

---

PRAGUE – Public Participation Committee and Community Consultation  
Thursday, June 28, 2012 – 09:00 to 10:30  
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Good morning. Good morning. I am Sebastien Bachollet, chair of the Public Participation Committee of the board, and I would like to start this meeting today. If you can take your chair and open or close your laptop, take your earphone if somebody is speaking another language, as I will do, obviously, and be ready for the start of the meeting.

We will start in two minutes for the people online. Thank you.

Okay. Thank you very much for coming to this meeting. May I suggest that the people in the back of the room come closer? It's very difficult to find the right setup of any meeting room, but I have the impression to be a teacher and I don't -- I am not, and please come closer and we will try to have some exchange.

If we don't see you because you are at the back, you will not be able to participate fully.

We have two items today. It's one around the public comments implementation and we will get a presentation by Filiz Yilmaz, senior director of participation and engagement, and we will get a presentation on language services -- I guess that's the title -- and then I will -- that will be Christina -- now I have to remember because it's not written here -- Rodriguez, I guess, and she is in charge of all the languages services for ICANN, and

---

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

we will discuss that. And then we will open also for any other business, hopefully, at the end if we have some time.

I want to present to you the people on this table. I already talked about Christina and Filiz, and on the other side of me on this table are the board members, Kuo-Wei Wu, Bertrand de la Chapelle, Gonzalo Navarro and Chris Disspain and Thomas Narten, and once again, I am Sebastien Bachollet.

I will give immediately the floor to Filiz.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you, Sebastien.

So the purpose of this presentation is to go through the public comment process implementations, the recent ones, and then open up some discussion environment or a discussion fora, as Sebastien mentioned.

So I will try to keep it brief, but I will also -- I want to provide the full information for the benefit of those people who haven't seen the history of this process.

So first of all, what happened with the request? How it -- how did ICANN start talking about this issue at all?

"ATRT" is Accountability and Transparency Review Team. They have come up with a set of recommendations quite a while ago, and five of them -- of these recommendations are actually related to public input and public comments and policy

---

development processes directly, and one of them is about stratification and prioritization.

The problem that was brought up was that it is not easy for the reader, due to the volume of public comment processes that are opened, it's not easy to see what is really relating to them, what is important for them, and the request was to stratify and provide some kind of prioritization, so that the reader could say, "Okay, this is in my interest but this is less in my interest."

The other recommendation was about having separate comment and reply period -- periods within the system, embedded within the system, and the overall reason for that was to have the -- was to have a mechanism built in the system so that the comments do not only come at the end and there is some time for the previous submitted comments to be responded to.

The problem about this is mainly due to the fact that often there is a tendency in the ICANN community to send remarks or post comments really at the end of the said reply period, and the intention was to bring some dialogue mechanism to the whole system. At least that was our interpretation of this recommendation.

And that was 16 and 17.

The other recommendation was to have an annual list of upcoming topics. This was totally relating to raising awareness

about what subjects are going to be at the table and what issues are about to come to be discussed on ICANN fora.

What happened is we saw the implementations in two phases and in February 2011, even before we could start the implementations, obviously the process had to be concluded, and that -- the milestone for that was February 2011 when the comment period for these recommendations was over.

So the review team's recommendations was also opened for the public to get the recent comments or the latest feedback on the recommendations itself.

So when that comment period ended on the recommendations, this is when the ICANN staff could start planning what we are going to do about that, because there seems to be consent from the community that these recommendations now should be implemented.

In June 2011, ICANN board approved the implementation plans, initial implementation plans that we have produced from April to June, and then in the -- in Phase 2 -- and this is -- these phases -- Phase 1 and Phase 2 is totally related to our implementation point of view. Nothing to do with the formal processes.

Through June to November in 2011, we worked with the community to receive further feedback in the details of these implementations. How we should be implementing exactly those recommendations.

---

And January 2012 we launched a new system, if you like to call it.

So this gradual implementation contains some milestones and these are, like I said June 2011 we wanted to set the foundation to make further work -- to be able to produce further work. And the first problem we saw was that the public comment pages on the ICANN said was not streamlined in terms of the information that was presented, and it wasn't very consistent.

So the first thing was to put up some streamlined system so that they present some kind of consistency among the data tokens, such as purpose, status, the times, closing times. They were differing in their format and now we have a more consistent way of presenting that information.

We have also implemented ATRT Recommendation 21, which was publishing the upcoming public comments.

This has been -- already been done since June 2011.

During June and November, back in last year, we worked with the community, like I said, and in December 2011 full implementation was produced.

July and August, the focus group -- the details about the work, the work with the community, just to recap, during July and August we worked with the focus group.

This focus group was formed by appointments -- appointees after a call to the ICANN community leaders.

---

We reached out to all the groups and asked for one representative, at the least, to work with us, and it was about 20 people, and we received some initial feedback to refine the details.

And then we continued our conversation or dialogue with the community on these matters through a community Webinar, and in September and October period, we had a public comment period as well on the subject to receive wider community feedback after having worked with the focus group initially.

And then in December, the ICANN board approved the implementation details and the new system is now effective since January 2012.

What we have there, we have categorized public comments. They are tagged. That reflects to the ATRT Recommendation 15. They have two cycles, as recommended, comment and reply.

The minimum period for each is 21 days.

If there are no comments on the comment period, obviously there will not be any replies.

And upcoming public comments page is being maintained and updated through the input coming from community leaders and staff.

---

Since then, this is now new so this was what we have done, and most of you already have been following this process quite well.

I've been looking at what's going on and what kind of information we can gather so far.

What we see is comment and reply structure is in focus at the moment. Reply does not seem to be used as intended.

The intention was to have responses to the previously submitted comments, and what we see most of the time is that the reply period is used as an extension to the comments cycle.

Which is -- you know, which is good. If there is a need to have more time, there will be more time, which is the other focused item, duration of the comment periods.

Minimum 21 days is found too short by certain groups who actually need to go out there and form up their consensus and present their unified response to an issue. And that is understandable.

They have -- they have their own internal procedures to come up -- to reach to that consensus, and we understand that 21 days, if used as the minimum, then it is -- this is not enough to form up that consensus.

And then you look at the overall about 20 public comments opened and closed within the first five months of 2012, 50% of them used the 21 minimum comment period duration.

And the other thing as an observation that I would like to make is also we are receiving conflicting views in regards to the duration of the public comments and the structure of the public comments of the new system.

And so what we have is some find 21 minimum days is too long when it is for the reply period, or maybe the reply period is redundant in certain cases.

So we need to talk about this. There is more talk that needs to be done on here.

And then, actually, if you may remember, when the ICANN board approved these recommendations and our initial implementations, they also noted that this is subject to further community feedback.

So it's an ongoing process and some further thoughts or questions I've been hearing and I've been sharing or I've been noted to are, could we maybe extend the minimum comment period duration. Instead of 21 days, can we make it 30 or 40 days.

And otherwise, altogether doing that, could we also allow overlapping comment and reply periods which will bring some more flexibility to the system where a shorter period of overall elapsed time is anticipated or sought for.

And my bigger question to you, in the latter phase, is: What is actually expected of ICANN's public comment period? Is it something that we want to use as a media, a fora, whichever



you would like to see -- or call it? Is it to facilitate a dialogue and a discussion on an issue in an interactive way? I make a comment as a community member, you respond to that. Or is it an environment where we want to just collect responses about a certain issue, and then the subject of the receipt of that collection will be the originating body? It can be ICANN board, it can be GNSO Council, whoever -- or a review team, whoever initiated that public comment period.

Or is it both? Maybe it is both. We need to be thinking about this. But I think we need to come a bit more towards a common understanding so the expectations from the system is balanced with what the system is providing, and which reflects your and our experience of the system as well.

So thank you, and I'll let the mic off.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Filiz.

Any comments, questions, from participants?

Okay. Then I have to take -- prepare then. Chuck, Steve, Marilyn Cade, Werner, and Kieren.

Sorry, I -- my brain is working sometimes but for names it's not working at all. And you. Yeah. You will be on the list. Sorry. Yeah.

Chuck, please.

CHUCK GOMES:

Thanks, Sebastien. Chuck Gomes from VeriSign.

I want to talk about the reply period, and I'm really going to sort of be redundant of a comment that the registry stakeholder group submitted when we first looked at this concept of having a reply period.

First of all, it's a good idea to have a reply period, but it doesn't work if you don't enforce it as a reply period.

If you allow it to become a time for new comments, then that's what it will be, but --

And enforcement doesn't have to be some rigorous monitoring. It could actually be designed through systems to make it that way, and then it will work.

If it's -- if there's not some sort of enforcement mechanism -- and again, I'm not talking about some law enforcement agency overseeing it, but rather, systematically enforcing it -- then it will be useful.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. Chuck, absolutely. And we've had this -- we've had this discussion amongst the committee and I think one possibility would be to have a system where you actually reply

in the sense that you have to find -- you hit a comment and reply to it.

Now, that's not going to stop people from hitting the comment and then just saying whatever they want, but at least you have to go through that process. And that's one way of -- one way of doing it.

But, yeah, I think when I was -- the reason I'm talking about it now is because I was on the ATRT that made the recommendation, and the intention was to try to move the debate on a bit, rather than just having pontification, which is an unfair term to use for people making comments, but there's a tendency to just, you know, "I want to get up at the microphone or I want to make my comment and I just want to do that. I don't necessarily want to read what anybody else says or listen to what anybody else says."

So that was the intention. So hopefully we'll get there in the end. Thank you -- so thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Steve?

STEVE METALITZ:

Thank you. Steve Metalitz from the intellectual property constituency.

I'm going to plead guilty to the offense that Chuck just cited.

We have to do this all the time with the intellectual property constituency, because a 21-day comment period is simply too short, as Filiz pointed out in her presentation, for any group that's representing others, which not only is our constituency but is the members of our constituency.

And we've kind of been through this before, but if -- if an individual is looking at this, they know what they think and they can respond quickly, perhaps, because also they may have a very limited number of issues that they're dealing with.

But in a constituency or any type of representative group, first there are a lot of issues that you have to deal with so you have to adopt a first-in-first-out approach, and on a 21-day comment period, you're barely able to get the word out by the time the deadline has been reached.

So for that reason, we've done all kinds of things to try to, in effect, treat the reply period as an extension of the comment period.

So if the initial comment period were long enough, I think you would see less abuse of that and more of the type of response that you're -- that you're looking for.

I was surprised to see on the slide that some people think the 21-day is period too long.

I don't know whether that was for initial comments or for reply comments.

So I guess I could take that point -- I mean, I don't agree with it, but that makes some sense. But I think the initial period definitely has to be -- has to be lengthened, because otherwise, you'll get -- you'll be -- people will be circumventing the purpose of the reply.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Steve.

Chris had a question for you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Steve, I have a question for you.

So the comment period itself is actually set by the asker of the comments with a minimum of 21 days.

So the original thinking, I thought, was you need to have some sort of a minimum, that people would look at it and say, "Well, this is a big topic, it needs 40 days," or whatever.

You're finding, are you, that comment periods are being set at 21 days?

STEVE METALITZ:

I don't have the statistics. They're not always set at 21 days.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Right.

STEVE METALITZ:

Filiz indicated that some were longer.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Right. So groups are not taking into account the fact that -- which I quite understand. It's the same for the ccNSO. They're not taking into account the fact that it takes you longer as a group, rather than as an individual, to actually make the comment.

So what we need to do is to -- is to lift the minimum comment period, or do we need to -- is it an advantage to have a 21-day period as an absolute minimum, provided that people actually only use it, or are you saying 21 is just ridiculous, it needs to be 30 or --

STEVE METALITZ:

It is hard to imagine a significant issue on which a comment is sought in which 21 days is sufficient. So I think you should lift the minimum.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you.

Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade, and I'm going to just make a short suggestion. I think there might be other people

---

here who have a comment response on this particular topic, and it might be helpful to see if that were the case.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Should we wait for 21 days to see if anyone comes up to make a comment?

MARILYN CADE:

Because I'm going to both agree and disagree with some of the points that have been made, and I hope that my opinion will also -- the information I provide will also be helpful.

The President's Strategy Committee -- And I see Jean-Jacques here. The President's Strategy Committee actually looked at length at the idea of the reply round. And some of the idea that then came into the ATRT, I think, may have come from input from the President's Strategy Committee.

And we thought about the need for reply for a specific reason. But when we thought about it, we assumed two things. And, perhaps, we were not specific enough then to have conveyed that thinking.

One was there are communities that do take internal consultation. They're required by their community to do internal consultation in order to make a comment.

I see Ayesha Hassan from ICC sitting here. She's shared with the BC the complexities of doing that consultation. That is true for WITSA. It is sometimes true for big corporations as well. But in

the constituency that I sit in, like other constituencies, they have to do backward consultation. That takes quite a long time. We don't have staff, so we drive it ourselves. And then we have to do the negotiations on consolidating those comments.

30 days for initial would probably be more realistic.

But then the second thing that I thought was going to happen as a member of the PSC was that staff would then do a summary and post it and we would have a gap of time, not long, maybe a week, a gap of time to analyze what staff gave us as the summary of the comments. And then we would be replying -- Yes, we can see everyone's comments. But we would be replying on the basis of also seeing sort of a preliminary short analysis.

If that's not possible, then there has to be a longer gap of time because sometimes a flood of comments come in at the last minute and we now have to read all the comments that others have posted, digest them, go back out.

I'm not trying to elongate our comment process to 60 days by any means. I'm just trying to share the concern.

And let me share the second concern. Within my constituency this week and leading up to this week and in every other constituency here, because I have spoken to most of them, we are beginning to experience a -- we are anticipating a tsunami of new players. So we're now going to dramatically stress our



---

existing capability to gather comments, analyze them, synthesize them, and give them back to you.

And we expect the commenting on public comments to slowly begin to increase from individuals who will want to be contributing to the public comments.

I don't have the solution. I'm sharing my problem.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Marilyn. Next one is Werner.

WERNER STAUB:

Werner Staub from CORE. I have taken the latest public comment I can see in the latest open public comment, and I can read the beginning: "HTML body style word wrap break word rep kit" and so on for about a page or so. This is a comment from Christopher Wilkinson. Hardly a newcomer in ICANN.

What the system does, it garbles the message. And do we expect people to be able to read that? But we're still good because this is an old-fashioned comment system which still respects the URLs. That is, there is a given URL and you will find a piece of information that corresponds to the URL the way the Web has been invented.

There is a new trend in ICANN, which is not to respect URLs. There is just a page. Then you have messages going to whatever, so many pages.

---

And if you update a page, it is not going to change the URL. It is going to go and display it with a separate connection. So a search engine cannot index the page. The system makes sure that people cannot search for the message in Google. And if they want to send links to the message so that somebody else can say, "Do you see that message," no, it is not going to be available.

Further, even if it is outside of public comment, sometimes you need to have something to attach our comment to, there is something that comes out from ICANN.

I give you another example. An important posting on the ICANN knowledge base for new gTLD, January 16th, this year, the process had already started but there was an important comment, an important update about the definition of "exclusive use" or more exactly the definition of "use." Affects everybody.

And if you understand that link, the link is cryptic. It takes about five lines on an e-mail. Nobody can understand what the link is about. As soon as you click on that link, you get to a page that says "log in." Most people give up.

So from there, some people, the intrepid ones, might find it says somewhere "not an applicant" and that is where you have to click. But it is not finished.

---

If you have used the link and you went through that point, you just get the search page that says "search the knowledge base." The content of the link was lost.

Only those who then at that point when the cookie was set click again on the original link will find the page which was critical for people to find. So it is with that kind of resources, with active prevention of indexing and active prevention of sharing URLs that we try to do public participation.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Werner.

Kieren.

KIEREN McCARTHY:

Hello, Kieren McCarthy. So I would like to start off by saying there has been definitely improvements in public comment periods. The page is better. The setup is better. The timing is clearer. The way the page is broken out is clearer. And I like receiving regular e-mails. I get regular e-mails now saying, This is what public comment periods are closing soon. This is what public comment periods have just opened, which I think is a great improvement.

It could be a little bit more compelling, but just receiving those e-mails itself saves me from having to think, "I wonder if there is any open comment periods" and going to an ICANN Web site. Just that process is much better.

I do think a lot of concerns and complaints you are getting is because you are still using this horrible comment system at the back end, which actually when I was on staff, I went through a big trouble to try to get rid of it and we never quite got rid of it.

I think systemically you need a system in there that just will solve a lot of these problems. These problems are mostly because the system is not very good. And actually when you click through to the actual comments, you have just got this HTML page and it is not very interactive. That's a very old system. It doesn't work.

I think Werner is absolutely right when he is talking about having clean URLs. And if you set up the system correctly, you will have clean URLs.

Also, if you set it up correctly, it would be very easy to reply to a particular comment which, I think, is the solution to the concern about the reply. Make people reply to a particular comment, and in that way that will resolve a lot of the issues.

Oh, yeah. So other improvements that need to come down the line, allow people to subscribe to a particular public comment period. Just so every time there is a new comment, you get an e-mail saying there has been a new comment on this public comment period that you subscribed to. That would be hugely useful, and it is actually pretty easy to set up.

And then you can also e-mail people saying, Oh, by the way, now here is the summary of the public comment period. Oh, by

the way, now the reply period is open. And oh, by the way... Just people getting e-mails would solve, I think, quite a lot of the problems that you're hearing.

I think you should proactively identify people that are likely to be interested in a public comment period. So before you even put it live, what is this issue and who is likely to be interested and then reach out to them -- proactively reach out to them and say, "I think you will be interested in this." And people will think a lot better of ICANN if you approach them and say, By the way, have you noticed this? I think you will be interested in that. If you write that into the system, you will have a much better public comment period system.

And I think you should also think about including things like polls in it. They don't have to be legally binding, but think about doing things like polls and think about breaking out what you're actually asking people to comment on into simple chunks. And that way you will get more people responding. You won't end up with, Please comment on this PDF file and then people replying with a PDF file. That's a pretty bad sort of level of interaction. That's the default, but I think you can certainly improve on it.

That's my feedback.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Kieren.

---

Chris, not the one at the table but another one in the room, please.

CHRIS CHAPLOW:

Thank you, Chris Chaplow, vice chair finance operations in the business constituency.

Thank you, Filiz, for doing that presentation. That was exactly a lot of the problems that many of us in the community have seen, and I wondered where this was going to get picked up. Luckily, I find myself in the right room.

I think the reply period in principle is good. No doubt about that. I think when time is short where the maximum time is needed, in particularly complicated things like the budget, then we shouldn't be looking at 50/50 for comment and reply. We should be giving more time for the comments and less time for the replies when we've got -- when time -- it is actually easier and quicker to reply than it is to comment from my experience.

And I think probably more detail is needed on the Web site about what the procedures are. I'm guilty, like Steve. Missed a deadline not that long ago. So I am sort of wondering what I should do.

Should I just publish comment a few days later in the comment period -- in the reply period? So I look back at what had happened previously and I saw a complete mixture of places where comments had replied late in the presentation. Some people sort of put documents in that sort of referred to

previous comments, a reply document that referred to a comment but then went on to -- so there is a complete mixture out there. I wasn't sure what was going to happen. Would I get a knock at the door or something like that? So I went ahead anyway.

I do see in some cases when the staff summary report is being produced, it said these are summary of comments up to the date of the regional deadlines. So to know -- like you said yesterday, it is useful in some cases to have comments in the reply period so you can see that, yes, you do that but you are risking that it is not going to go in. It is not going to get taken off by the webmaster.

I think that level of detail that's coming out of what you're hearing today, if those sort of rules are published, then I think it would help. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Chris.

And the last for this item, Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Olivier Crepin-Leblond, At-Large Advisory Committee Chair. 21 days doesn't work for ALAC at all. It actually is in direct contradiction with our recommendations -- At-Large improvements recommendations. We have actually discussed

this with your committee or with several people on your committee on several occasions.

And the matter has also been discussed at SO and AC chair level. And we spent a significant amount of time discussing this and trying to find possible solutions where some -- which I have actually heard in this room.

David Olive took some notes about this. I hope these have reached you or will reach you in the next few days. Some of the solutions included having staggered first initial comment period being 30 days, but the reply period starting after 21 days. So you'd have a period where you would still have initial comments and replies arriving at the same time.

Also, perhaps -- there are other solutions as well.

There was another concern that was raised which was -- that some comment period, some initial comment periods finished just before this meeting or during this week or next week.

ICANN staff next week is usually completely wasted and tired, and nobody is able to file anything in the week after an ICANN meeting. Similarly, doing an ICANN meeting is very difficult to deal with filing comments officially whilst at the same time, well, being able to run meetings and sleeping three hours a night. It is pretty hard. So the idea of a blackout period was also raised.

And the last thing is also that the comment periods for -- well, for an individual, 21 days might be good. For an SO or AC or SG,



the consensus process has already taken place by the time the comment is filed. It is a consensus statement that is there. So perhaps these should be treated differently, even time-wise.

And so maybe for individual comments, 21 days is okay. But for SO, AC and SG comments, the time could be extended to 30 or even 35 or more. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Olivier.

Do my colleagues from the board want to make some final remarks on that subject? Bertrand?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

Thank you, Sebastien. Just a quick remark that there is a need to correlate the comment period with the timing of the different meetings so that there is a natural workflow in the discussion of issues and evolution in the way they are addressed.

The second point is we have a one-size-fits-all process, this comment period. I'm wondering -- and maybe it's something that could be explored -- whether we shouldn't distinguish the time of consultations we make depending on the stage of the discussion we are at.

You can imagine something that is a call for input at the beginning of something when an issue is being raised so that people can contribute just ideas. There is no need for a reply

---

period necessarily in that case. It is just an input and a synthesis to get to the next stage.

Then in the iterative processes of the drafting of a document, the policy or recommendation, there can be stages where, as Kieren said, you use quick polls on certain elements or you make a comment on a portion of a document instead of making a comment period on everything. And then at the end of the drafting when the document is being ready for getting to the council of the GNSO or to any other structure, having a period that is basically a validation question like are there strong objections, sort of rough consensus testing.

The periods can be variable, but the question is: How do you use the different tools along the different stages of the workflow? We have a process today that is exactly the same even for short questions and for long issues. So maybe that's something we need to explore.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Bertrand. I would like to close this part of the meeting. I ask if there are remote questions and there is no remote question. It is not just because we forget about it. It is an important part of the meeting in general and this one in particular.

And now I would like to switch, switch language and switch subject.

(Scribes awaiting translation.)

These tools are not working completely because the scribes are waiting for the translation to get -- able to have this on the text. And my trouble is that if all of you would have text there, I would have been able to follow on. But as you don't have, you are relying on this tool with the scribe and I need to have the scribe working to be able -- the scribe able to listen to translation of what I say in another language than English. I will try again.

(Scribes awaiting translation.)

Okay. A way to see that we still have progress to make and I will stop here, this demonstration. I think it's really important that we use those tools together, but I will give the floor to -- but ICANN language service -- no. The Floor is yours. And you are to do it in English, please, unfortunately.

CHRISTINA RODRIGUEZ:

Okay, let's not try that. Good morning, everybody. I want to walk you through a presentation we prepare which refers actually to the ICANN language services policy and procedure that has been posted for public comment on May 18th. Next. Okay. You can read there. ICANN is thinking, of course, of providing the service of the provision of language services at meetings and, you know, to get the community closer and to reach people that wants to work or needs to work in their own language.

---

ICANN working language is English, however, we do provide interpretation and translation in the five non-English U.S. language -- U.N. languages, I'm sorry. Those are Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish, and Russian. Next, please.

ICANN language services include translation, simultaneous interpretation, teleconference interpretation support, transcription, and this is recorded audios when we have either transcription for -- interpretation for teleconference or here in a meeting, and scribing which is what you see up there, realtime transcription, and when you have scribing we don't need the transcription of recorded audio. Next, please.

To give you some brief information about each service, this is what you will be seeing on the next slides. Translation is the conversion of a written text into another written text and that is the source language into the target language. As I said before, we do this into the five non-English U.N. languages and we translate the core documents produced in ICANN, the Board documents to provide the ATRT recommendations, blog articles, announcements, and some other documents that you will see as well. And simultaneous interpretation you see here there is something that -- okay, it's translation but it's actually a service or something that requires very different skills from the person that is doing it. For example, interpreters. ICANN main sessions are interpreted and also Select Support Organizations and Advisory Committee sessions. Teleconference interpretation is actually something that is used to provide enhanced communication among the working groups and the community

---

when they have, you know, the different conference calls and meetings every month. And we do these to support as well the -- as I said before, the Supporting Organizations and the Advisory Committee sessions, too.

And transcription, what we do is converting the audio that was recorded into written paper. Or written form, I'm sorry. And we do this for ICANN meetings that is do not receive RTT or what you know as the scribing or we do this as well for teleconference audio recordings.

Realtime transcription, of course as you can see right now, as the words are spoken and the text is displayed on a screen or it can be also streamed over the Internet. We also capture this for archival purposes and when we need, you know, to have a feedback also for the use in working groups and other groups.

We are also included in the language services policy and procedures a part which talks about the enhanced multilingual strategy. This strategy will be seen already in progress on FY13. The strategy includes the translation and the interpretation support will officially be to the -- done which is, you know, the official United Nations languages for absolutely all core documents and main public meeting sessions and Select Supporting Organizations and the Advisory Committee.

The ICANN language services will be providing interpretation in all GAC sessions in the five U.N. languages, not any more. As you will be seeing we provided French and Spanish and the local language. You will see interpretation or you will be supported

---

with interpretation in Arabic, French, Chinese, Russian, and Spanish. Next.

As I mentioned, GAC sessions will be receiving this in all five U.N. languages and they also have Portuguese. Next. And one other thing that you'll be probably seeing when you start reading translations or documents that are provided on the Web site, ICANN is going to -- we are going to add to our team one expertise per language and that will be to work in the capacity of a validator and reviewer, and that person will be -- that person will be in charge of reviewing and assessing all the translations and all the material being posted and published are correct in regards to terminology and the consistent use of the same terminology and this will enhance in a great manner the quality of the translation in fact.

I made it sure it was a short presentation so that I provide as much time as possible for any questions that you may have.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Christina. This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Now it's time for the debate for the A&A. Kieren, Jean-Jacques, Bernard are asking for the floor. You want to talk now? Okay. Sergio Porto.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

I am pleased you are here. I am speaking Spanish. This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. I want to state this publicly. I want to share LACRALO'S feeling regarding interpretation and

---

translation. There has been a major change within ICANN thanks to your leadership in this area and we want to recognize you for that. Let us -- or allow us to make some suggestions. We read the language services policies and procedures document. We have some input. I imagine some things are not exactly up to you, but I would like to mention them anyway.

We have constantly had a minimum threshold of three participants, three speakers of a certain language per teleconference in order to have language -- or language support services. Some of my ALAC fellows or colleagues told me that we shouldn't have a threshold or limit of speakers, but our proposal is that we should lower that threshold to a minimum of two participants of speakers of a certain language.

Secondly, we have a proposal regarding the Web site. I know this is not within your scope, but it is frustrating to see that we have material posted in English on ICANN's Web site and when we search for the Spanish document, instead of having a mirror Web site, we find something which is very poor.

And thirdly, I have a question. You speak about documents and you speak about translation of core or main documents. I would like to know which the main documents are because we need to be very specific. Every time we receive material or a document and the community needs to participate and vote on some issue, we find the document is only in English. So it is impossible for the -- at least for the Spanish speakers within At-Large to voice their views, there's a very reduced percentage of

---

bilingual members of our -- in our region. Most of us are Spanish speakers. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Sergio. This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Christina, would you like to answer that or are you listening to all the questions first? Okay. Then I think that Kieren is the next speaker. Kieren, then Jean-Jacques. And if anyone wants - - Marilyn, okay.

KIEREN McCARTHY:

Kieren McCarthy. So I think the PPC has an enormous opportunity here. Christina has done an amazing job over the last three or so four years. ICANN simply didn't have the capacity to translate and interpret before she came on board and now the capacity is there and she stepped it up and actually ICANN is now in a position to do what it couldn't do before. So now the PPC can actually make a very big difference and really can internationalize ICANN by putting in place some principles about how it deals with language. One of the things -- so, you know, in the big scheme of things, in the document that's out there for public comment at the moment, there is a mission statement which is depressing in its sort of lack of vision and it says -- and I don't mean this to be particularly critical but it says, in all aspects of implementing this policy a balance must be achieved between the benefits gained from including more people in ICANN's work and the potential cost in time, money, and possible delay to the Policy Development process. I would



---

like to see you pull that out and stamp on it and say, from now on ICANN will make available its documents in the five languages and just say this is what we're going to do, not put in the caveats about well, it might cost a bit and we should think about this. Just throw it away.

What you can do, what you should do is what you did with the document disclosure policy or I forgot the name of it, and say, no document should appear on the ICANN site until it has been translated into these languages. You should put it out there as a policy. And it will be painful about two months and then it will be tied into the processes and then it will simply happen. I think you should say that. I think you should state we won't publish any documents for public comment or any fundamental documents until they have been translated and that will make a huge difference to ICANN and its internationalization issue. Just do it.

And another aspect is, which I think you should get onto staff about, is you shouldn't -- the Web site is in English and if you click on the French button, you get a long list of documents in French. If you click on the Spanish button you get a long list of documents in Spanish which have no context around them and it's almost incomprehensible. You cannot follow ICANN unless you speak English. And that is a big problem. It's not that hard to do. The software you have actually makes it pretty easy to produce a front page in that language. So I think that should be your number one priority, should be I want to see a front page of the Web site in these different languages. I want the

---

documents in the different languages to be structured in the same way they are if you're an English speaker. So if you do those two things, make the front page available in different languages and say we will not publish documents until they are translated, I think you'll basically take a huge step forward with internationalization of ICANN.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Merci, Kieren. Mike.

MIKE SILBER:

Just to translate comments and reply comments before we put them up, I really -- I take the point but I also think that we're getting to a suggestion where we're going too far. I think firstly, having searchable and navigable pages in other languages rather than just lists of documents, I agree with you completely. But trying to complete a live mirror of what's going on is close to impossible and I do think that that caveat is important. I think that we need to take -- and I get your point. We need to remove the caveat about translating documents. The caveat there really is in terms of the ability to produce live versions and contemporaneous versions. Because if we have to wait at all times for all translations to be finalized before anything gets published, we're going to start seeing significant delays and then we're going to have complaints about the delays. And I really think that while the comments are well-taken, that some of the extreme approaches that you're suggesting are almost an invitation to criticism if that were to be ever followed.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Kieren, and then I will give the floor to Kuo.

KIEREN MCCARTHY:

So I'm not suggesting for one second that every comment needs to be translated, that's just crazy, nobody does that. All I'm saying is, every announcement that goes up --

MIKE SILBER:

Sorry. Then while you are addressing it, just explain where that line is, because you said earlier there is no line, everything needs -- must be translated.

KIEREN MCCARTHY:

That was not what I intended to mean. What I was saying is any announcement that goes up should not go up until it's translated. Any document should not go up until it's translated. In terms of the quick interactions that are constantly going on on the Web site, no, I mean, it would be a crazy resource and a delay in time to expect to translate everything. But everything that is formal, that has gone through a process of review within ICANN should be translated. When you put out an announcement and then you have to wait seven days for it to be translated, that's -- that's just not a good way of doing things. But you -- so that's where I -- I see the line working.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Kuo.

KUO-WEI WU:

I think -- I'm Chinese, and I fully understand the different -- language differences importance. But I'm -- those who are the process thinking about how the translation is really good. To be honest, for example, you go to the U.N. and listen to the -- you know, the -- you know, the interpreter, actually most of the time is not accurate. So if you want the official document in all - - for example the U.N. five different language translations, just make sure all the documentation is accurate. This will postpone the process, to be honest, because the language -- the term they're using is very different. So I'm -- I will say first of all, accuracy is one thing you need to concern.

Second of all, are you willing to postpone the process? I think there's a reason why we are choosing ICANN does not go through the that a cost we're willing to bear? I think that is another issue we need to think about it.

Number three, if everything in all the five different languages of the U.N., then there will be tremendous amount of document we need to publish, and I think that is also is come back to the cost that we are willing to bear, you know. I think the two key issues, the accuracy and the process speed and efficiency. And I think -- I do like to have this kind of -- you know, the translation interpretation because the people can use their own language to comment. I think it's good and cut through the communication. I much support this kind of, you know, on-site interpretation and helping the different languages communicate well. But if you go through this official document, I -- what my concern actually is, accuracy and speed.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Kuo. Now, I'm going to give the floor to Bertrand and then to Werner. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

First of all, I think the very fact that we're paying more and more attention to this is a good sign of the fact that we do feel we are an international organization and that there are accompanying duties that go with it.

The second thing is that the desire to have translated documents is absolutely valuable, and I just want all of us who normally work in English to try to understand the feeling that they would have if, for instance in the future, in the portion of ICANN that will be dealing with some IDN registries, most of the exchanges will be either in Arabic, or in Chinese, or in Cyrillic and you have absolutely no clue about what the discussion is. It's not to that extent because English is shared as a vehicle in many cases, but it is true that as we develop, as IDNs are taking place, as the organization covers a larger and larger group of people, the language issue and translation issue is essential.

However, it is interesting to see the challenges that existing or more ancient international organizations are facing in dealing with this issue. And without naming any specific organization, there are tremendous process issues that they are fighting with, including when there are conferences that are very limited in time. Like how late are the versions -- the translated versions available, the fact that working groups mostly still work in one

language in most discussions, even if there is translation in the room.

So there are, for instance, questions about translations being available but the work on the documents being made in one specific language, and it can be English or it can be another one.

The question of accuracy that Kuo mentioned is a very important thing. I participated personally with Martin Boyle, who was then the U.K. representative, in the sessions in the plenipot of the ITU where the -- all the translators are around the table to find the exact equivalent of one word to the other, and it is -- it's a different type of document but at the end, when you have the translations, sometimes the variation in one or two words may have a huge impact.

And so it is not to dismiss. It is just to highlight that if we really want to tackle this, as Kieren is encouraging us, we need to go into a bit of the weeds and maybe that would be a domain where we could initiate some cooperations with other international organizations, and take a part of the lessons that they've learned in how to manage cycles of translations of documents.

But it is a very, very deep operational issue, and if you want to do it -- which I think is necessary -- it needs to be well done. You cannot just do a little bit and not all of it.

But it is a sign that we have to tackle this topic but it is really not an easy one.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Merci, Bertrand.

Thank you, Bertrand. Now we are going to give the floor to Werner, and then Jean-Jacques, Marilyn, and Robert.

WERNER STAUB:

Werner Staub. It is undeniable that we have made big progress, that we have a pretty good standard of making things accessible, you know, in spite of the problems that we undeniably have to solve.

And translation is important area where we have made big progress.

And we have right now not talked about one item that we have actually very good a track record which is real-time scribes. You know, this is really important because many people who have trouble understanding can read it. But in this respect, recently we have made a step backwards simply by relying so heavily on the extraordinary quality of our scribes who used to be usually with us in the conferences and who could work better because they would see people and have interaction with them, seeing their faces, voices, and not have a time lag as they would if they work from home. And specifically, if they work in a different time zone, having to get up at 3:00 in the morning and -- to try to do work of extreme concentration. And I can see that sometimes the quality has gone down, compared to what the extraordinary quality we have had before.

But it doesn't stop there.

We've got -- with the real-time scribes and with the translators also doing an excellent job, we've got a resource that we're not using with the elementary technological tools that we have available, such as just linking things by timestamp.

If it is written here at a given moment, we have the timestamp when this happens. We can link it to when the person spoke. We can enable people to search a given portion of the speech.

We can link the translations between each other. We can enable people to jump from one language to another. So even if the -- under the pressure of the moment the translation is not perfect, we can enable people to capture something and go back and fro and actually get a good picture and improve their language skills both ways, not just for English, but also it would be interesting for many people who may see that. People who train themselves here actually know the language. So we've got a wonderful tool. We can do way more.

I have two suggestions to address that.

One of them is, let's take some of the savings we can make in the new gTLD program, which has accumulated \$300 million in the ICANN bank account. If we just make elementary savings such as not evaluating the same content 300 times -- which does not make sense -- or another elementary saving is asking applicants what they really want to do, such as do you want to use your TLD as described in the guidebook for exclusive use, and then of course not ask them, you know, evaluate whether they're good enough to serve themselves as a registry.



If you just make those savings, you have to look at the numbers.

These are just with an elementary asked, \$100 million saved of waste that ICANN has created programs to commit waste.

Take that money --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Werner, it's --

WERNER STAUB:

-- and put it into translations, put it into outreach, which is actually one of the purposes of the program, because the program -- the new gTLD program has no sense if it is not in the framework of interactions that people can comment on it.

And the second thing is probably even easier. There are many companies such as Google and Microsoft who work in translation tools who would certainly like to be sponsors and commit not money or a stand, they might actually commit, you know, to providing a service and technological knowledge for ICANN.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Werner. I am sure that the gTLD committee will take that into account, your last comment, and I am not about to comment at all on that subject.

I would like to ask Jean-Jacques now.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Hello. Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'd like to address two questions, but first a sort of overall comment.

In this business of linguistic services, we are not striving for perfection. We are aiming at efficiency.

I think we should remember that.

Now, there are two points I want to bring up.

First, translation, and the second is interpretation.

I believe they belong to two almost different worlds.

So taking up translation, I agree completely with what Kieren was suggesting, especially after he responded to Mike Silber about translating everything. No, that's not the point.

I think to be perfectly clear, what we require in our community is translation of along-the-way markers or signposts, to allow the community to know at any given moment where they stand on any given subject.

Now, on interpretation, I feel more queasy because I think that there is still quite a large misfit between the real demand and the services made available.

For instance, as one person using these services, I make it a principle to use my earphones and to have them with me all the time.

If only as a matter of courtesy, by the way.

I happen to be able to speak a few words in English. That's not the point.

I would dream of an ICANN which -- whose status would say that it is an international organization and has six languages.

That's not the case.

It's a corporation under California law, and it says clearly "including the recruitment process that English is the working language."

So I have a personal view about the evolution of that, but for the time being, that's the reality.

So while I understand the point of view expressed by Sergio and the discussion he referred to at the ALAC, I would comment once again that there is a cost-effectiveness consideration and that we should not throw all our linguistic means at just one aspect of that.

I think that as long as ICANN is not an international organization with officially six languages, I think that the people who come or who are sent, who are delegated to ICANN to work with us, should be able to work in English as a matter of principle.

That doesn't say that we will not continue to strive for interpretation, but I wanted to make that difference.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

Mike, please, before Marilyn and then Roberto.

MIKE SILBER:

Jean-Jacques, just quickly, and you may choose to reply.

I've had a personal view for some time now -- and it is not shared by many; maybe you can comment on it -- that instead of ICANN trying to do everything, ICANN should be assisting and facilitating for language communities for them to help themselves. And maybe a better way, especially for those languages that fall on the cusp of the six U.N. languages and where people may be better served by having documentation in their home language but they just don't make the cut, that we should find ways to allow people from those communities to actually do their own translations or provide us with translators that we could train up in terms of the technical language or maybe it's funding or, I don't know, Werner seems to have an inexhaustible supply of money so maybe he can supply the money on behalf of third parties.

But I'm just wondering how we can empower people rather than do things for people.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay. Jean-Jacques, but short, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Yes. The short answer is: Yes.

When I was a board member and the chair of the Public Participation Committee, I had put up the suggestion that we should find a way of empowering the community through the At-Large networks we have with the RALOs, et cetera, because they can ensure more than just the six U.N. languages.

Is that short enough?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Yes. And sorry to have pushed you, but we are eight minutes at the end -- before the end and I have Marilyn, Roberto, and Kieren. I will stop here and answer to my other business after that.

Thank you. Marilyn, please.

MARILYN CADE:

My name is Marilyn Cade.

I'd like to just offer a couple of -- I think they're facts. I'm going to try to make it factual.

Having participated in a number of meetings in various U.N. organizations, I think there's sometimes a level of support, depending on what the activity is, such as in a rapporteur group at the ITU group in a study group, language translation is normally not provided, but in a study group it is.

So it's kind of layered.

And the further you -- away from the core you get, the less expanded services are provided.

So that's one thing to kind of think about.

However, exceptions can be made when they are justified.

So if you're holding a meeting in a country or a region and there's going to be a very large attendance from that region, then an exception is provided to add those additional services.

We may -- maybe we're on an evolutionary path and we can add and expand. We can have a goal of getting someplace, but take the steps and be accurate, be accurate along the way, because I think that is really important for people.

I want to make a comment about the scribing, because perhaps it's not -- you're not aware of how important the scribing is to the business community and how it helps us to reach businesses around the world by being able to send the rich -- content-rich information as a transcript forwarded as it is real-time when it's happening.

We are losing real-time transcription, and -- scribing, sorry, in many of the meetings and in many cases I can't get the transcripts for the workshops for several days after an ICANN meeting.

This is a problem for us, and I think it may be a problem for you, because we use those transcripts to go to our members and ask

them what we should respond to in the public forum, and we don't have them.

They cannot participate real-time because they don't have time.

So some -- perhaps we need to prioritize continuing to make scribing available always in the -- the public sessions, the main sessions. And I would support what Werner said. For the public sessions, I think we need in-person real-time scribing. The accuracy is not there.

Finally, one critical point. Let's please reinforce that people must say their name and let's ask people to look at the screen and see if their name is captured. Perhaps you don't know this as well as I do, but we are missing the names in perhaps 25, 30, 40% of the time, and I know they don't want their name missed and we don't want their name missed.

Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Marilyn.

Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yes. First, I would like to note the progress that we have made since the early days when Stuart Lynn has put together the first group that was looking at the problem of languages, and I think that we are -- we went a long way and I'm looking forward to

---

further progress in the future to the end result that in my opinion is what Kieren has stated.

I think that there's one misunderstanding about the multilingual issue.

I think that we are treating this as an abstract question of fairness versus the non-English speaking community. That's not the point.

The point is that ICANN has to make the best use of all its resources.

If, on one hand, we say 21 days is short -- is too short for providing comments and we want to move it, let's say, to 30 days, then it is not acceptable that we have to lose one week, 10 days, or even two weeks for waiting for the translation simply because that means that the non-English-speaking community will have a shorter period to comment.

And that means it's not a method of fairness. It means that we will miss comments that will not be submitted because they -- they -- there was no time.

And I would like to bring another issue. We are working here under the assumption that in any case -- and that was the comment, do we need to translate our comments and so on.

No. That links with the fact that has been already said that at one point in time we need to have a summary of all the



comments that are done, but we are working under the assumption that everybody is going to comment in English.

I think that this has to be disappear.

We -- the non-English speaking community -- which is the majority, incidentally -- not only has less time to access the documents but then they have also to translate in English what their comment is before submitting it.

I think that I would like to invite the non-English speaking community to submit comments in one of the six U.N. languages, and I think that this can be the starting point in which when you start submitting comments in other languages, then the English speaking community will realize what is also a loss of -- of resources that we have.

Just a final comment. I'm not so radical not to think that we have budget limitations and we have of course this sort of limitation. I don't think that this can be done immediately, but I think that we have to distinguish what is our end goal, and the end goal can be nothing less than full multilingualism, but that can be achieved probably in years to come, and we have to define also the path that -- the little steps that we have to do little by little in order to achieve that goal. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Roberto.

One minute, Kieren.

KIEREN McCARTHY:

Hi. Kieren McCarthy. I'll be very quick.

With regard to accuracy and also with regard to empowering other groups, I think you should ask Christina to give you a briefing on how language memory works.

She -- that will clarify -- this is what I learned when I was trying to put it together. Language memory, ask for a briefing on how that works and why that means that translations will get better over time, and if you open-source that, why that means that other language communities will have access to easy -- much easier translation.

So ask a briefing from Christina on that. Sorry, Christina. But you will then understand how what can be done and how it will get better.

With regard to the concerns about the delays, "Oh, well, it will take a delay," et cetera, et cetera, that's approaching it from completely a wrong perspective.

If you have this -- the agreement we will not publish until we have the translations it will simply be pulled into the system. In the same way that we have the 14-day publishing the documents -- you know, closing 14 days out from a meeting, you will have a painful couple of months and it will simply be written into the system and staff will say, "Whoa, we need to send this for translation, we need to get this up by X date. How long does translation take? It takes a week. We need to get it

to the translators a week earlier." It will simply be incorporated into the system.

So you should take additional -- we should do this and then you'll find the rest of it works itself through.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Gonzalo, and then I will close the meeting after, please.

GONZALO NAVARRO:

Okay. I will be short. I agree with your ideas and I know that Bertrand has some ideas about this. This is a greater problem.

But I have the idea or the feeling that we have -- we are carrying our activities, and we have to make certain measures -- or take certain measures and we have to do it right now. We have had good ideas and we must analyze these ideas so as to provide quick answers. But this is the first step towards an internationalization and this is our goal.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thanks Gonzalo for your words. I think it is important to use the tools that we have here.

And I would like to thank Sergio and Gonzalo. I think it is difficult, and I know it is difficult because we believe we understood, but -- we'd rather work in English, but if we use our interpretation tools, this will be improved.

So I ask to -- if you speak other language, rather than English, you must use the tools that we have.

[Scribes not receiving translation]

We are going to be taking it into account by the PPC and don't forget there is a comment period opened on the services -- languages service, so please answer in English or in one of the six U.N. languages.

I'm sure the staff will translate it. It's important to do comments. It's very important, and the comment period was long enough to allow all the constituencies and communities to do -- all the groups to do their comments. Please, I hope to see you all for -- in the next -- during the next ICANN meeting.

Now, Jean-Jacques, you want to take the floor but we are late, Jean-Jacques.

Okay. Jean-Jacques, 30 seconds, and then we close the meeting.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

It's a request, actually, that in the next ICANN meeting we be given a general appraisal of public participation, what it has achieved, not only in the linguistic service but in terms of outreach, in terms of bringing in people who have, or not, contributed to our work in preparing policy.

Thank you.

STEVE METALITZ:

Thank you. Steve Metalitz, intellectual property constituency. I just want to thank the chairman and the rest of this committee for obtaining the report under the document publication operations policy, which was adopted three years ago by the board, and apparently this is the first report that has ever been prepared even though the policy calls for a report after every meeting.

I also want to compliment the staff for, in my -- at least my impression is, you have met -- did a much better job at this meeting of meeting the deadlines of having the agenda and the materials out three weeks in advance much more so than at the Costa Rica meeting. So I thank you very much and I look forward to future reports.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

And I would like to thank you, Steve, because you put us back on track on that subject, and it's exactly part of what we need from the community. We are not somewhere doing something. We are doing something for you, not just for us, and thank you very much, Steve, for that last word -- no? Okay.

MIKE SILBER:

I'd like to echo that as well.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mike. Thank you for all the participants, once again, and see you at the next meeting. Bye-bye.