask about cost-benefit analysis of improved education [inaudible - 27:16.8], I just wonder whether every single constituency has to go through a cost-benefit analysis including ICANN staff, ICANN board, ICANN CEO. How about the benefit of anyone within ICANN?

I just wonder whether this is the right question or whether we should actually say the political benefits of having all of those people involved, and especially the political benefit of having At-Large involved. Because if there is no political benefit of having At-Large involved then I will join Sébastien to say that scrap At-Large. But then I think that ICANN will lose no credibility whatsoever. Thank you.

Alan: Hang...

Hang: Okay. I'm not sure we're making general comments to this document or we're going to specific point. Actually I have two specific questions, Alan.

Alan: At this point we're talking about Section 4 and trying to understand the general motivation for why we should be looking into more detail in Section 4.

Hang: Okay. I do have a question on Section 4, Section 4.5.4. There's a ALAC, a noncom jointly decide a person for mid-term replacement. I'm saying this is a completely new mechanism. This is a very tight schedule, this schedule from June to September this year. So I wonder whether this is a confirmed schedule because it's a joined action and has not been informed to noncom.

Alan: I can get my comment to that. This plan is a longer-term plan than just this year. So I wouldn't read into it that we are speaking about this year in that particular item. We may be if we get – if we work that fast. But as Seth pointed out, I think our first task is to understand the principles under which we are attacking this and that is the difficulty.

Seth, has the discussion that we've been having here a one-sided discussion, given you any insight in how to proceed? The general consensus seems to be that the benefits are effectively political ones. They will be –

Seth: Yes –

Alan: They will be delivered through a more educated At-Large structure; At-Large structure, with a lower case “S”. But the real benefit is to provide ICANN input from users.

Seth: Yes, yes. I understand. I think to that extent it is useful. I think that the point here is on the politics of the issue and not necessarily focusing on the cost-benefit analysis for this any more than it could be done for absolutely anything for the coffee that is being drunk in the conference room right now. Yet, everything – this could be applied to a cost-benefit analysis could be applied to anything, of course.

Granted, it all comes ultimately from ICANN. I think that you’re right when you say it’s simply how it’s perceived and presented politically; the actual political facts where the benefits lie and where the costs come from, is my understanding.

Perhaps – if no one has anything else, we certainly can move on to the next recommendation which I think the question in point, the questions in point are more of a substantive nature about what the working groups are going to end up tackling rather than in as you pointed out the principle behind Recommendation number 4.

Is there anything else that anyone wants to say? Or shall we do that, Alan? Should we move on?

Alan: Just one second, Seth. Adam had his hand up that I missed.

Adam: I only put it up a second ago. I just wanted to say, I do agree. I think there’s a problem with the word “cost-benefit analysis” because it doesn’t capture the nature of what the At-Large is and its importance to ICANN.

But – the second part of this about expenditure as being a black box is something that we really do have to address, and see how all monies that are spent in the name of At-Large are really made more transparent. So that we understand what it is being spent on at At-Large in terms of even it could be – we don’t really know in terms of how much staff time is spent on At-Large. We didn’t used to know.

But it would be very good to know what the actual expenditures are in certain – in much more detail. Then we can plan out – we can understand what we’re spending, if you like. We could understand what our real costs are in that sense.

Alan: Anyone else on Section 4? Okay, Seth, back to you, starting on 5 then.

Seth: Okay. Starting at 5, again, the questions, at least the ones that we developed, Cheryl, Heidi and I developed as a starting-off point, of course, more questions. We’re not limited to these by any means.

The questions that we were hoping to address, as you see right there, have to do with identifying the barriers that have been causing frustration in past tense to engage in the broader strategic and operational planning of the organization. I certainly am very curious to hear what some of those specifically have been. I think that’s all that needs to be said as the background there. I think I very much would like to hear it. I will be sure to then convey to the working – to the appropriate working group.

So, yes, if we can have some volunteers for that, that would be terrific.

Alan: I’ll lead off in that case.

Seth: Okay.

Alan: I'm going to read the wording that's there because I think it's important. The final report, page 10 paragraph 3, because it seems that ALAC has had some degree of frustration in its previous attempts to engage the broader ICANN planning process. Currently there is a diversity of opinion within At-Large of what barriers causing this frustration are.

I'm not sure there's a huge diversity. The process certainly as I have seen it has been we have asked to participate. We have put input in and we never knew exactly what came out. If you read the actual plans there may well be words that we could read as implying At-Large, but the people who spends the money didn't seem to agree, because the money went somewhere else even though it was an activity that sounded like it could have been partly ours.

So, there's certainly frustration at that level. There is also frustration I believe among those of us who have worked with other parts of ICANN, why it is that we need to work at that level in the planning process when most of the other groups don't, to be quite blunt. The GNSO does not spend a lot of time saying, "What should we say to input into the planning process?" I can say with some authority, they spend zero time on that.

It is acknowledged that GNSO policy development on gTLDs is an important aspect of ICANN and it is factored into the planning process. Interacting with users, getting their input, speaking on behalf of users, safeguarding the interest of users doesn't seem to be factored in at the same level. Therefore, we're expected to come up with the planning, the input of the planning process which may or may not be listened to by anyone.

I think that's the frustration of why us when no one else. If we go through the process, can we get some feedback and some indication of what's cooing out of it? That's my perspective. I suspect other people around the table may have a more pointed one.

Anyone? We have Adam. Sébastien? Sorry, I see hands up but I don't know if they're old hands or new hands.

Sébastien: I agree with Alan's and I'm not sure that there is diversity of opinion within At-Large. I guess this sentence from the final report, it's now one you're old and something's happened when we do some new policy advice and comments and we work on the strategic planning and we're already discussed that this morning, too.

Then I think what's with it is to know – it's good to have as objective to double up strategy can a person plans. It's really what we do. But if nobody taking care of why to do it.

Then now it's the question, it's not on our side. It's really on the side of the staff and the board to tell us if there are any interests in our comments and those filled. If not, something we are not to do in the future.

Alan: Any thoughts on that bullet? There's a second bullet in the upper right section which we'll go on to if no one has any additional ones on that section.

The second bullet says, “It is a priority then to identify the specific barriers within the processes currently used by At-Large to contribute to ICANN’s strategic and operational planning.”

Now, I know what I believe those barriers are, and I’ll be glad to state them. I don’t know if anyone wants to speak up first...

Male: [Inaudible.]

Alan: Evan says let’s hear mine first. I’ve done a lot of planning processes in my life and wearing various hats. It’s a difficult process and requires training. Most of those surround this table do not have that training, certainly not using ICANN’s methodology.

And to be quite blunt, I don’t think it’s our job. I think it’s our job to identify the things that need to be done, which essentially are line items in an operational plan, or maybe a more detailed plan than that. ICANN’s planning experts to translate into the words that need to go into a strategic plan and then the operational plan to define that.

I just don’t think it’s our job to write high and mighty words in ICANN’s strategic plan. I think we need to say what needs to be done to make At-Large effective. And planning experts should be working with us to put the words and the plan and with feedback to make sure they’re not getting mangled along the way.

So, I don’t really see us as spending all of our time writing plans. We could probably do effective job. We could learn how and I think we’ll spend all of our time writing plans. If you think people get bored with what we’re doing today, just wait.

Seth: May I ask something, Alan, at this point? would you say carrying over from your comments regarding the first bullet point, would you say where one of the only or perhaps one of the few ICANN constituency areas that are asked to spend our time in this way, the At-Large community? Rather than other constituencies?

Or, would you say that the same defense can be waged on the part of most of the ICANN parts?

Alan: Well, with the exception of the board which has planning retreats, where they go off to some nice part of the world and spend a few days talking about this kind of thing, I don’t think any other part of ICANN – that I’m aware of and I may be not aware of all of them – any other part of ICANN other than staff, really go through this exercise in any detail. If anyone around here, staff or more experienced ICANN people than I want to speak up they certainly can. I’m not the most experienced.

But I don’t see it as a major focus. If you look at the comments that are made, even when the plan comes out, how many people comment on them? Individuals do. Occasionally a GNSO constituency does. But rarely do you see the constituent organizations of ICANN doing anything like that.

Seth: I see, I see. Thanks, and it’s worth just briefly discussing why the divergence of expectations? Or is that obvious to everyone in the room? And of course noting that I’m not in the room, and it’s not obvious to me.

Alan: To give a very cynical answer but I don’t – I prefer not.

Seth: I was hoping...

Cheryl: The cynical answer...

Alan: If I'm as being cynical and I don't believe this is true, it's a nice barrier to put up to slow us down and stop the demands. I don't really believe that is the case, but there's a bit of it there.

Seth: You have an idea of what you do believe is the larger reasoning?

Alan: No. I really don't.

Seth: Does anyone around the table?

Alan: We have a couple of speakers.

Male: [Inaudible.]

Alan: Yeah. Go.

Bedouin: [*En Français* – 42:53.1 - 43:13.2]

Alan: Seth, are you hearing the English translation or the French?

Seth: I'm hearing the French, which I do not speak sadly.

Alan: Do we have any technical way of having him hear the English?

Bedouin: okay. [*En Français* – 43:29.5 – 43:32.6]

[Murmuring in room]

Cheryl: Seth? Cheryl here. Did you hear any English then?

Seth: No. Hello, Cheryl. No, just French unfortunately for me.

Cheryl: Okay. Try again.

Bedouin: Okay. [*En Français* – 44:09.6 – 44:54.1]

[Murmuring in room]

Alan: Seth, did you get any of that in English, or was it all still in French?

Seth: No, I'm sorry. All in French.

Alan: Okay, we will have an on-the-fly translation from Sébastien. I think that's what you're volunteering for.

Sébastien: The questions that's here, it's an important point and we need to understand how those process are working, both the strategic and the personal plan to allow us to really point at the ALS and the RALO level inputs.

That's summary of what it was say. Thank you.

Seth: Yeah, thank you. as a quick side remark, if you don't mind, I think I'll be able to communicate to the working groups what's been gone over today even if it's not necessarily directed so explicitly toward me. I'm happy to help try to tease out what I think what the working groups are going to need certainly. But if I really going over the transcripts so certainly, we don't have to worry – we don't spend much time worrying about translations or something like that.

Is there anyone with any further comments? I see I myself –

Alan: Yeah.

Seth: See a hand up.

Alan: Yeah. Sébastien does have a hand up and Adam? No? Seth, we appreciate you'll go over the transcripts and we don't want to spend a lot of time on translation. Some of us are rather frustrated because we thought we had addressed this issue ahead of time.

But Sébastien...

Sébastien: Yeah, and in addition maybe other people online needs also to have the translation. You are maybe not the only one. I don't know. Start to translate to take one point.

I am not sure that we don't know how the process is working. We as At-Large and ALAC we put comments on the strategic planning process. We send our comments to the board. The question, it's more how it's used and how we get feedback on that. As soon as we get to know that it will be easier for us to continue this work.

I really think that more than knowing how the process is working the beginning it's not working at the end was frightening us. Thank you.

Seth: May I throw in a comment at this point, a question actually more accurately?

Alan: Yes. Certainly.

Seth: Thank you. do – at the working groups, do they work on these matters? I think what I'm hear being brought up is obviously this question. Should they simply be taking what's come before the work of the – say, the work reflected in the review working groups final report? The approval of the board, etc.? as Gospel so to speak?

Or, should there be – is there room do you think, does the room think to question the recommendations themselves? What I hear is so far in these few recommendations that we've gone through, at least for two, is some wondering of why this is considered an At-Large improvement at all.

Now, granted I feel a little hesitant even asking this as such a newcomer. But is there room – here's something, a topic that you certainly could advise me on. Do we think that there's room for questioning these recommendations? Should we just take them as word upon High that this is in fact what we should do? Should we – are there pragmatic ways of – needless to say there are certainly pragmatic ways I would imagine, obscuring the efforts more towards those as a consensus are important?

Does anyone have any input on that? That, I think will be very useful if I know that when it comes up on – I imagine I'm going to be asked – perhaps I'm naïve but I imagine I'm going to be asked this in a couple of months by the working groups.

Alan: I'll start and I think Sébastien also has some comments. There are two different issues with planning. One is should – to what extent we should be involved in the formal ICANN planning process? And the second is to what extent should the At-Large and ALAC be doing plans for its own work efforts?

I think there is a definite need for us to do plans for our own work efforts and I would not make a very formal structured strategic plan followed by operational plan and review it every two years. I think it's much more an operational issue. And maybe some strategic ones.

But I think it's a much less formal process. Should we be reviewing the ICANN operational plans and strategic plans and commenting on them? I think as individuals we should, and if there's enough people at At-Large or in the ALAC that believe we need to say something, yes, I think we should. Whether that happens every year or not depends on how well we think the rest of the process is being handled.

But contributing new stuff to the plan, I guess an example I could use is if no one in the world thought of IDN domain names yet, and we were sitting – we could sit here and sway, "Hey, an awful lot of our end users don't speak English and don't use Roman characters," there's a real need for ICANN to focus on IDN. That is certainly something which At-Large could input into the overall strategic process.

But I don't think that that should be something that we input as a strategic plan part, but as a real need on behalf of users. And then again, I think this needs to be translated into the planning process by people who are more adept at the formalities of that than we are.

Seth: Right.

Alan: I don't know to what extent that answers your questions. I try – I think it did, but I'm not sure.

Seth: I'm not sure either.

Alan: Sébastien, did you want to make a comment?

Sébastien: Yeah. First of all, I would have been very happy or sorry about the IDN would not start from using it. Evidently it was that the case and it's maybe one of the reason we are in the mess that we are today.

But about the strategic, I agree that we need to have some strategic inputs for our work because our organization, it's complex with ALS, RALO and then ALAC. And yes, we need to do that. But in the same time we have to be cautious because we are under the work done by the policy buddies of the organization because very often we have to react to what they are doing. That's something we can't always really quantify because it's come. And three weeks before the meeting and we have to answer two weeks after the meeting, for example.

But also what it struck me in this document we have in front of us and points 511, it's everything done by, let's say, what was organized, what was done to inform us but nothing about our prediction. There is no link to the comments we made on the strategic planning. And that's strange to me because it's exactly what we are looking for. It's to have policy advice from the ALAC and it's not included in their work, in documents.

Yes, we get teleconference, briefings and so on and so forth. Yes, all that allowed each region and ALAC to have southward comments on the strategic planning. I think we need at least to have the link to comments made by ALAC. Thank you.

Seth: Certainly. I would say that I believe that I agree with that myself. I think it's not a sold case. I think there are a lot of steps at this point missing from the list of tasks or it's not a lot, certainly, from that have jumped out at me as I go over this document a number of times. I think that's true when I think it's true elsewhere. And certainly that's one of the – I didn't mention it when I was making my few comments.

But that's certainly something that I think needs to be done in the next, well, very short-term is go over it and see exactly what is missing. And a lot of that will certainly be done I believe by the working groups as they hopefully and actually are helped to take responsibility for various parts of recommendations or whole recommendations.

I mean, if you actually look at the documents, some of the actual tasks literally and now I'll be a bit sarcastic, they basically amount to tasks 49.7 implement recommendation 49, which clearly doesn't quite do the job.

So, yes, I think there are things missing from this document. But, I also think there's a decent starting position, hopefully, hopefully. If I could actually ask a question getting back to which is following up on what I was trying to figure out earlier. As I read this recommendation, number 5, it seems to me obviously but it did not speak about our own, At-Large's own planning and strategic and operational planning. Certainly the community holds the majority responsibility for that, if not all of it. Well, the majority of it, I guess.

But it's speaking about specifically, as we've all said, ICANN's strategic and operational planning. Now if we were being at there, it seems to be a consensus or at least to ask the question, well, why are we responsible for sitting around and coming up with that? If we were compelled to do that, as you said, Alan, as you said actually, certainly there are cases where that will happen and we're in the best position on certain end user issues to originate such ideas.

However, if it doesn't happen, it might not happen in every year, every round, are we going to be seen as having failed on this recommendation? And if I may ask, what would the consequences of something like that be? This goes for any of the recommendations actually but I think this is a good example being that there being a voice of why are we involved in this at all?

So, the question I guess again I'm asking is for anyone at the table to talk about is can the recommend – is it the role of the working groups if they feel it's suitable to actually question these recommendations? Either instead of, before? Certainly before attempting to come up with an implementation plan. What are the consequences of not questioning it but simply not implementing? And I don't – this isn't limited, of course, to recommendation 5. Does anyone have any wisdom on that to point me in the direction of?

Alan: I'll give an answer. Cheryl's sitting here and she's not acting as chair. Maybe she has some thoughts also. If you look at any document like the output of the review document and look at one here historically and say, "What was implemented and what was not?" You will always find some areas were ignored. Whether it was benign neglect or conscious neglect, some of them do not get implemented.

Now, there are a number of ways to look at it. Are we subject – are we going to be subject to criticism three years from now, someone looks at this review and says, “They never did it”? Yes. Are we on the other hand going to be subject to criticism if we put a large amount of effort into building our own strategic and operational plans and try to feed them into the ICANN plans? And we spent 80 percent of our time and no real work, would we be subject to criticism? Yeah.

So, I think there’s a line that has to be drawn somewhere of what kind of effort do we put into this and what are the real goals of doing it? If you spend your business as a planning consultant, then the plan is the end product. We’re not here as a planning organization. We’re here to do something. I think the bottom line is to what extent do we need to plan to make our work authentic within At-Large and within ICANN.

A lot more than that is simply make work efforts again. That’s the perspective of someone who’s done a lot of planning in his life. Most of the plans end up sitting on a shelf and never being looked at. So, I’m perhaps not the right one to answer.

Anybody else? I’ve been talking far too much.

Cheryl: Okay, I don’t see any other hands up. So, I’ll just speak perhaps jumping down the list of five. I actually have my great faith on where we might here by June 2, 2010 or June/September 2010. With apart from the annual report that’s talking under Section 5.2 and that is development of a simple annual statement of intent which is aligned with ICANN’s particular strategic goals and their operational plans.

I think that is achievable and that is something that we as a broad large advisory committee and regional leadership should be able to do. Do we need to go further than that? I’m very much of the concept that serious in-service skills and planning and it’s not what we were meant to be here to do in the first place.

But whether or not the example that we had with the greater outreach in direction with the regional meetings called the strategic planning exercises that were going on where we had to raise it with Kevin, I don’t think that’s a real moment and it’s the first time it’s happened. The team regional meetings in each region. To me, we don’t have that articulated as an objective but it would be a huge [inaudible] under 5 for something that we are doing.

So, our influencing the macro-planning of the organization but our role should really be to focus on our own and our regional needs and certainly to put out some sort of annual statement to make sure that the clear points of Nexus and clear points of advantage that we can make sure budget applications and funds can be linked to our needs. That would be extremely useful.

The only other thing I thought would be interesting, the excerpts here talk a great deal about the frustrations. I’m wondering, how many people voice the frustrations or is it several very well-voiced people highly frustrated? Do you know what I mean? It seems to me that in the interview process and in the mechanisms that bought the At-Large review process together, they were a large number of ALSs and to some lesser extent whole sections of sub-sections of regions that was silent on a lot of these issues. There were a few very vociferous and articulate individuals who may have over-represented sort of a global At-Large concern. And perhaps our levels of frustration are – maybe it’s different now.

But I'm wondering how accurately they captured and how much I need to be concerned about what's said here in terms of the final report. If we're looking at a simple annual statement, I think we most definitely should do that and it should be a focus activity that we schedule for Brussels.

Seth: And is your point, Cheryl, just as applicable to many if not all of the recommendations in that case regarding working groups' ability to choose within any recommendation just how far it makes practical sense to go?

Cheryl: Seth, to some extent, yes. If I'm answering on behalf of 5, yes, most definitely. I'm answering on behalf of any of the or all of the other recommendations not necessarily. Because some of these recommendations really are the business of the ALAC as a committee of the whole. They went on saying, "the ALAC is a committee of the whole." I'd like to think, "And the regional leaders from each region as well."

There are others which quite reasonably belong in existing At-Large advisory committee work groups. They need to be carved off and dealt with in sort of a microcosm of the groups of people who have already gathered together to deal with that.

Now, whether or not a decision made by a work group of the ALAC is as binding and as universally applicable to something that's taken by committee of the whole in the regional leads. I'd strongly argue that that's not the case and that any small work group or sub-section work group input on that would have to come through to the committee of the whole for discussion and ratification.

But we can't have all of us sitting around this table and those who are remotely participating do everything on these very extensive enabling points and the 13 objectives. It's just impractical and it won't work.

Seth: True. Yes. At this point, with about 10 minutes or so left, may I request that we turn to number 13?

Alan: Yes, certainly.

Seth: Terrific. If we just take a second to look it over. Perhaps some people want to raise their virtual hands or...actual hand...

Cheryl: Seth, Cheryl here. With Alan's permission, if I may, particularly for the transcript whilst many of us are busy reading, I might read to the record. Recommendation 13 is as follows: ALAC should strive to provide policy advice on any issue that effects individual Internet users. Since providing policy advice is part of ALAC's purpose. To this end, the following should be strengthened.

"The processes within ALAC for developing and providing policy advice the processes within the SOs, that's the Support Organizations for requesting input from ALAC on policy issues. And the process within the SOs and the ACs – that's the support organizations and the advisory committees – and the board for providing ALAC with feedback about how its policy advice has been used."

Now is it just me, or is there a strong sense of déjà vu from an earlier conversations we had today? Note: Much of the implementation of Recommendation 8 and 13 must be done jointly in light of their related substances. This is a hugely hot topic,

Seth, and something I don't think more than two of us have gathered together in the name of ALAC at this meeting and not complained about.

In fact, it appears to me that it's more than two of us gathering together in the name of many parts of ICANN can't be brought together without complaining about this closing of the loop provision to advisory committees and support organizations about who our policy advice is being used.

So, with that introduction, back to you, Alan.

Alan: I think if you look at the specific issues of how do you "fix" the problem of the comment cycle which is what 8 is talking about and getting input all the way up from the bottom of our organization to the top so we can formulate in a formal policy.

It's almost a rigged game that it's virtually impossible. And indeed, if you look at the other similar organizations, you'll very rarely find a comment from the GNSO or the ASO in the comment period. They will periodically when something rises up to be important enough issue of a particular statement or a report or a request to the board, but they rarely fall within the comment cycles, individual organizations, constituencies, people, companies will often comment during the comment period. But not the formal ICANN organizations because although the GNSOs structure is different from At-Large, it's not that different.

It is made up of stakeholder groups which in some cases are made up of constituencies which are made up of individuals. For instance, the business constituency I think has a rule that they have to give their members 30 days to comment on things. Well, you're never going to get a comment from the business constituency filtered up through the commercial stakeholders group, filtered up to the GNSO and the output coming out in 30 days when the lowest level has to take 30 days.

And yet, we're expected to act differently and to somehow create magic. And I think the bottom line is we can't. I think we need to do a much better job than we're doing about anticipating what the issues are and starting to discuss them before the comment period comes up. That can't always be done.

For instance, we have spent an inordinate amount of our time in the last year on non-policy policy. Whoever did the count of –

Seth: Sorry.

Alan: Pardon.

Seth: Go on.

Cheryl: [Inaudible.]

Alan: Oh. I was going to explain. Our statement outcome has increased significantly. Our statements on real policy issue, names and numbers policy, is not all that large. It's grown but it's on zero. We have issued a huge number of statements on comments on review periods, comments on review reports, comments on board actions, comments on the things running ICANN. Not necessarily the issues of substantive names and number policies.

I'm not sure we can expect individual members of ALSs or ALSs to have great opinions on some of these issues. We may want to issue as a committee statement under whether we think the board review recommendations are good or not. I'm not sure someone four levels down cares a whit about it.

So, these things fall into different categories. I don't think we should be expected to be able to address all policy issues that are relevant to users with the full depth of consultation all the way into our regional and local groups. I think we have to do a little bit of decisions on what discretion is given to our leaders at various levels who speak on our behalf, that we appoint them into positions of leadership, give them some discretion to do it, because I don't think there's going to be a way to go all the way down and up on every single issue.

Cheryl: Thanks for that, Alan. One of the things that I'd like to raise and it's to some extent going to preempt to where we're heading for the rest of the afternoon. We're looking more in the nuts and bolts of how we get greater engagement and how we can make the policies stuff happen from the edges and more effectively.

We really should and perhaps it's something that we can do between now and Brussels in a way of meeting some of the items in Recommendation 13. We really need to define clearly for the community and ask the community to agree or otherwise on what is expected for outreach and the direction on statements and policies.

In other words, we need to have some clearly defined what it means to be an "ALAC statement". To my mind, that is fairly well-established. It goes through a set of policy development processes, frequently from a group work base. There are discussions both online and in telephonic meetings. The ALAC, the 15 members, have to put a vote to either accept, reject or abstain from that then craft policy to become a fuller statement.

That's pretty clear and I certainly wouldn't want to fiddle with that. But when we have this situation, there where we have a, for example, a non-hypothetical example I'd like to share with you and I want you as the community to challenge yourselves to solve this problem.

When we have a comment, a report being made either at a public microphone, on behalf of the ALAC, or in a more formal reporting mechanism, and it's by regional leader or the chairman of the ALAC, no, whomever. It's clear by who they are in the role they have that they are speaking with some sense of authority.

They have not brought up and stated this is my personal opinion. I'm speaking as Cheryl Langdon-Orr or Fred Nurse, right? But because when someone goes up in the regional lead or the chair of the ALAC brings a certain set of expectations with it. Unless you make those statements, you really can't expect.

When you clearly making, for example, a regional report or an ALAC report, something like the report that the Chair gives at the close of all these public meetings. Then is that reasonable for rank and file within the At-Large world to have had due process and opportunity to discuss and vote on that? Can every regional lead be assured that they are bringing in an absolute accountable and transparent way? The diversity of voices of all your ALSs?

Think about it, guys. If I took you to a challenge – if I challenged you an ombudsman and had this statements that we're going through, gone over and really looked at who of any of us would say that? Should we? It definitely can be done.

But we do have to build in a set of for community what is expected at what level. I saw David and I saw Carlton. He seemed to be more hot under the collar. So, they value the regional lead feedback on that.

Carlton: Thank you, Chair. I want to support the comments that Alan made in this specific way. I do not believe that it is useful to expect every single issue that comes up to attract comment from the ALAC At-Large. I do not believe that is. That's why I keep on saying that we have to cherry-pick what we do.

With respect to the issue that Cheryl brought up about, I think it is simply unreal to expect a report being made by a newly-nominated and duly accepted Chair, member, leader of a RALO, of an ALS, of ALAC to expect committee comment on a statement in that the person's doing in their capacity as leader.

I believe that we are leaders because some people think that we should take a particular route to representation. And if I cannot engaging with my ALSs, my RALO, have a sense of what they're thinking is and make a statement that is fair and balanced. It seems to me that we are in the wrong place.

I cannot accept and I cannot understand why the ombudsman, for example – and I'm saying this straight – would even entertain a request for something like the statement, a report should be put to public comment before it is accepted. That is irrational. That is irrational.

And I think it's a waste of time. I think it degrades the commitment that each of us make to this organization to go down that road. I'm unanimous on that.

Cheryl: T. J.? Dave's saying what – he says what Carlton says. We're not just wasting time here because it is important that we make sure as a result of this meeting and of recommendation 13 that our community is aware of these views so that we don't have a mis-matched bit of expectation in our com. Olivier – sorry, Alan.

Olivier: I just wondered whether we could conduct a quick poll about how important this particular phase is for people who are ion the table because we're only hearing the same people speak. There's a number of people who are not taking part. So I'm not quite sure how involved they want to be in this. Thank you.

Cheryl: You're referring to 13, or the implementation plan?

Olivier: The implementation. We're spending hours on it and...the progress is extremely slow. I don't know whether we should be moving on and doing other things. Just a suggestion.

Cheryl: Okay. Alan, to you.

Alan: I think the thing we're talking about right now is perhaps the most critical thing that we can talk about. I'm going to repeat what I've said a number of times and some of you are bored with having me say it. The At-Large structure that we have right now, which is hierarchical with about four different levels is unwieldy and probably – I

have cynically said that if someone were trying to design At-Large to make sure it didn't work, this is the structure we would come up with.

I think the expectations are unreasonable given the overall environment in which we are working. Therefore, I believe there are only a limited number of things that we can all the way down the ladder and all the way back up and respond in timely manners.

Therefore, I believe the only alternative to making it viable and this particular review of the ALAC explicitly said, "We're not sure if the At-Large structure is right but we're leaving – we're not going to comment on it. We'll leave it for the next review," which is 10 years from now.

Okay? So, we're stuck with this structure whether we like it or not, and we have to make it work. the only effective way I can see it making it work is for us to carefully pick the ones that we try to go all the way up and down the structure on and that we make sure that when we appoint leaders, be it ALAC members, be it regional leaders, an ALS chairs that they be picked because you expect them to act on your behalf.

A RALO leader or an ALAC member selected by RALO is going ot have to make their own decisions on which things do they feel they hae the discretion to act on because they know the pulse of their organization, and which ones do they feel they must consult on.

I think we need to ratify this, because we have in the last year or so being called more times than I can refer to and Cheryl is being – was not being quite candid. Her examples were not hypothetical. Her examples were real, that people are calling us because any given issue we cannot produce the paper trail that we asked one and a half billion users and they all agreed with us.

And I think we need to make some decisions and make it public. The regional leaders need to be held accountable if they are going against the will of their regions then they need to pulled back and removed. If not, they've been put in place in a position of trust. They need to be trusted at some level.

Adam: Okay. That answered my comment. Thanks very much.

Alan: And so, I think it's absolutely crucial that we address this issue and it does come up peripherally in this discussion. But I think it's the absolute crucial issue that we need to address to make this group more functional, and to increase its credibility.

Cheryl: We just – we need to be very aware that we're coming up to 4 minutes past our timing and we do need to move on to Carlos' presentation. But I recognize both Alan and Evan.

Wolf: Direct remark to what Alan said. I entirely agree. For me, it's simply unconventional, unconventional set to regional leader could take a position who is not based on the majority vote of his region. This person would be completely beyond everything. I would never, ever in my life dare to take whatsoever position and other circumstances I can say, "Well, my personal opinion is..."

But in whatever discussion but if we are going on voting on formalized procedures in the context of a region and At-Large, I have nothing but to represent the voice of my region. That's my job. That's my duty and nothing else.

Cheryl: Thank you, Wolf, and ratifying it will be most useful. Evan? Alan? Final words.

Alan: Just as a follow-on, I have heard the discussion both in At-Large and the GNSO, by the way. It's not unique to us. In a discussion of should a particular ballot be bound for selecting a person? Should it be a secret ballot or a public ballot? The question has been raised of if it's not a public ballot, how do we know that our representative the way we told them to?

And in GNSO constituencies, in most of them the votes are directed. So, it's not – I'm not talking about At-Large too. my question is, you selected this person to represent you but you don't trust them to follow your instructions. And that's scary.

Cheryl: Interestingly enough, not only is it scary, it is the one question that the Chairman of the GNSO asked me directly with relation to our white paper. In our white paper out for public comment would be selection, the voting process, the bi-secret ballot. But I answered, it wasn't difficult to answer but it was interesting that that was the one clarification inquiry I got Chair to Chair.

So, it is perceived in other parts of ICANN as an issue.

Alan: That has become – I sit with one leg in each of them and the culture in the ALAC for the last four years that I've been here is ballots invite involving people, selecting people be private, because the people are going to have to continue working with each other. They often have to work with each other in other parts of their lives, be it IGF or regional activities. We think it's more important for people to vote the way they truly believe and not have to worry about they're hurting their friendship or hurting the working relationship.

Within the GNSO, the culture has been everything is open ballots and these are people who don't see each other outside of ICANN. It's a different culture. I think I can defend both of those aspects, and they don't have to be the same.

Cheryl: Thanks, Alan. Evan...

Evan: I guess this is just the part of the meeting where I guess I get least involved in things because I still – I'm chomping at the bit to do policy. I would simply note that the terms for "regional leaders" are one-year as opposed to the two-year terms for ALAC members.

So, it is a level of accountability. This is a matter of needing a recall or whatever that every year the leadership of the RALOs have to go back and get the trust of their region. I really don't see the problem. Or is something being created that I'm not seeing here of some real lack of trust.

[Male in background]: [Inaudible.]

Cheryl: Okay. There is some perception of issue because it's come up. Sébastien, closing remarks?

Sébastien: It's not really on the same topic but if we want to fulfill the goal of the recommendation sets in, we need our working group At-Large and ALAC working group to work better and better and to maybe be reputable for some, and to at least be sure that the people who art her are really willing to participate to this subject. I guess it's something we need to do as soon as possible to get that. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you, all. Just closing that off that section of Jay's agenda. Thanks very much, Alan. Oh, I don't know. Do we need to thank you, Seth? Seth, I think the people here think you've done a good job so far. So, on behalf of us here, thank you very much, Seth.

[Applause]

Seth: Thank you very much, Cheryl. It was my pleasure. I apologize for asking for your indulgence on my level of knowledge at this point.

Cheryl: oh, now you think you know that I've been tutoring you. That's naughty of you. Seth is very good at his job, mainly because he asks questions. He doesn't believe there's such a thing as a question not worth asking. So, I think it's very refreshing and I think with him assisting us now in management, we will do some of the hard yards more effectively and follow efficiently without him. So, thanks very much, Seth. I assume you will stay on the line if you're game enough and physically able to. Must be a very unearthly hour where you are.

Okay, over to you, Carlos.

Okay, for the record, we're just doing logistical issues because unless you're working through one of the table mics, the material of the spectrum doesn't go through properly for interpretation. So we're just...we're just tying him up in knots actually.

Okay. Okay. We are now moving to strengthening of working groups, a precursor to the cold, hard policy. We will like to think we're going to get there. But we do have to have enablers in place. Carlos Wear has prepared a presentation. I'm certainly looking forward to seeing what the work group that the is leading has been doing. Carlos, ready to go. Over to you.

Carlos: I know there is not a good time to my presentation because you are tired a lot after lunch. I saw two or three sleeping. But okay. I try to make my presentation.

I was watching my turn. I was waiting my turn presentation to present all of you first my wife, Patricia, who is at the end...

[Applause]

Carlos: Thank you. My presentation will be in English, sorry, in Spanish, but okay. The presentation in English, in half-English.

Okay. Yes. *Beuno*. [*En Español* 1:31:45.2 – 1:32:41.2]

Cheryl: Oh, no, no, no.

Carlos: [*En Español* 1:32:47.5 – 1:33:54.4] Okay. I you very lies. No, no, no. Not in your case, not in your case. Okay. [*En Español* 1:34:09.5 – 1:36:53.0]

Cheryl: No. You're fine.

Carlos: Okay. [*En Español* 1:37:20.6 – 1:50:03.5]

[Applause]

Cheryl: Thank you, Carlos, and the floor is now open for questions or comments. Looking around...Sébastien, your hand is up in the room?

Sébastien: No, but, I will take the opportunity to raise again my hand. I would like to send the working group and Carlos for this very interesting work. indeed, it's what maybe the other working group try to do is to take from the Mexico summit meeting what we publish at that time and to see where we are today.

Because it's something also in our strategic planning something important to build upon what we already say and already write. I guess we are doing that but we need to be sure that it's done in each of the other working groups topics.

I really think that it's the observe of this morning's discussion. We are around this discussion of how to involve more of the people who are participating more or less within our structure currently. That's what you call now in-reach and then to follow with outreach. One ALS per country, at least one in every country will be still be a good idea, I think, for that.

I hope that reach will allow ICANN to think that outreach to give us enough money to do that. Thank you.

Cheryl: Well, the latter might be a challenge. But we can but try. Let's recognize that the fact there may be an imitation doesn't mean we won't make the effort. So, anyone else? Yes, please, go ahead, Bedouin.

Bedouin: [*En Français* 1:52:32.3 – 1:53:07.6]

Cheryl: One moment. We have no Spanish coming through. We have you coming into English but we do not have Spanish. Is that correct? Spanish, we need Spanish. Okay. Can we try again? Thank you.

So, please go again.

Bedouin: [*En Français* 1:52:29.4 – 1:54:38.4]

Cheryl: Thank you. Couldn't get my equipment to work which is a bit of a worry. I see, Heidi, your hand is up first and then we have Andreas, okay? Sorry, you wanted to respond to that? Okay, Carlos. Go ahead.

Carlos: [*En Español* 1:55:00.1 - 1:55:55.1]

Cheryl: Thank you, Carlos. I think all we can do is take that as a question of notice and pass that on to the appropriate part of Global Partnerships that deal with that. By my understanding, however, there is a selection committee and they have an established criteria. How that's measured against individuals, I think we perhaps coming to some issues such as the noncom have to deal with their confidentiality and rejection of things you need to look at very, very carefully. If one has not been selected, it can be quite damaging if those reasons are too transparent sometimes.

But we will ask Global Partnerships – they can be my totally personal view I'll hasten to add too much transparency because it ends up leading to a point where people are uncomfortable or unable to act because of their fear of what may or may not be established in their action.

We need to allow, for example, noncom appointments and perhaps when it comes to personal selection and fitting of criteria when criteria is well-established. That's important. I'm less personally concerned about knowing why Mary Jane did make it and Malcolm Smith did not, providing that it was via an internal process that was well-established.

Carlos: sorry, my concern is about the names of the members of this committee to elect the fellows because in any place appear the names of this persons.

Cheryl: As I said, we will have answers and questions unless you have the answer to that question. I thought you were reaching across to give me the answer. Okay. Thank you. Andreas.

Andreas: [Inaudible]

Cheryl: Oh, you're being gallant. Okay, Heidi. Go ahead.

Heidi: I wanted to thank Carlos for a very interesting presentation. And again, just to link the connection between the ALAC improvements and the idea of the strengthening the working groups are very important linkage there. On the issue of in-reach and outreach which I also think is incredibly important. Scott Penzan, who is our director of communication in our policy team, we've been discussion how we can focus more on At-Large outreach and in-reach.

What we thought was prior, shortly prior to the Brussels meeting, if members of the At-Large community, the ALAC, the RALOs, the leaders, working group chairs would wish to participate in a webinar that would provide information to the end users on what At-Large is, on what some of the policy issues that are being discussed on structure so they could get involved.

I'm just wondering whether that would be of any interest to you, prior to again, it would be working with Scott maybe a few weeks right prior to the Brussels meeting.

Cheryl: I'm not sure whether it's fatigue. I'm seeing a whole lot of people giving me great big green cheeks, but I suspect that it is something that the regional leaders and secretaries would be very keen to engage in. Certainly I would believe the ALAC would be. So I'll second guess the group I would think so. But so Andreas, did you wish to respond to that? Yes, you can.

Carlos: [*En Español* 2:00:06.7 to 2:01:20.8]

Cheryl: Okay. I would be happy to ask the ombudsman to respond to that as a hypothetical but normally the ombudsman needs to respond to – that would almost be a class action which would be an interesting concept. I'm not sure where it would fit into his particular. I'm happy to take it to him as an inquiry.

Andreas, and then Fatimata, and then Hang. Go ahead, Andreas.

Andreas: [*En Español* 2:01:58.5 – 2:04:32.3]

Cheryl: Do you have this guide questioning in front of you because I don't see a question for Carlos. Skype might be slow. Was there a question coming in on this phone? Okay. Yes, it is. If it comes onto the screen, then we will read it to the record.

Okay. We have Fatimata and then Hang. Go ahead, Fatimata.

Fatimata: [*En Français* 2:05:34.5 – 2:08:58.6]

Cheryl: Thank you, Fatimata. I would like to think we might revisit that again when we've discussed with what Sylvia and Chiva are going to look at after our afternoon tea because this really will be pivotal to Next Steps; maybe, and maybe not.

Hang, go ahead.

Hang: I want to supplement on the Fellowship Program. It's been mentioned many times in our meeting. Fellowship Program is only for funding participants from developing and transitional countries. It does cover all of the countries in the regions.

Developing countries is by definition by United Nations. And for transitional countries it means East Europe and former Soviet Union countries. So that's a whole coverage. For selection criteria, yes, of course, there's a set of criteria.

One point I want specifically mentioned that is the regional liaisons recommendation. That's very important for the [inaudible] to consider. That's kind of connection between Fellowship Program and Global Partnerships program.

So, it is to our ALSs would like to join the Fellowship Program, apply to that, apart from a very good proposal for education. I guess Bedouin can come in on that. He's a long time alumni for Fellowship Program. Apart from that, the regional liaison's recommendation is very important. If recommended, this is a regional leader, rising star then this is of course the real panel will consider that.

For long time, there were no one from Asia/Pacific to serve on this action committee. I guess I'm the first one. So we're not in [inaudible]. Okay, that is that. We are really in the participation from this end of representative regions.

For the transparency, Carlos is right. There's not completely transparent, just similar to noncom. Only those people who have been selected, selectees will be disclosed and published on the ICANN's website. It's just applicants. It's not distracting. The name will not be disclosed, probably to preserve their privacy on one hand and also, to encourage to apply again. Is that [inaudible].

But the last point is that – oh, that's all. Okay, thanks.

Carlos: Hang, my concern is only about the names in the committee with elect. Okay. Yes. Who selected the fellow?

Cheryl: Who was it when you did this?

Hang: Tell us. I'm very sorry. All right. There is a selection committee. I guess the name should be public on that side. If it's not been done, I'm sorry for that. There's a very small group. I guess only five representatives from five regions. When the – our [inaudible] is representing Latin America. I guess we got two new representatives from Europe, and from Africa. There's so new. I couldn't remember their name.

There is another one from North America. So there's only five people on it. This is surprising. It's not being disclosed to the public.

Cheryl: Perhaps then, Hang, rather than me take it, I think some of your answers have been found around the table. Would you mind on behalf of us taking it back to that group, and just mention that it would be nice to have it obvious on the site somewhere because certainly some of us have looked and haven't been able to see the names.

Not wanting them therefore to be lobbied and hijacked in corridors or all those sorts of things. But I think it would be very useful if we could know. To whom do we need to thank? Go ahead, Hang.

Hang: Thank you, Cheryl and Carlos. The last point, now I remember my last point. It is for Fellowship Program there's not only to fund but is a [inaudible] society front At-Large community. It is a very large spectrum. It's also covered application from the government from developing countries, from the business sector. We see many applications from ISPs from telecom communications, right, and from lawyers.

So, even though they're not from the sector, they are eligible to apply. But what I'm suggesting now to this selection committee is to reinforce the founding for similar society and for At-Large community. That's only one discipline. Right. Okay.

Cheryl: Thank you, Hang. Fuoud? Go ahead, please.

Fuoud: Thank you. I think to what Caleah [*Not sure of name 2:14:10.4*] said, just to give you an idea of last year's Fellowship Program, we had people from registries as well from like small islands and these kind of smaller countries, Haiti. We had people from Haiti. We had the Director for our city, from the government of Pakistan. He was also funded for participation.

We had someone from the private sector in Pakistan and the group grew from last year. Like there is a diversity of that. And somehow there was also, what you call it? A question raised amongst the larger ICANN community. What is the output of this Fellowship Program? Is it just funding so many people? What is the actual output?

So, when all of the participants who were alumni at the program look into it, for the output...for example. I could give an immediate example – two examples from myself or three examples, clarification of how I can participate in the IGF? And what needs to be improved, right, with respect to like larger issues?

Second thing was what you call it? Participants' participation in ICANN that might be through the At-Large process. And number three, I could see it like with the IDNs coming in, right. We then have a director of IT over here right now from the Ministry of IT from the GAC.

So, there's – he's not a Fellow. He's sharing the participation considerably now. Every participant was able to elect others. No [*inaudible 2:15:46.3*] for ALAC.

I think that, once again, things go to great extent to what is and getting things done that way. Maybe if we start volunteering from regions and we actually encourage people and actually disseminate this information for people that can participate, maybe the volunteers will have to double the government sector people or the civil side people. Because funding is so scarce and most of the time the government does not have a dreadful compensations.

There's also an opportunity to look at for the most sponsors to maybe fund specifically ALAC membership. Why? Because lots of fellowships have very

financially very well-doing in most of the countries of ALAC, right? So they may be a very good possibility to start a Fellowship, a sub-Fellowship Program which can be done like an ALAC 113, right, a larger selection committee. Diversity in that selection committee and this people can brought in on a rotation basis. This from the morning suggestion. Thank you.

Cheryl: Very interesting opportunities there and perhaps something that the regional leaders might want to think about as a mechanism if not for a whole global approach. It certainly seems to me to be an ideal micro-approach for regional outreach, thinking about how AFRALO could, with all the work it has done today. Just take those Next Steps with some wise next sponsorship and use another opportunity.

So, perhaps we could build on some regional positive experiences in that way and then feel larger. Microphone? Sorry, darling.

Fuoud: This also adds to the morning issue about the Capacity Building. I don't know if you know this or not, but if you look at the schedule of the Fellowship, we actually have a very military-style schedule. We wake up at 6:00 in the morning, 6:30 we have breakfast at the Liko Hotel. Then we end up here, at the 7:30 meeting. For four and a half hours we have a direct meeting with ICANN staff and the alumni and the participants who've actually gone into main organizations. Last we even had from ALAC we had visitation.

So, imagine that. Then, by the time you're done, ICANN takes a report from you before they give you a stipend. Then everybody have to say, nothing what you did in the past five, seven days then what you will do to the next meeting or the upcoming meeting?

Second thing, no one Fellow can participate in more than three meetings. After that, he as to achieve some level of entry into the constituency advisory group. And we come under their budgets to participate in future meetings. It's only three times in the Fellowship Program and then you have to leave.

So, this is where ICANN can make interplay. Why? Because the Fellowship, for example, five times on the Fellowship Program can participate more into that group which feels that it might want to do is very good for that. They will have to look sub-Fellowship Program whereby it can continue the participation continue.

Cheryl: Indeed. Look, I think there's a lot of possibilities there but there's also possibilities for coffee. And can I just say that unlike last time when we were running late for our break, I'd like to have you out the door right at the 3:30 mark. I'd like to have you back in the door at the 3:45 mark. I do have one small piece of any other business that I'd to raise at that time.

So before we come back to our afternoon session, I'll just tell I'd like – what's it personal to me would I endorse someone? I think there's an opportunity for us to discuss whether an endorsement might come from the wider community. So, we'll take that opportunity three to five minutes at 3:45.

Move next. Yes, I will in fact do that. It's why you have to wave these things under my nose. Apparently not many of you people have put your names up on the sign-up sheet, which is over there. Every one of you regional leaders, sponsor travelers and ALAC personnel need to have your name against one or more of the non-ALAC and At-Large community meeting activities.

It's a simple system. If you don't put your name next to something, I'll put your name next to something. So – the choice is yours.

#7 OF 7 – ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session-7-07mar10-en

Alan: The session is all yours.

Nick: Right. So, I guess you're wondering what it is I do now. Can you hear me all right?

Alan: Yeah. Who are you?

Nick: Nick Astinhaut. My official title now is Senior Director for Participation and Engagement. I think all of you will have received the email from Doug that was forwarded when I was appointed at the beginning of December.

The main things I'm working on at the moment are the Public Participation Committee has resolved upon a draft program of work for the next – for the remainder of this fiscal year and all of next fiscal year, basically. It will take 16 months, whatever that is, 15 months. Which you'll hear a good deal more about on Wednesday, if you come to the Public Participation Committee's public session in the afternoon.

I can give you a summary of what those four areas of work are, if you like.

Heidi: Yes, please, Nick.

Nick: The first project is called Meetings for the Next Decade. It's a three-part consultation which instead of previous meeting-related consultations which tend to start with a position paper drawn up by one or more people that is then the subject of a consultation.

This time around we're doing it in the opposite way. We're actually putting out a survey that uses big pulses survey technology. You all will be pretty familiar with that, which asks questions about, at a high level, what kind of meetings do people want? What decisions do they – what's the decision treat to attend a meeting? What do they find valuable about meetings? What do they find less valuable?

What do they think the criteria should be in selecting the host city and the venues for meetings? As well as other questions like this so that at a high level we would get sort of the temperature of the community about what matters, really. And from that, we would then develop some options which could be the subject of a second consultation to sort of narrow down to the point where ultimately off to the third consultation we would have a very clear picture of what the community actually wants meetings to be like for the next 10 years.

Of course, it's sort of evolved over the last 10 years in an organic way, sort of reacting to the needs at the moment and financial. The bid system on which meetings are based today is really based on a different time when ICANN's finances didn't allow it to spend much money on meetings. Hosts were expected to bear most of the cost which is not really the way it works today.

So, that's the first project. I'm expecting that the first, that first survey will come out not too long after this meeting ends. Each of the surveys will be 45 days long, each of the consultations to allow more time. Each of them will be in all the six UN languages. From the beginning, by the way, we'll post everything in six languages from the start.

The second is something we're already doing. It's distant communication tools. The idea here is that we focus a lot on remote participation at meetings. What we don't really focus as much on is the fact that everyone is a remote participation most of the time because we are all working in-between meetings with one another. And we're all remote from everybody else.

So the idea here is to look at the way in which different communities have evolved their systems to work remotely. And take the best from all of them and then use what – look at what people are doing and then going to the community and say, “Well, here's what we've heard you say. Here's what you were using. Here is some ideas for how we could improve things.” Then you would end up with sort of a best practices based model developed on what all of you need.

You will have noticed that we have had to move a little bit ahead of what I would have done in order to facilitate remote participation at this meeting for obvious reasons. But that of course, does not pre-judge any outcome at all from the larger consultation. It's simply us needing to greatly up the quality level of remote participation for everyone.

It was very clear starting in December that this meeting would have more remote participants than any other meeting we've ever held. That's certainly proving to be true.

The third subject is a review of the public participation systems that ICANN uses. These have also grown up over a 10-year period as you all know. AT-Large actually recently sent the PPC quite detailed recommendations on how the public consultation process could be improved.

So, the idea of this is basically to look at all the different public participation systems from the public forum at ICANN meetings, the public board meetings at ICANN meetings to the public consultation process. And avail ourselves at the advice of world-respected experts in creating public participation systems, large-scale public participation systems to provide us with some options for things we could do to improve things.

Then, of course, take them to the community and see if you like them, or if you don't like them. Probably there'll be some things people will want and some things that people will be less emanate of. But that's basically the idea here is that we once again should look forward and review how things work and see if they can be improved for everyone's benefit.

And finally, as you all – I know you all feel strongly that outreach to new participants, both new participants to existing communities and new communities is very important. Of course, there are initiatives in various parts of ICANN to reach out to new participants in one way or another. They generally arise organizationally out of the need in a given stakeholder group. There isn't any coordination of efforts to help support all of them, to help support all of these initiatives. Provide informational products that they need, for example.

So, the idea of this project is that we should do just that. We should look at all the initiatives that people are doing to bring new participants in off the community what efforts they wish to see into to bring in new participants. And then create a broad coordinated strategy where the differentiation that is needed can be brought to bear so that we can do what is needed for a given different community.

But at the same time that there's some overall coordination so that collateral materials can be re-used by different groups. Messaging when ICANN staff and others are at events can be cross-collateralized and that kind of thing.

So, those are the main four areas which you'll hear more about as time goes on. Of course, this is a draft program. This was prepared understanding that we are finishing off a budget year which has constrained finances for reasons that you'll have already heard about and/or will be hearing about at the budget consultation on Wednesday.

And at the same time, we're in the budgeting process for the next fiscal year. To the extent – I mean, At-Large has always been very forthright and interested in outreach and making things work better, making systems more volunteer-friendly I know. So to the extent that you are for all this, make those views known in the budget consultation.

And probably I should leave it to questions.

Cheryl: Thank you, Nick. Opening the floor to any questions...? Looking around...I see Sébastien's hand in the Adobe Connect Room. Go ahead, Sébastien.

Sébastien: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Nick for your presentation. I have one question. What is the relationship between the organization of the meeting and the organization of the overall structure of ICANN? Don't you think that they could have some changes in the organization of the meeting, if there are some changes in the organization of the – and especially after the review of the board of the noncom and then other AC and AC and SO? Thank you.

Nick: Do you want me to wait?

Cheryl: No, no. I was going to say go ahead, Nick because I wasn't sure whether....

Nick: Well, I think I understand the question. I'm not entirely sure. The approach that I'm trying very hard to take with the meeting consultation is, to keep my own opinions out of it, I think the path where we have gone wrong is stop or somebody has all the best intentions, had ideas about how they think meetings should be organized and propose those as an initial proposal.

We're trying very hard to avoid that and just say, "Look, let's do this a different way. Let's really ask the community. What do they want out of meetings?" And use that then drive a discussion about what kind of meetings to organize.

Yes, I think it's entirely possible that one could say that a different meeting structure would be more suitable for X and Y reasons. But I'm very desirous that you be the one to tell us that.

Cheryl: Thank you, Nick. Adam is next. My line is off so I didn't notice him here.

Adam: Hello, Nick. Hello. It's Adam and my question is [extreme noise - 12:31.3]...feedback –

Nick: Yeah, I got some feedback there.

Adam: Yeah, it's my phone. What's the rationale for selecting the six UN languages? Why have we decided on the UN languages offered by the United Nations? Nobody is

judging whatsoever. No one is right or wrong. Just if we're thinking about restructuring the meetings why does [extreme noise – 12:58.4] and what's the cost-benefits analysis on the usual thing being discussed?

Nick: Well, I mean, I can tell you there's actually not really any connection between those languages and meetings consultations. To the extent there is a sort of a guideline framework for translation, it's in the Accountability and Transparency Management Operating Procedure. I think that's the right name for it which was agreed in September 2008 which said that, "ICANN should seek to translate major documents and initiatives into the six UN languages."

I mean, having been involved in discussions about translation, and I am involved in them now, I can tell you that the rationale is simply that to the extent there is a list of languages which are the object of translation in international affairs, it is those six languages.

So, I think the basic rationale is you could pick other languages. There's a suggestion that language that ICANN should translate into the 10 languages that are most used on the Internet, for example. This is a proposal that was made.

The only thing that really makes that problematic is, to be honest, we're not even translating everything into five; six at the moment. It's quite expensive even the amount of translating we're doing which is considerable comparing to where we were a couple of years ago.

I don't see how we can do 10, just from a cost-perspective. So that's why the list is those six, really; if that's helpful.

Cheryl: Yes, Adam says he's satisfied. I see a light on and I'm talking through the end of the tunnel which in fact I'm not. Perhaps someone in the audio can make something magic happen because we are now going to see if there are any final questions. They're not. Thank you very much, Nick. I would like to ask if there's any final words you'd like to give us?

Nick: Well, all I can say really is the point of my position is to make life better for all of you. The mechanism by which you tell ICANN what would make your life better...we propose ideas for projects. I've just given you some outlines here. I know that At-Large has quite specific views on how outreach community development and systems support should be entered into.

So, to the extent those are important to you, as the budget consultation proceeds, please make that clear. There's quite a lot of noise now but...and now I hear nothing.

Cheryl: [17:16.4] Theresa, it's all yours.

Theresa: So, I shall do my best. Since I wasn't here, I also want to make sure that we have a chance for a direct dialogue. So, first of all, thanks for the opportunity to be here.

I got feedback this morning on a variety of areas on some that I was planning – I got feedback on a variety of areas so I'll keep my points actually relatively brief and allow more opportunity for discussion and questions, if that's okay with everybody.

Cheryl: Keep going. Welcome to our world.

Theresa: Yes. Yes, I, yes. On that note, let's see how the technology works.

I believe Mandy gave a brief overview about what Global Partnerships does, but I'm going to give it from a perspective of where the organization was when it started and what the objectives of Global Partnerships area have been. And where I think that we have some alignments for the future with ALAC and with the regional organizations as well. And specifically how we can leverage that in light of trying to utilize existing resources, existing networks and reach out to new entities together and do that.

Also in keeping in light of course, that ALAC has a responsibility to individual users and how one can synergize that and get that alignment also with the other stakeholder groups that ICANN has a responsibility towards.

So, the reason I'm going to explain, the average day in a Global Partnerships team can range from pretty much anything under the sun that you can imagine. Raising, responding to questions regarding visas to ICANN meetings, facilitating that dialogue discussions about ccTLDs, questions – information flow on ccTLD issues is a very primary one working with Ianna there.

Working with the Policy Department on getting the information out on what's happening in policy development processes, engaging with the technical community on trainings, civil society, business community and working with the International Chamber of Commerce chapters, etc., working with the ccTLD regional organizations and the regional Internet registries.

Then a very large part is also engaging with the governments and we do quite a bit in order to facilitate knowledge that participating in the GAC is quite important. That's been a very important part of the work. And then I'll soon engage within our government to our regional bodies.

The mandate really is to work against the business plan that maps to the operational and strategic plan. The reporting also comes in mapping against the entire operational plan and the categories of work within that.

Taking all of that, how can we actually work with Global Partnerships team and that area of work? And work with ALAC and strengthen both the promotion of ICANN, the strengthening of what's happening in regions and better aligning the resources that are being allocated?

I'm going to qualify two areas that I think there could be quite a bit more work. It could obviously be some very good internal coordination. I know that Nick had just raised overall internal coordination among the organization on all the areas of work, how we can better prepare materials and leverage that. How we can better work together also making sure that the staff is working together on a regular basis. Being globally distributed, you could appreciate that challenge.

But the other one is making sure that we're all aware of the various activities that are happening. So, it may seem irrelevant or it may not seem as important. But potentially, there might be an engagement of ICANN together with ISOC and another regional organization to facilitate a ccTLD technical training.

But on the other hand, having that information and being able to provide it out to individual users and let them know that that's another area of importance that ICANN is participating in may actually be very important.

So, I think what we can do is really do some better aligning and leveraging on all the variety of activities that ICANN is engaged with in the regions. And allow ALAC and the RALOs to really make the choice of which information they then want to work with on the individual user's side and have them leverage that. Or, where they may be opportunities to bring participants in who hadn't been considered before.

So, that's an area that we'll certainly engage very actively on the staff side. I think what would be helpful is to keep a regular dialogue going on what's been helpful and what's been not for that part.

Then the other part is really ensuring – getting the information out but that there's also then the participation and the opportunities to participate in the different events better occurring and again, that's within the realm of interest.

Now, those are just two sort of high-level areas but what I'd really like to hear is maybe some ideas and suggestions from this room and from the participants remotely on what other ideas exist, and how do we do that? And where does fit within the organization? Or is that consistent with some of the work that Nick is trying to do overall?

So, I'd like to leave my comments limited to this because I really would like to get a dialogue on some of the more creative ideas and thinking, if that's okay. I know that you're hearing from Tim and others who have responsibilities in other parts of the organization so I can only speak to the areas that I'm dealing with. I also understand there might have been some questions about the strategic plan and [inaudible 23:14.3]. Thank you.

Cheryl: Thank you.

Theresa: Oh, do you want me to go ahead on that?

Cheryl: Yeap. Jump right in.

Theresa: Jump right in.

Cheryl: Jump right in.

Theresa: Okay, so save your questions. So, yes, the comments of all the organizations and all the comments that were provided were incorporated into the strategic plan. As you know and as we had presented at the time, the strategic plan is a very different approach this year. It's a much more high-level approach. So it may not find the exact word that one had used but the concept and the principle is reflected quite strongly.

Separate from that, there is a summary, an analysis document that was posted which provides where the different inputs were. It captures that. I'd pull it up here. I will send a link around and get that over so that you'll have that. First, it provides just general comments and then broken down by the four focus areas, what some of the different views were from that. And again, we may not see the exact word that was

used in the submission but the concepts and principles were certainly reflected in there.

When I go to the actual strategic plan and look at this, a lot of the comments that we had gotten, especially from ALAC, a lot of them were very much relating to the healthy Internet ecosystem, working on participation, working on engagement. You'll see language in there, contributing, increasing participation, contributing to international forums. For participation, building capacity and strengthen partnerships, things like that.

So, one should view that language as being reflective to capture, not just the feedback that we got from ALAC but we also got from, say, the CCMSO and from other entities there, from that area.

But then again, in the budget and operational planning part, again, you'll see some language in there which I would really guide you to page 5 actually, which is really asking about getting comments on the following strategically-significant areas.

In there, again, you'll see language or the organizational activities prioritized correctly. Operating activities, there's outreach, there's the rules of what the Internet in the ecosystem, those sorts of things. So, focus in on what the strategic significant items are because I think that's important feedback that we look for.

In the remainder of the operational plan, you'll also see then different categories and you'll see very much global engagement and participation and things of that. Again, those capture the concepts that we had also gotten the feedback from this.

So, I'll leave those comments there and then maybe just open it for questions? I don't want to intrude into Tim's time but I'm happy to remain as long as you'd like me to remain.

Cheryl: Thanks very much for that. The floor is open for questions. Sébastien, certainly you were leading the discussions this morning on the lack of clearly on what we said was strategic plan holes and in our comments and it being annotated or clearly seen strategic plan. Did you want to follow off on that, while other people perhaps frame their questions?

Sébastien: Thank you, Cheryl. I think for your position and your inputs. Yes, it's important for us to know that some of our ideas were taken into account in some sentences. But if I look, the differences between what it was proposed prior to the comments and after the comments, I don't see so much differences in the strategic planning.

I - a person who is certain that what ALAC put on the table with a specific as strategy project was not taken into account as a project by the board. That's a pity because if it's not taking women now to find a way where we will put our ideas to be a good to do what we were seeking to try to do. That's not good as image. That's not good to reword our work. That's not good for the participation of the members here, this is all this future work.

That's not good either for your department because at the end of the day, one part of the participation, it's coming from the end users. We need to do that more. We need to do that with you and your department, too.

It's why we didn't get real for the moment...[Audio silent 28:22.6]

I've come to the second point about the...*[Microphone not picking up his voice - 28:00.0]*

Bedouin: *[31:24.6 - Audio picks back up En Français]* *[Audio silent]* *[En Français – 33:04.2]*

Cheryl: Sorry. We have a meltdown. We missed the very last of that. I think you were finished but just repeat the very end, please, Bedouin.

Bedouin: *[En Français – 33:21.6 – 34:03.1]*

Cheryl: Thank you, Bedouin. I see nothing but agreement from Senegal at the end of the table as well. So...Is she going to be electrocuted? Can someone... Yes, call me fussy but I prefer not to have to evacuate. Go ahead, please.

Theresa: I think the, if I'm understanding the point correctly is that the female issue is how do we create greater awareness of what the activities are, and how do we get that information out to a much wider audience, both through web portal information but also through the different networks of information.

So, going to my earlier point about really needing to strengthen the alignments that exist, both, amongst the stakeholder groups in the regions and amongst the different entities within the organization structure that have responsibility for the different issues. So I think we have responsibilities on all sides in the community and in others.

I can give you an examples of partnerships . We worked closely with AFRNIC or AFTLD or regional organizations to other organizations. But I think what we could do much better is get that information out to a wider audience, figure out how to do that better and then do stronger internal coordination as well. I think that is a very practical first step and then identify what practical Next Steps would exist.

Another area that I would like to be working on is providing a web portal of information also on the different events that are being covered and who's covering them and getting that information. So at least there's a resource on the website that has all that information and the activities so there's not a strong as reliant on solely just having email.

I'm not a technology expert but I'm sure there's other mediums that we could use and we could explore in order to get the information out to a much, much wider audience and strengthen that.

But I think you've really touched on what it is we're trying to address in this conversation and also as a really fundamental issue moving forward. I hope that's been responsive to the question.

Cheryl: Bedouin, you're okay with that? Mmm, work in progress. He likes to see the proof in the pudding. He'll just look at the recipe for now.

Theresa: May I address...? I would ask you to give me – if you have ideas, please, share. Really, because we're dealing with a unique model so we have an opportunity to be as creative as we need to be. So, it doesn't have to be now but I would welcome suggestions at any point in time, or ideas and things to do.

Cheryl: And of course, it does fit perfectly with some of our own ALAC improvement implementation processes where the regions and the ALS engagement is one of the major focuses we have. So, knowing now that we'll be able to work in closer partnership has come.

Theresa: Yes.

Cheryl: It's going to be very, very important.

Theresa: No, I think that's, yeah...

Cheryl: Well, I would like to thank Theresa very, very much and pass on through her our thanks also again to Mandy because she just jumped in this morning and did an amazing job. So, we want you to know how much we value what your team and you are doing for us.

Theresa: Well, thank you.

Cheryl: Look forward to all of our Next Steps including those closer communications between our staff and your staff in the future.

Theresa: Likewise, likewise.

Cheryl: Thanks a lot, Theresa.

Theresa: I'm glad we've taken these steps.

Cheryl: Thank you.

Our next victim is Mr. Cole. No...Tim, come on down.

Tim: Thank you. Thank you. I don't feel like a victim. But before I launch into my presentation I wanted to dovetail a little bit on Theresa's talk. Just to give you a little taste of how the synergy sometimes works between Global Partnerships and some of the operational staff functions.

For example, on several occasions, at least once a year if not more often, I am asked to attend presentations. I was in Senegal. I've been in Cairo a couple of times and other places to speak in conjunction with one of the Global Partner staff members. Two emerging groups that are hoping to become active in the gTLD space or perhaps want to transition their ccTLD space from a pure single registry/registrar model to a diversified registrar/registry model similar to what we have in the G space.

So, I found – it's been a very receptive and a very positive place for me to go and speak. And then on the flip side, there are occasions when we have compliance issues or concerns with registrars in some of the different regions. In some instances there are cultural or language misunderstandings or communication issues that the regional representatives from Global Partnerships have been able to help us with.

So, I just want you to know that we, too, take advantage of these different elements and we find a synergy that is often very helpful.

Now, let me speak to what I was asked to come and talk with you about a little bit. And that is our – the regional registry and registrar events that we hold routinely, just

to give some background about them and then to talk about where we think they're headed, and get some of your input. (Can we move to the next slide?)

First, the first slide shows the history of these meetings that we've had...if we can get there...

Cheryl: Welcome to our world.

Tim: Okay. If you look at this, I started at ICANN in the latter part of 2004. Starting in February of 2005, I helped coordinate a session to go out and meet with the European registrars. This was not, in fact – we hadn't decided to call it a "regional meeting" and it didn't even involve the registries at the time. It was just our first effort to do outreach to a group of the registrars in a specific geographic region as opposed to the ICANN meetings that historically had taken place.

So, that was our first foray into it. Then, what we really got a new model going starting in 2006 where we recognized three primary regions where we had a critical mass of registrars, Europe, Asia/Pacific and North America. We're starting to get more of a critical mass in South America and Latin America so we're probably be looking about how we may add that into the mix or a new version of the mix.

But as you can see if you sort of look down you'll see that in some order and some variation on the order, we have Europe, Asia/Pacific, North America, Asia/Pacific, Europe, North America, Asia/Pacific, Europe, North America. We have tried to rotate between those three regions approximately once a year.

Where it gets complicated is that we also try to hold these sessions at times that are fairly remote from an ICANN meeting in that region because we – it's a little – it may be overkill to say to the European registrars to come to a regional gathering a month or two after an ICANN meeting in the region. It was particularly challenging with Asia this past year because we had two Asia/Pacific meetings back to back.

So, if we go to the next slide...what our current plan has the next meeting being next month in Asia/Pacific. Specifically it's expected to be in Hong Kong. These dates are tentative. The reason for these dates is that they coincide with an ICT event in Hong Kong and some other regional TLD activities there.

So, it actually provides the attendees with multiple reasons for going to the location at that time. What I will say is that we have started to get some push back from the registries, and let me explain a little more about the way the model works.

We have a meeting. It is essentially closed to the registries and registrars so that we can have an opportunity to do a couple of things. First of all, we want to update them on compliance matters, contractual matters, issues that relate to what may be – trends we may be seeing in their region with regard to either problems or potential best practices that some registrars are doing which would be good to share with others, etc.

But it has historically been we bring the registries and registrars together because they also then can interact. But because the registries are more global, and the registrars are more local, they find that they're being asked to come to three meetings a year. And the registrars in any given region are only asked to go to one or invited to one per year. So, for them they really look forward to it. They ask us, "Can we do two a year?" or whatever but we really haven't been able to accommodate that.

But the registries are starting to say it's too much. So we may revert to somewhat to more of a registrar-focus model and then open it to registries when they're interested in attending. But we're not quite sure how that is going to go.

So, I know that there's interest in finding ways if at all possible to possibly dovetail activities of the RALOs or ALAC and some of our regional activities. I have to admit, I have to confess that we have a real logistical headache trying to set each one of these up. As I said, we're tentatively scheduled for the 15th and 16th of April. We don't have a venue yet. We're almost a month out now and people aren't going to be able to plan plane tickets and travel or whatever if we don't firm that up.

I just want to let you know that we have our challenges just trying to find times that will be acceptable people that are good in the region, whether it be from avoiding holidays, avoiding conflicts, trying to go at a time when the weather is at least part-way reasonable, not trying to go to the hottest climate in the middle of the summer and the coldest climate in the middle of winter, that sort of thing. Sometimes that can't be avoided.

So I wanted to explain to you that that is sort of the general function that we have with these meetings and why we hold them. If there are questions or concerns or things I haven't covered, please let me know.

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you, and the first hand up is Evan.

Evan: Hi.

Tim: Hi.

Evan: Heidi, don't look at me that way.

Cheryl: We're all looking at you, Evan.

Evan: Yeah, okay. At the beginning of today's meeting, somebody had mentioned in passing that there was some comments that have been within ICANN staff saying that there were lessons learned after Toronto. Could you please expand on that?

Tim: Well, a couple of things. We are planning – well, one of the questions, we got concerns from registrars who weren't in the region that felt that discussions, for example, about new TLDs or whatever that were held at the sessions were somehow imparting information to just the people who attended, and that if people who didn't attend were disadvantaged. It certainly wasn't – I don't think it was the case or I don't think it was. It certainly wasn't any intent.

But what we have decided to do in that respect is that we are going to be more public about when the meetings are held and where they're held. And that we will open them to registrars and registries that aren't from the region if they choose to attend. That's one thing.

We also felt that just by being more public about it, we don't have any expectation of making them open meetings. But we do feel that there may have been some people in the Toronto area, for example, that felt they were kept in the dark and that this meeting was held and it was secretive or something and they weren't informed of it.

So, we're going to be more public with our schedule about when and where they're being held but we're probably not going to change the fact that they're focused on a specific target, our audience.

Evan: I guess my main question is about closed versus open. I think there's people with – I think within At-Large, there's an understanding of what's a policy conference and what's a technical briefing. I think people get the difference between that.

I guess I'd like to ask, as probably one of the people who was involved before, is to find out why there is a resistance to having people from At-Large or even GNSO or whatever, to come in, and to use the old college term "to audit" something and just basically be a fly on the wall, see what goes on...I mean, this isn't an industry association. This is still ICANN acting as a public interest body and unless you're having individual discussions with a contractual relationship – okay, that we get.

But if you're having a briefing with all of them regarding things like new gTLDs or REA or things like that, is there a compelling reason not to allow interested and well-meaning people from At-Large or other bodies to come?

Tim: Well, I guess I don't know how this will come across, but what we hear from the registrars is that they believe there would be somewhat of a chilling effect on the openness and the discourse that they would have if they felt there were other people in the room.

By the same token, we make all of the presentation materials public. They get posted. We do not – I mean, you have full access to all of the presentations that were made to them. Those materials are posted publicly on the ICANN website following the meeting.

So it's not that we don't have any – we're not hiding the ball in terms of the materials that's presented to them. But the dialogue that takes place in the room is designed to be – there's an expectation that it's among contracted parties.

Evan: And that's not going to change...

Tim: It – I don't see it changing in the foreseeable future. I mean, I'm just one voice here. I'm just saying, from our discussions about how these are being organized I don't think that's going to change.

Cheryl: Okay. We've got Olivier and then Adam and did I see then Sébastien? Go ahead.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. We're discussing this under promoting ICANN through At-Large outreach activities. How is this set of regional registries/registrar events outreach?

Tim: I didn't put it on your agenda.

Cheryl: No. Yeah, that's not his issue. Okay. Adam.

Adam: Yeah, I just wondered actually two things. One relates to what you just said and another question. The idea of having closed meetings of contracted parties seems highly unusual from this sort of "good government" perspective and the whole trend that we have in regulation policy generally. We've got a whole review of the FCC in the United States going along with which is actually moving away from even an ex-

parte meeting process which would be one if we put it into the context of the registry/registrar meetings where you would – you'd put forward not transcripts but you put forward reviews of what was discussed.

So, it seems like a pretty unusual process for ICANN, which is but – [Audio silent - 52:00.6] but all bodies of its kind. So it just doesn't seem to gel with everything else that ICANN does. So I'm surprised that there are any closed meetings, right, of this nature unless they have to go into specific one-to-one contracting negotiations. I can't see any reason why these meetings have to be closed, but I might be misunderstanding something.

Tim: No, there is no contract negotiation that takes place –

Adam: That's what I mean –

Tim: There is no policy-making that takes place. We have been very deliberate from Day One to make it very clear that these sessions are distinct from the ICANN meetings because for one thing, we have no desire to compete or create an alternative to the full ICANN meetings. The registrar constituency meetings are open. Those meetings take place on Constituency Day. A lot of visitors come and attend those and listen. A lot of similar presentations are made by policy staff or compliance staff or whatever to the registrars in those sessions.

What tends to mark these is that they tend to be more intimate. They're smaller. The goal is to, once a year, because it's regional, once a year in a given region is to provide a sort of a safe harbor opportunity for people to get together in a room and talk about the concerns, challenges, whatever is involved with doing that business as a part of the ICANN community.

I don't really think, I mean, I understand why people might be interested in attending but I really don't think asking for one meeting a year to be closed per region is really all that contentious. Yeah.

Adam: It may be that people are generally concerned is not only me. It's a lot of people, not just ALAC. It's the fact that we didn't even know the meetings were going on at one point. So, the fact that they would be on a schedule –

Tim: I know. As we get more open then we get more criticism.

Adam: No. Well, no –

Tim: I mean seriously.

Cheryl: No, and the main thing is, I think what we're hearing is that this is an opportunity for the retreat aspect of conversation to go on. I think it's very helpful for us as a community to understand the purpose and intent because lack of information and knowledge usually leads us to jump to conclusions.

Tim: Right.

Cheryl: So, that I think is what we're trying to avoid doing in the future.

Tim: And you know? The other aspect to this is that it has a significant compliance component to it. Whether you call it the compliance staff saying something to them

or not, it's helping them to fully understand what is required of them under their contracts, and what it required as the contract evolves and changes is a crucial component that we don't really have the time to do that at an ICANN meeting. We really don't have many other opportunities to do that.

So, in fact, one of the clear goals of what we're doing is to make sure that these members of the community are doing what you and others want and that is behaving appropriately from the context of their requirements of their contract.

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you, Tim. I just need to make very clear to our audience that the translators leave in five minutes. We have real work that is going to rely on those translators. So, I understand there's a great deal of energy and enthusiasm to go through the speaking list, but I'm very concerned that perhaps that we – anything else can be jotted down and sent to us as an email or whatever.

But thank you. Thank you, Sébastien and thank you, Adam. I know you want to say more but I really think we just...yeah, very, unbelievably brief, Evan.

Evan: Okay. Tim, we here at At-Large don't have the luxury of having any meetings that aren't open. I remember during the summit I was involved in a meeting. We were half full with registrars that had no problem in inflicting themselves on us. It was useful, but by the same token, I don't think that a meeting that ICANN funds should be closed. If the registrars want to pay for one on their own, let them do it instead of set their own rules.

Cheryl: Thank you, Evan, and of course, one of the things we're very proud of is our openness and inclusiveness. I don't think there should be some – it's a benchmark we'd like to see everyone come up to but I don't think – there was heavily implied criticism we're putting up with. What we need to do is engage more closely. We have supply and demand and the better we work together the better we all end up working.

Evan: I know you're in a hurry but I know that each meeting starting, I can't remember how far back, the registrars – we tried to work out a joint session sometime during the meeting with the registrars and ALAC. I don't think it's scheduled for this meeting partly because so many of them are elsewhere.

Rudy and I were briefly talking about possibly doing something a little more extensive in Brussels. And I'm more than willing to help work on that so that we get that dialogue at least in those context.

Cheryl: And that's something Bo and others have been actively involved with. To revisit that I think would be brilliant. So, thank you very much, Tim. I appreciate that.

Okay, can I now have, and I do apologize for the contrition that is going to be required but we do need to look at what Sylvia and Civa – do we have Civa on the line? Is Civa connected? If not, then the telecommunication gremlins have won and we have lost but we do have a real live presenter and that's the main thing.

So, Sylvia, the floor is yours and if you have Civa, fantastic. If not, then it could be impossible to hear your voice. [Horrible background noise] It's not going to work.

Civa? Civa? You must mute your line. It's untenable in the room. Go ahead, Civa.

Sylvia: [*En Español* – 58:25.0 – 59:39.4]

Cheryl: Be nice to [inaudible].

Sylvia: [*En Español* – 59:44.4 – 1:08:13.3]

Cheryl: Okay.

Sylvia: Okay?

Cheryl: Okay. Thank you, Sylvia. I'm sorry about my laughing out loud but there is a snowball's chance in Hell of this getting the type of support it so rightfully deserves. However, that does not mean that we cannot use this information to try and influence choices that better-funded programs within ICANN might be doing.

So, what we can do is look at ways where meeting the needs here as it's being very, very well analyzed and done cannot be passed to public participation and nix units and directors. There are people with better chances of getting that sort of budget input. To be honest, if I had a choice of running a whole bunch of regional meetings in another At-Large summit or doing ICANN's advertising for it, it's a no-brainer which may help you going, because we need to do a lot of capacity building and development in our areas.

Increasing some of these capacity for people to understand and know about ICANN is itself an interesting debate that we probably need to have, because do we need to educate PDP bodies and decision-makers or do we need to educate the man in the street?

They are two very different approaches and it's not actually clear, at least from my understanding of the regions which is the right way or which is globally the best way forward.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very, very keen to however put this on our to-do and discuss agenda. So with your permission can I ask this link we can analyze this? The link will be updated and we will have this presentation now. Correct? The link to the presentation we've just seen because I think some of us would like to go over in specific detail. I would very much like to have the regional leaders focus on this perhaps – I don't know whether you could squeeze gTLD leadership and secretariat meeting. But if you can, I think it would be a very, very worthwhile exercise.

Perhaps in wrap-up meetings later we can look at that later in the week. My apologies for compressing time. Are there any questions that need to be raised right now on this matter? I see Olivier. Anyone else? And I see Evan. Okay. Go ahead.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. I just have two points to ask...

Cheryl: I'm not hearing any English.

Sylvia: Okay.

Olivier: Can you hear?

Sylvia: Yeap.

Olivier: Okay. I have two points I wanted to expand on. One was whether it was At-Large's, was within At-Large's commission to propose such a thing. The other one was just a word of [inaudible 1:11:36.6] to you and to Civa for having put such a good presentation together which, and I'll speak just for myself, made a lot more sense than some of the babble for the French – I don't know how to translate "babble" in Spanish but for the French it's [inaudible] that we dispense with in the plan, in the strategic plan, which absolutely has no mention of outreach. Unless there is outreach in ICANN, ICANN is absolutely nothing outside of the Canute International Conference Center. Thank you.

Sylvia: [*En Español* 1:12:16.91:13:15.6]

Cheryl: Okay. Evan.

Evan: When I think of advertising companies like Ogleby and Mather I think of big media. I think of radio, television, newspapers, traditional media, big media and some of them would say "old media". In your proposals, did you consider the idea of doing viral internet-based marketing that would literally approach the people who are using the Internet? Who are in fact are the people who are most in need of knowing about ICANN?

Such campaigns would possibly very effective and probably much less expensive.

Sylvia: [*En Español* 1:14:05.6 – 1:14:50.0] Okay. Gracias.

Cheryl: Okay. Final question then from Bedouin, please. You'll need your [inaudible]. Thank you, go ahead.

Bedouin: [*En Français* 1:15:03.5 – 1:16:14.4]

Sylvia: [*En Español* 1:16:19.1 – 1:17:28.9]

Cheryl: Thank you very much. I hear a great deal of enthusiasm. But I also want to make a huge individual thank you because I think what you've done is get us thinking in some new ways. I think this sort of idea is very, very important.

You want to have a tiny moment, Andreas? Was that what you were telling me? You wanted to...Thirty seconds? Okay, go ahead then that's it.

Andreas: [*En Español* 1:18:06.1 – 1:19:08.4]

Sylvia: [*En Español* 19:09.9 – 1:2:01.1]

Cheryl: Go ahead, Olivier, and if your definition of 30 seconds is different to Andreas', I would appreciate that.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl, very much so. Do a search on Google. You mentioned Google. Do a search on Google for domain name and you'll find that in the first few pages ICANN doesn't even exist. Thank you.

Cheryl: Very good point. ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to ask that we now stop our need for interpretation because we have had our interpreters working almost 20 minutes over their due time. I want to thank each and every one of them for the hard work they've put on today.

[Applause]

Cheryl: Having worked on this in particularly difficult technology challenges as well. So thank all of you. while they take a deep breath or a cold drink of water and leave the room and get ready to come back tomorrow for it all to happen again but on a larger scale. I want to draw your attention to what we're now going to have to do to our remaining agenda.

I think it is vital that at 5:30, yes, ladies and gentlemen, that is in 10 minutes that we head off to the events which are the Fellowship and the AFRALO event. I expect to see each and every one of you at those events. Please. Particularly the AFRALO outreach. It's vitally important that we see you all there.

Then in this last ten minutes, what I'd like to propose is that we take some time to look at the EOI issues and give some feedback for Olivier. Is that, I think – incidentally, my view of the priority of 10 minutes value be stemmed. Is there anyone wish to argue with me at this point, that this is the way we should be going?

Yes?

Evan: Doesn't the African showcase start at 5:30?

Cheryl: I believe so.

Evan: Okay. He says no.

Cheryl: Well, come on and tell me what's going on.

Male: We will start at preparing the showcase at 5:30 but Rudy is not expected to be there before 6:00.

Cheryl: Well, we still need everyone there well before that. So, yeap. We will work until 5:30. Yes, come and plug in if you can up here, I believe. And Mateus, can you make the magic happen so we can see presentations and things? We need to plug in Olivier's computer, please.

Just while we're challenging the making the magic happen on screen technology issues, we have not clearly time now to go through and make sure there are names matched to various of the non-ALAC and At-Large meetings. It's going to be a fairly simple process. Take the time to do so now. if you're not on one of those, speak now or allocate or forever hold your peace.

But we do know the system. We've got opportunities for everyone to be in different meetings. ; If you haven't got your name next to anything, we will track you down and it will be held against you because it is important that we are seen.

Whilst we are still waiting for the technology challenges to be met, yes, go ahead, Alan.

Alan: Although we're doing Olivier's now on EOI and not the intellectual property issues on new gTLDs, if you have any advice or sage words for me, get them to me by email before this session tomorrow afternoon.

Cheryl: Thanks, Alan, but you have a fairly good measure. Rudy, you're waving to me. I know I've bumped you off the agenda. What do you want to say about it? Go ahead.

Rudy: Well, I would like to know when it's going to be on the agenda?

Cheryl: When we next convene as a regional meeting, so, at the beginning of our Tuesday activities. Is that a problem, or not? If not, we can have other opportunities on Thursday but I would have thought sooner rather than later.

Rudy: I personally prefer to have it on Tuesday as the council meeting will be on Wednesday.

Cheryl: Fine. Makes perfect sense.

Rudy: I need the input.

Cheryl: Is that the Tuesday sounds like a perfect match, then. So, we will bump our agenda around to make sure that it's met. There's nothing we can do about it. Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier: Thank you, Cheryl. Well, I wanted to go just quickly through the questions which will be asked tomorrow during the EOI panel session that will take place right after the integration ceremony. On the screen you'll find the EOI panelists. I'm not sure whether I've got a list them through. There's Bruce Tompkin for ICANN board, Ava Doria USC, Beton Chappell, French government, {Inaudible] DRC, then myself. There's Richard Tindale who used to be with Demon Media but is now independent and there's Anthony Vancouring, mines a machine.

The questions that are being asked, I wanted to sort of get some feedback as to what we were thinking. Most of the answers are already written in our document that was submitted. But I just want to make sure that I understand the document correctly and see that this is really indeed our own answer.

I gather that I won't be able to speak on behalf of ALAC, but I will express my own opinions and say that because we haven't ratified this in the usual processes and so on but this is the sort of thing that we think of as ALAC. That's it.

Cheryl: Yeah.

Olivier: So the first question that will be asked and there's been a slight rescheduling of the questions that are going to be asked there, the first one, what are the benefits of the EOI preregistration? And does it serve the public interest? One of the reasons why it's being moved to the first question is because some of the participants are hoping one will whiz through their first question without really speaking much about it. If Monsieur Chappell wishes to change this to what are the expected benefits of the EOI preregistration and does it serve the public interest?

Some of the people there, some of the panelists think that this will serve as a mitigating factor or first step in controlling the new flow of gTLDs. Some of the participants indeed think that their cake is going to grow if you look at the gTLDs space. Others think that it won't grow and it will end up with smaller slices.

So, any points on that that you think we should be pushing through? Adam.

Adam: Yeah, I'm just a bit concerned what was the original purpose of the EOC and are we now expanding on that into something? It's almost as if from what you're saying, Olivier, we don't really know what the purpose of the EOC was anymore. Obviously it had an original purpose. What was that purpose? And is what we're doing now meeting that purpose?

Because it seems to me we're going off into – I think the original purpose was basically a marketing exercise. I think that's why it was originally suggested, if I remember correctly what the discussion was. We seem to be going off into...and that should be the first question because everything else depends on that, I think.

Cheryl: Okay. Okay.

Olivier: Yeah, I'll put this down. I think that in this particular case we'll just have to listen to what the others have to say, I guess, because there are vastly different views on this event.

Cheryl: Alan, go ahead.

Alan: This was discussed a little bit at the GNSO meeting yesterday and someone, I don't remember who pointed out that if submitting an expression of interest is mandatory, if the price is so significant is a very large part of the overall price, it effectively is no longer an expression of interest. It's a very stage of the application process. Let's not call it anything else.

There is a downside however, and that is should the gTLD process get derailed, postponed for two years, for whatever reason legal or otherwise. And have to be started over again, there will be public knowledge of who wants what TLD. There will be an opportunity for other people to register trademarks perhaps now a year or a two years before and cause all sorts of havoc. Therefore, there is some potential damage.

Olivier: We'll touch on that –

Alan: And if it's not truly the launch of the TLD application process. Effectively, it will be the launch unless there's a derailing in which case it has some negative ones.

Olivier: I forgot to mention it earlier actually. We had yesterday night dinner, all the participants on the panel had a dinner and beat some of the questions there. So as to try and see what everyone was thinking before we actually met in public. So...

Cheryl: Excellent prior planning to prevent the inevitably dismal performance which is what we're trying to do. So, it's very good.,

Olivier: Yeah, not quite sure how it will pan out but we'll see.

Cheryl: Okay. Okay. Any other comments or questions on that? If not, can I ask is there something else you want to specifically have us address now?

Alan: Yeah, that was question number one?

Olivier: Yeah, that was question number one.

Cheryl: I'm trying to move it along. We've got three minutes to go.

Olivier: I'll be a bit faster then. The second one what is the best way to ensure global and fair process? Some people think that the process is not going to be fair because only those in the know will actually submit an EOI. So they're saying that a large media campaign should be launched, which is funny because we've just spoken about something like that.

I know that suggestions do go through their localized registries and their registrars and get them to email their customers so as to push for this. But it sounds more like a marketing exercise than anything else, yet again.

Alan: Good point.

Olivier: Prince, on the behalf of ICANN, yesterday did allow that whatever marketing campaign would have been necessary prior to the launch of gTLDs and I think it was specified minimum of four months by the GNSO would have to precede the EOI.

So, whatever the problem would be for GTLD launch it has now being moved to EOI, but it isn't any different.

Olivier: Do we have any preference in regards to whether it should be through the registrar/registries or through a large media campaign?

Olivier: Next one. Should the EOI [inaudible] preparations be mandatory, pros and cons, from the report that we submitted? It looks as though we are saying that it should be mandatory. That's at least what I understood it to be. Am I being correct on this assumption or not? The code is actually there. The At-Large believes that the participation of the EOI should be a requisite to follow full application later. The will allow potential applicants to develop their proposal without running the risk of being out-paid later on by latecomers with big pockets.

Adam: I think that is what we meant but we also had caveats in there about the cost of the EOI and that the community applications that should be categorized, this, that and the other so that people wouldn't be disadvantaged simply because they didn't have deep pockets now.

Olivier: Okay. Any other...Next one, what information about the EOI preregistration submission should be made public? There were two camps in there. Some wished to keep everything confidential. Some wished to have only the acutaly string that the domains themselves to be confidential and some wanted nothing to be confidential, everything to be open.

My own view is that since ultimately the stakes are very high, keeping everything confidential is likely to be impossible. We should expect leaks because it's not in ICANN's culture to keep secrets. The second thing I also think is ICANN has pledged to keep its processes as transparent as possible. If we start having confidential EOIs and choices and so on, it goes directly against this pledge.

I don't know if you do agree with that or not...

Cheryl: That does sound a little like you need an end of the wedge to me. But what's the feeling of the room? Sounds to me like no one is objecting to that. So, that gets a big tick. Next.

Olivier: Then additional question was added by consensus. We discussed it and the question was, how to minimize gaming? Parties lodging expression of interest purely for the purposes of being bought out by another party. In fact, we upon discussion found two ways of gaming the system.

One, the first way to game things would be to identify the generic word that matches a brand, let's say, Time, for example. Register for an EOI for a time whilst Time-Warner Group also registers for Time and then try to get bought out by Time-Warner Group somehow, was one idea.

The other idea was a counter example, was a large company checks for unregistered generic words, because that's if everything is open and looks for the applicants details. If it finds it, it's a small-time applicant then he registers the word as well by making the process more expensive for the small applicant. It gets the applicant to run out of cash, because the application is then from \$55,000.00 to \$185,000.00 for a [inaudible 1:34:11.0] fee.

The problem you end up is you're not even playing at a casino. What you're actually playing is poker with someone who's basically cheating and trying to basically run you out by bluffing their way through. That's the position that Avery is probably going to push forward.

I wondered whether you thought about...

Cheryl: Adam...

Adam: I think there's a notion of frivolous application unless you could almost judge that by the nature of the business plan that was submitted. But the original applicant would have a hopefully a detailed business plan and they de-pocketed it back and would have something somewhat frivolous and should – I don't know. You can't tell. But you know what I mean, what I'm trying to get at.

You'd have – you may well be able to note the legitimate applicant through the nature of his business plan as opposed to this sort of counter de-pocketed response. I don't know.

Olivier: The problem is that it looks as though the big guys, I'm not going to name any of them but the big guys are there to try and make a killing and not let any of the small-time applicants including non-profit organizations or any other organization that wants to get their gTLD, if they think they could make money out of that.

Adam: Has anybody mentioned the possibility of limiting the number of possible applications for TLDs by any particular organizations? So that if I'm a Adam Rich Corporation I can only actually apply for three or four or two or whatever it be. And is that reasonable? It's a bit late but is that a reasonable discussion item?

Olivier: Nothing as such has been suggested but I would be happy to suggest it if you think it's something worthy.

Cheryl: From my perspective, I think that could be a very interesting conversation if the work group heads in that way. I think from an audience perspective that could be very, very interesting indeed.

But that's your additional question. Is there anymore? Okay.

Olivier: That's it. Thank you very much.

Cheryl: That's all, folks. Okay. Thank you, each and every one of you. It has been, to say the least, a day with some interesting challenges from a technology or technological perspective. If I can encourage you now to all go upstairs to the delegate's lounge and make our AFRALO showcase everything it should be.

And I'll see you tomorrow morning, early, if not bright at the opening ceremony which will be in the Tibu, I think it is, in the main ballroom on the left-hand side. So, our day tomorrow is all about being in the main room. And Tuesday, back here.

Good morning, good evening, good night to those of you who are on remote participation. And thank all of you for I think a lot of very worthwhile work and discussions today.

Upstairs, little...