
TORONTO – Academy Working Group
Wednesday, October 17, 2012 – 07:00 to 10:00
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

MATT ASHTIANI: Welcome everyone to the Academy Working Group Session on the 17th of October, 2012. Please be sure to state your name before you speak for the transcript record. And with that, I believe we'll start.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. My name is Sandra Hoferichter. I am the Chair of the Academy Working Group and I'm really honored that so many of you got up at this early hour of this Wednesday. We're expecting more people during the day, because not everybody can make it for the three hour meeting so we will have more people joining us later.

But before we start I'd like to ask you to introduce yourself. Your name and which constituency or which stakeholder group you belong to. Maybe we can start on my left hand side, with Hong?

HONG XUE: Good morning everyone. I'm Hong Xue from ccNSO.

RON SHERWOOD: Ron Sherwood, ".vi" liaison between ccNSO and ALAC.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: My name is Yaovi Atohoun, AFRALO ALAC.

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.

YJ PARK: YJ Park, from ALAC At-Large Structure.

ADAM GOSLING: Adam Gosling, from the ASO, Secretariat.

RUMY SPRATLEY-KANIS: Romy Spratley-Kanis, from the ASO as well.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Filiz Yilmaz, ICANN staff.

MATT ASHTIANI: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter, European Representative at ALAC and ICANN Chair...ICANN Academy Working Group Chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're already ICANN Chair? Goodness! That was fast. Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC Chair.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.



SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sandra, it will be after the training. Sébastien Bachollet, member of the Board of ICANN.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes, Registry Stakeholder Group.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Chris Chaplow, Vice-Chair Finance and Operations of the Business Constituency. Marilyn Cade sends her apologies.

ALAIN BIDRON: Alain Bidron, ISPCP Constituency.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, AFRALO Vice-Chair and ALAC member.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: So thank you for this. I wrote down your names, I hope I can today address you mentioning your right name. This was a bit of a problem last time. The agenda for today has three points which were discussed and agreed in our last conference call prior to Toronto. I don't expect the agenda to follow one-by-one. I think there are overlapping issues which I have a discussion on Point 3 and Point 1 already but, however, we should be aware that the points of this agenda should all be addressed during that meeting and that we can move forward in all of these three points.



It was agreed that the basic discussion about such an ICANN-wide Academy, such a framework, should at first identify target groups and learning goals in line with the mechanisms to be used. We had already a lot of discussions on the list and many ideas popped up but what I hope here is that we can clearly identify which learning groups the different stakeholder groups within ICANN can identify and that we note them and that we try to cover all those needs for the different target groups in the overall framework of the ICANN Academy.

And I'm referring to this term which was mentioned various times and I think we will have a look at this later on today. Secondly, we will then discuss if we are going to design or if we are going to develop a pilot project, a leader pilot project, the way it was actually planned and also approved in the financial year budget for Toronto but was, due to the time constraints and other reasons, postponed. So we will hopefully have a decision on this, if we go to develop something for Beijing or not.

And the last important point is that we should clearly identify the relationship between the communities in this regard, the role of staff, which tasks we expect staff to fulfill how they should do it. Of course we are not explaining their job, but how we think the interaction and the implementation on whatever we decide should be structured. And staff, and I will say Filiz from now on because staff is always a very unused word, and Filiz will be with us all day and she will then be able to say, "Okay, this might be realistic. On the other hand, this might be not realistic." and I hope we will have a very good collaboration with this project in the future.



What I think is that if we decide whatever we do in Beijing or not, the scope of this working group goes far behind. I think this really a long-lasting project, taking into account that we are working on an overall framework and when we try to implement other capacity-building provisions within ICANN, existing ones, new ones, then we should always, as the working group, have a look on how this is going to be structured. Is it synchronized? Is there any things which is repeating which can make advantage of the other? Where do we have common playgrounds? Common playgrounds will always force the interaction among or between the stakeholder groups.

I think this is one of the most important goals of such an effort and that we cut it vertically and also horizontally to mix the stakeholder groups among each other. So that we are not talking about only capacity building, but we can also talk about improving the interaction among the stakeholder groups. So that's, for the moment, from my side and I would like to open the discussion now. But I'd like to ask you before, if anybody in this room sees that there is something essential missing in this agenda or if there is any question, if somebody needs an update on the latest development...I gave this already during the last conference call so I think everybody is pretty good informed, please let me know if this is not the case. And at this stage I would hand it over to you.

[background conversation]



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: So obviously there are no questions, but my question is to open the discussion on the target groups. We had already identified different target groups. For instance, Marilyn was promoting that the Business Constituency has very special needs, which should be accommodated by any effort which goes in the direction of the capacity building.

On the other hand, I know that At-Large, because I am from the ALAC, is also developing something for their own community and maybe I can ask Tijani to explain a little bit more about what At-Large is currently doing and how this could have an impact on this ICANN Academy framework. And maybe we go then in to the direction to identify other target groups and discuss this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Sandra. As you said...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, can you introduce...you know, just one housekeeping note. Can everyone just say their name before they speak, please? I know it's really tedious, but it's for the recording, etcetera, etcetera.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sorry, Tijani Ben Jemaa. I said that, as Sandra said, Marilyn asked for...she wanted to bring special needs for her constituency, and this is normal. That's exactly what is done now in At-Large. We have a working group on capacity building that will identify the needs of our community.



As you know, in our community we have a lot of small groups. Five regions, and in each region there are ALSs so we have different needs for different regions, for different purposes. So I think that this is what we all have to do because the Academy will not identify the need of each constituency. Each constituency is in charge of its needs and also of other things, such as the time they want the capacity building for their people to be done, because of their agenda for example.

So the Academy is, more or less, the compilation of all the learning effort of ICANN and I think that the Academy has to receive the information from the constituencies about their needs, about the manner that some constituencies, for example, want that the capacity building be done only virtually. So it is the need of the constituency. The ICANN Academy is in charge of the learning and with all tools possible. And it is the constituency that defines what kind of tool, what is the need, etcetera. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Tijani. I see Yaovi, you raised your hand.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. Thank you. I want just to ask for this picture to come. I wanted clarification because I'm a bit confused. My understanding is that this framework is there for capacity building, for ICANN, the whole. And then ICANN Academy is part of this one. So this is my understanding, so ICANN Academy is part of the old framework and then if we talk about target groups it's like we already know what we are talking about when you consider the ICANN Academy.



So my understanding is for the ICANN Academy to define and for the various constituencies their need doesn't fit in the ICANN Academy. They are different from the Academy. But the whole framework includes the capacity building of the different constituencies. This is my understanding, so I want to have clarification. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you, Yaovi, for the question. And you are absolutely right. The latest development changed actually, this picture it is a little bit outdated. And as we...or let me go a little bit back in history. When the At-Large proposed or submitted the financial plan to apply for a budget we were talking about an ICANN Academy which was, in this sense, a Leadership Program.

Due to the development, actually it has changed. It is agreed, or it is seen, by the community that an Academy, an ICANN Academy should be a framework which accommodates all the different needs. So when we see in the yellow brick the term "ICANN Academy", it does actually not apply anymore to the current status. It should mention a Leadership Program. And if you go to the colors on the left hand side you will also see that leaders, as they were identified by the Outreach Program, are the yellow part.

So I'll try to find another picture and maybe I will ask Matt to upload it because there was a previous version where this was the other way around, but then we decided no we'll keep the term "ICANN Academy" as it was established. So this is actually...the overall thing should be called "ICANN Academy" and the yellow brick should be called "Leadership Program".



YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. I think this is very clear for me, very clear for me now. So the framework is the framework for ICANN Academy framework, this picture. And then the ICANN Academy is Leadership Program. So this brings me to the question do you want to define the target groups for the whole ICANN Academy framework or the target groups for the Leadership Program in this meeting? Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Yaovi, it's Sandra speaking. It is my understanding...and we discussed this within ALAC yesterday and I'll be really interested in what this working group thinks about it. It is my understanding that the target groups within the different constituencies, within the different stakeholder groups, must be, as Tijani mentioned, identified by the various groups themselves.

But the leadership of ICANN should be identified and should be taken care of by this working group. This means that we here have to discuss on the one hand the implementation of different capacity building provisions for different groups, which are to be identified by the various constituencies. And on the other hand we should discuss an overarching leadership program where apparently all the leaders, or incoming leaders, from the different constituencies are coming together and get the leadership training actually. Tijani, you mentioned first, but I would like to give the word to Chuck because you spoke already. So Chuck, you have the word please.



CHUCK GOMES:

Thanks Sandra. Chuck Gomes. I want to start off with some general questions and comments about the target audience. First of all it seems to me, especially as we're first exploring the target audience in this group, that we ought to think about both short-term and long-term targets, not just maybe what will be the target audience for the first effort, whatever that is. And also the focus on leadership training, I certainly understand that and appreciate it, but I think we need to keep in mind that we don't always know who potential leaders are.

So it seems helpful to me to include in the overall framework and plan some general training that is beneficial to new participants. They might not be identified as leaders yet, but by providing the right foundation they could turn in to leaders, not everyone will. So I think, and it may not be our first thrust at this level, but it seems to me it would be helpful to not just focus on this whole project long-term as just leadership training and try and identify leaders. We're not going to know who some of the leaders will be, but if we provide the right foundation, some building stones, we will out of that see some leaders emerge.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Chuck. We have a queue in operation now. Next is Tijani and then Olivier.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. The Leadership Program is designed to train the new appointees from NomCom and from the different constituencies. Those people will be the future leaders of ICANN. And in my point of view, the



program must be done by the ICANN Academy sure, but in collaboration, in close collaboration with the constituencies because a GNSO councilor perhaps doesn't have the same need as an ALAC member. So even for the Leadership Program we need the input from the different constituencies.

Second point, when we speak about target groups we must do it for each operation, for each action, capacity building action or learning action. For the Leadership Program the target group is already defined. Those are the new appointees, or new elected members of the ASO and ACs. For the other actions, the target group must be according to the kind of operation we will do, of the action we will do.

So there is not a common target group. The target group is defined for this special action, for example for the Leadership Program we have already the target group defined. If we decide, for example, in At-Large, and for example if a RALO decides to do a capacity building program, the target group will be the ALSs. The African ALSs. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Tijani. Before I give the floor to Olivier I'd just like to remind you that there was a discussion going on on the mailing list about what is an ICANN leader. Are these really incoming leaders or are these ICANN veterans? And I think this issue is not finally discussed yet and it had also an impact on the program planning. Filiz might refer to this later on. And we said, "Okay, who will be the trainer and who will be the trainees?"



So if you have ICANN veterans as trainers they will somehow also get training. But I think this will come up in a discussion. Meanwhile, I'd like to draw your attention on a very previous, which also not up to date but at least it avoids us from the confusion that the ICANN Academy is mentioned in the yellow brick. It says here "Leadership Camp". The white bricks are provisions which, whether at this point or after our research, to be identified but I think it gives us a clearer idea on what we are talking about. And now I'll hand it over to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Sandra. And thank you for changing the graphic in there so it looks a little bit more understandable with regards to the framework of the Academy itself. I totally agree with Chuck in that I think that we're looking in the long-term at more than just one program. There is a need at all levels for capacity building and for learning, even I think at the CEO level. Well actually the CEO is in his learning phase at the moment, so this is the need that there is and things change so quickly.

Oh, great. I was going to refer to this. So when one looks at the overall picture, of course, you'd think, "Well, where do we start?" And I think that the easiest group to identify, and that's probably why I think the original intent in At-Large was to think of the Leadership Program first. That is the easiest group to select. Why? Because someone is doing it for you. The SOs and ACs are selecting their future leaders, i.e. the people that will take on position in their councils or their leadership group on their board or whatever you call it in your SO or AC or SG.



And the NomCom is doing a lot of work as well, because they're also selecting the people to go on there. And that, I think, is probably in the short-term, the most easily identified group. And at the same time it's also a case of being able to know how many people there would be in that group.

I filed financial plans with ICANN, begging for money for several years, and one of the feedbacks that I got on several occasions was, "If you're going to ask for funding for a project, don't ask for the world." Don't start asking to do everything for something that is basically just not achievable and way too high-risk as far as the financing of it is concerned. Start with one step forward, do a pilot, find if it works. If it doesn't work, it's not going to pull all of ICANN down. If it does work, great. The second stage, the next year, then you can go for something that's going to be larger because you've effectively taken the model and you've proved that it actually works.

And so the Leadership Program is one of these things which doesn't cost an arm and a leg, we're not talking about having huge resources allocated to it. But at the same time it's also something which has the potential of a pretty decent return on investment because the people that are going to be part of that Leadership Program will immediately be put to the test. You don't have to wait two, three, four years to find out if they finally blossom. You'll find out within the first six months if they actually are operational or if they're not.

So that I think is a way to sort of go through a first step and having the actual program financed rather than wanting to do so many things in parallel. Now that said, I also understand that there is a real need



throughout the community, from the Leadership Program all the way to the observer level, for something to happen. And therefore...and on top of that I also, and Tijani raised this, it appears that every part of the community, at a more granular level, needs to get knowledge but sometimes that knowledge is not the same. We've certainly found this in our RALOs.

Some regions are more advanced as far as their knowledge is concerned than others. And in fact, looking back at the Internet Society in the early days when ISOC was trying to promote the Internet throughout the world, well there were some countries where they had to promote broadband and there were other countries where they had to promote the actual Internet itself. What is the Internet? In the mid '90s in Europe or in the U.S. you'd ask, "What is the Internet?" and everybody would know.

So the message would not be the same than in Africa, where you actually had to explain from scratch what the Internet did and what was the potential of it. And I think we might be at the same thing here because for the local capacity building I think, and local as I mean in a specific SG or in a specific advisory committee or a specific SO, I think probably the first step, and I'm not trying to tell the SGs and SOs and so on what to do, but the first step would be to learn pretty well how the SG, SO, and AC works.

So there would be an emphasis time-wise on that SG, SO, and AC to a real granular depth that is greater than if someone else, someone from another AC, SG, or SO, would take part in to this. So I think...I hope I



haven't confused you further. But as a first step I would say the Leadership Program is probably the easiest to identify.

As a second step, and I'm not talking ten years later, I'm hoping thanks to what we heard from Fadi and Sally Costerton as well that there would be a real push in ICANN for the second step to come shortly behind. And that might even be a matter of months. But the fastest program that could be designed, in my point of view, is probably the Leadership Program. So, that's it. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you. Sandra speaking. Thank you Chuck. Hong, you have the floor please.

HONG XUE:

Thank you. This is really a good start. First of all, I want to talk about the target groups. I see the colleagues just now have made very good observations. For "leaders", if we use that word, probably we would want current leaders, and potential leaders, future leaders. The current Chairs of different SO/ACs are already very capable, experienced, knowledgeable. Like Olivier there, who has beautifully presented his skill in presentation.

But there's some future leaders, there's some people who want to be leaders. So probably this could be a platform for them to grow up. I assume it should be completely up to an SO, or a CEO or a stakeholder group to decide which one they want to send to this program to be trained and to build the capacity. And for NomCom, I guess this is the really interesting part and previously we've been focusing to these



NomCom appointees. And now with trying to talk about...just opened up my mind, I think probably we should go one step back and instead to train those who have been appointed, we think about those applicants, they file the applications, SOIs, to show they want to be leaders in certain groups.

So probably that is the interesting perspective, for them to be trained as Olivier said, would not be wrong, would not take very long for them to blossom. A quite reasonably short time. And for even SO/ACs, they have elections. There would be a couple of candidates. How about we send these candidates to the this project and we can see how the capacity has been built sort of this process.

Secondly, about the training model. I fully agree with Tijani. Different groups have different needs, so in addition to a centralized training or building capacity process probably we need to diversify. There would be a couple of parallel or different projects in different formats. And finally I remember yesterday the CFO mentioned ICANN is actually developing a couple of training programs and I wonder if our Leadership Academy Working Group is built in to his budget plan.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Hong. Just a quick comment on what you raised about the NomCom advantages. I like this idea because it was always one of the smaller issues that such a capacity building level program could have an impact on NomCom elections. So they can even have a look at who did which level and make a different choice than they have now. If your proposal would work out from a point of practicality, I'm not sure about that. But let's discuss this and Filiz you raised your hand.



FILIZ YILMAZ:

Yeah, just a few points from my perspective. I think there are different issues here, and one of...I agree with what's being said so far obviously. This was always out there, all these items that we're discussing now. One of the reasons I believe that this leadership training was brought through, or the idea was put through, it was not only to get the very fresh new leaders and train them from scratch but also bring in more experienced leaders, no matter what, at the same table so this dialogue can start and we can create this chemistry between the new leaders and the more experienced leaders.

And also within the leadership of ICANN so we're not about just getting any fresh leader and bringing them in to a strict boot-camp kind of training but it is more of a collaboration environment where the new ones can bring their very fresh point of view while sometimes those points can be missed by the more experienced ones. Because you are so in to the thing for years, you are missing that new perspective. That's one other point to learn to. And I think this is why we try to keep the term to "participants" rather than "trainer/trainee" or "fellow" or "student", because it is an advanced training.

We are not talking about a school here. We are dealing with a very skilled set of people. They already know a lot of things. So it's not really a classroom setting. We are talking about a more collaboration environment where we can learn from each other. The other thing I want to mention is I think this is good also to enhance the relationship between the leaders and future leaders of ICANN, but of the components of the proposal ALAC earlier on developed, if you looked at



that proposal you will see breaking silos. I think this is a very important part of what we are trying to achieve here.

If this program goes through to implementation successfully I think there is a great potential here for ICANN leadership to start working much better in an earlier stage. We all know that ICANN leadership, among themselves, they have mechanisms to discuss certain things. They come together but this is just going to be an extra tool for them to use and also start nourishing the future leaders, as you have said. Bringing them on that ground early on.

In regards to the future leaders, I agree. I think this program should bring in those prospective leaders and in the earlier version of the proposal that I helped Sandra to come up with and this was shared with the group, there was one component where if you look in to the details of the call that was supposed to go out to the leaders as a call, "Please come in, this might be a training program, a possible program for you."

There was one note, if you don't want to attend yourself, please leave the space or bring in or appoint somebody else from your group who may be a prospective leader because we are aware that ICANN leaders, keeping an eye to the future, they often nourish and mentor somebody already within their group. And the other thing we have to notice here, in some of the groups...NomCom structure and how NomCom functions is pretty much outlined very well. Everybody knows that they will have a selection criteria and we will know at the end of August, maybe beginning of September, who the new leaders that they have selected every year.



But in the other parts of ICANN where smaller groups, maybe under GNSO, Chuck you may correct me if I'm wrong, like the NCSG and all that, they run their own type of elections. They bring their Chairs within their groups whenever they want to and we are not aware of that system. So we are bound to check with the current leaders to say, "Who is your prospective leader anyway?" at some point, and I agree this program definitely needs to combine that aspect and maybe we should provide two seats for each group, at the least, to have the current leader...at least in the early version, and then the prospective leader.

And once, if we decide that this program is going to be a yearly reoccurring program, then maybe the first year will cover the current leaders together with the prospective ones, but the next version the current leaders will step out and it will only function with the new ones. I think for the kick-start part it will be good to bring everybody in so that experienced eye and the new eye can make a good judgment about components of the program too, because the first one will be really a pilot. That's why it was called a pilot in Toronto. There was a reason for that.

So I think this is something to think about. But the budget, again, let's not focus on the budget. Once there is an agreement on what needs to be done, where the need is and how it is going to be done, there will be a budget process again. If it doesn't fit in this fiscal year, because you want to do it in the next year, then we will follow it from then on. But I think the budget shouldn't be the restrictive or the main parameter in these discussions. I think we should find out what we need, what needs



to be done and how, and then the budget part should be brought later on. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: We have a queue in operation now. I have Chuck first, then Hong, Yaovi, and Tijani, right? Okay. Just to go back to what you said on the budget, Filiz, I have a question in this regard. If I understand it right, that we should have at least a decision on how we are going to proceed for Beijing, because this would have an impact on do we have to set up a budget or not. Is that right or...? Sébastien can you please clarify this for us?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You have to work for a budget anyhow. Because the starting of the budget process for next year is starting now, then you will have to work on a budget. Whatever you do with the money currently in the budget this year, but that's not the question, you need to do both. Maybe to use the money that this year is in the budget, but you have to set up the budget for next year. At least you have to set up the request for the budget for next year.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Sébastien. So I have the next in the queue, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: This wasn't the topic I was going to first talk about; I'll come back to that. But because the budget came up, Sébastien's absolutely right. We're already starting and in fact there's a finance session later today



that will be very enlightening to everybody. My understanding is we already have some budget for this fiscal year, so for Beijing we're going to have to decide how and when we'll use that. But, and Filiz you're absolutely correct, we shouldn't get bogged down in the budget now.

But I think it is important for us to realize that the budgeting process is going to be moved forward quite a bit starting this time around for fiscal year '14. And so in the next few months it will be helpful if we can at least provide some high level guidelines in terms of what the needs might be for that fiscal year. That said I just wanted to...and if you attend the finance session you'll get more detail on that, because there have been some ad hoc groups working and so forth.

Now what I really wanted to do was suggest some possible ways for us to organize our thinking with regard to target groups so that we start pulling some of this together in a way that will be useful for us going forward. I think, first of all, we have a broad category of target audiences that we should capture. Don't have to do that today; some of it will come out today. But just what are all the possible target audiences that could benefit from a training program, an Academy program? That becomes a pool then that we can pull from with regard to specific projects that we may undertake.

Tijani's right, the needs are going to vary by each group. And so that becomes the second category, I think. Specific target audiences for particular projects. And that will be different sub-sets of that broad group. But I think it's good to have the broad group in our minds because as we're working down the road then it will help us continue to progress. Now to do all that, we do have to then come up with those



specific projects. And once we have the broader view as well as the needs of the stakeholder groups and constituencies and any other groups in the community, then it will make it easier for us to, "Okay, let's decide. We can't do all these things right now."

So I think an assessment needs to be done of the stakeholder groups, the constituencies, the SOs, the ACs. In the case of the GNSO it's probably less fruitful to go to the GNSO Council than it is to go to the SGs and the constituencies. Each SO and AC will be a little bit different in that, but we do need to reach out and assess, develop an assessment of the needs that they have. And so that then feeds in to both the broad view of target audiences as well as then ultimately in to whatever specific projects we decide to approach.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Chuck, for those comments. Next in the queue is Young.

YJ PARK: For the record, YJ Park speaking. I'm seeking your patience if I'm repeating some of your previous discussion because this is my first time to attend this kind of meeting. And one of the things I've been wondering is one of the terminologies about the leaders. So I wonder whether we can sort of rephrase it to more like a "facilitator" because when we say "leaders" I sort of feel it's too kind of dominating.

And one of the reasons I think we kind of try to have this kind of program is there are so many different structures here in ICANN. So for example, for myself, I've been involved with ICANN from the beginning as maybe Chuck may remember. And sort of I'm coming back to ICANN



more seriously these days. And even though I've been following this whole ICANN process and structure once in awhile, I still feel a bit distant from this whole kind of decision making process and things like that because initially I was involved with the ccTLD Constituency, which became ccNSO right now.

And then I was also involved with Non-Commercial Domain Name Holders Constituency, which now became NCUC, which also has sort of different structures and different decision making processes. So now I'm sort of sitting at At-Large structure and which has, again, very different perspective. So even for myself, who have been involved with ICANN from the beginning and involved with sort of a council decision making process, still it took lots of time for me to reboot this whole kind of process.

So I can imagine those who come to ICANN for the first time or those who have been kind of lingering in this process. So this kind of program is very necessary, but one of the perspectives I wanted to think about is since we have very different structures in this ICANN process. So if you kind of approach to this from one specific constituency and then try to have more overall perspective, it's going to be very hard. And so one of the target audiences we can think about is sort of those who have some kind of background of a specific constituency but who may not have the more whole perspective about the other structures and so they can have a more mature perspective of this whole kind of process.

That can be one of the target audiences. And another, as I said earlier, I'm wondering whether we can rethink about the terminology.



Whether we can rephrase "facilitators" rather than "leaders", which from my own perspective is a bit too dominating.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Young. Just a quick comment from my side on what you have said. I think you are right, the diversity is pretty high in this ICANN, but I think we will have the most common content to submit in the bottom level and in the leadership level. And in between, the diversity will be the broadest. But on an entry level you will actually teach, more or less, the same stuff to all the different groups.

And also on the leadership level, all this knowledge should somehow go together. But in the middle body which is there, the green body actually, we will have the greatest diversity and this is...I like the proposal Chuck made, to make an assessment in each of the stakeholder groups. This is something which should come from the stakeholder group. So the next in the queue is Yaovi. You have the floor please.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you. Yaovi speaking. I really like this chart because it gives a very clear picture of the ICANN Academy. My first comment is that we don't have to think about necessarily to identify future leaders. Let me explain. When we talk about ICANN Academy, if I take like Cisco Academy, you have in developing countries many Cisco Academies. And people...after attending a Cisco Academy the person has a certificate. And the person thinks that, "Okay, I have attended Cisco Academy. I am very powerful." And then you can recruit some of them but they can't



do the work. So I want to come to the point that in this picture the leadership group is very clear. Maybe if you want to find another term, the leader is clear, we're talking about the leader. It can be the current leaders or a leader that we can get through the NomCom on various groups. So for me the leaders, the group is very clear. They are the current leader and the potential leader we know.

But my point is that the program should not think about training people to become leaders necessarily. You can train somebody, but the person will not be a leader. So the leader will come from the various groups. So the program leadership for me is for the real leader and the leaders that are coming from the various groups. And I should say also we can have a system and we know the various target groups from the various constituencies through an assessment, so for me it is very clear and the program is so huge that my suggestion is that we can focus on the category of target groups now. Because if you want to talk about target groups for the various groups it's very different.

For people who are in the African Strategy Presentation, I hear also the work of ICANN Academy. So I don't know what people are expecting from that one, because my understanding is that if Africa, in this strategy, somebody wants to participate in the Academy the person needs to see where himself can fit in. In this one. It will not be...and according to what we have at the bottom, you have various tools and we can find a way or a place for every group in this program.

So I want just to say that we can probably think about if there is something missing or needs to be added, but at the time it's very clear and I would suggest we focus on maybe a leadership group, a leadership



target, so that we don't spend too much time on the various targets. As he said, we need to do an assessment. This one cannot be today, but we can just take a leadership group. We already have an idea. We have the current leaders and the leaders that will come through the various selections, and then we can save time and work on it in parallel. We can think about the other target groups later. That's my suggestion. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Yaovi. We have a queue in operation now. The next is Tijani, then Rummy, did you raise your hand? Okay. Okay we made you raise your hand. And then it's Olivier.

[background conversation]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, Tijani you have the floor please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Tijani speaking. I am a little bit uncomfortable because I feel there is confusion. And perhaps the confusion comes from certain things that happened at the beginning of this work. When first Sandra and Wolf brought the idea of the ICANN Academy to the At-Large it was about the framework to compile all the learning efforts inside ICANN, to harmonize those efforts, to avoid duplication, to avoid waste of resources, etcetera.



When Sandra spoke first to the staff about the project, they told her, "Please start with the pilot project, in Toronto, about the training or the capacity building of the leadership." And from this point, we start to speak about the pilot project as ICANN Academy. ICANN Academy is not the project. It's not the pilot project. ICANN Academy is much broader. The pilot project is one action, one specific action inside the ICANN Academy.

And I don't want to speak about budget at all when I speak about ICANN Academy because we don't yet define everything in the ICANN Academy. We need to do it, that's why I always ask to work on two tracks. The long-term track which is the ICANN Academy, the broad project. And the other track, which is the pilot project. So as for the pilot project, Filiz said that we need to mix the newcomers and the old leaders. But the newcomer leaders are councilors. They are members of ACs. They are not the Chairs of those structures. If you want to mix them you have to bring all the councilors of GNSO, of ccNSO, etcetera and all the AC members.

This is not the intent; the intent is to introduce the newcomers to the ICANN environment, to make them more prepared to start their job because they are appointed so they will start working in a few months. Now it is behind us, they already started. So if we want to speak about capacity building or learning, I don't think that we need to old and the new leaders. New leaders can be trainers; can bring their knowledge and know-how. The newcomers have to learn more; have to be prepared for their job. Thank you.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Tijani. This just brings to my mind that the defined target or the defined person which will be sent to such a leadership program can be various from one stakeholder group to another one. Speaking for ALAC, where we are only 15 people, we might think about incoming ALAC representatives. But within the GNSO, which has much more members, they are probably more advanced when they are already contributing in their constituency and are supposed to be a future leader. Just some thoughts from my side. Now the next one is Rummy please.

RUMMY SPRATLEY-KANIS: Thank you, Rummy Spratley-Kanis. Actually Ben said most of what I wanted to say. I've seen the last three meetings, including the conference calls, going a little bit in circles. And personally I think Beijing is achievable but only if the work really starts now. So my proposal would actually be to focus on the pilot first and stick to that.

Keeping in mind, in the back of our heads, that it might expand later, and should, because there's all these other regions and areas where this work can be done. But rather than maybe calling it like the full "ICANN Academy", which is what makes people insecure and makes this very vague, really just for now focus the work on the pilot in Beijing and start getting the work done. And the sooner we start with that I think the more chance we have of it being successful.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Rummy. Now Olivier, you have the floor please.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. It's Olivier for the transcript. I think we've got an agreement here. I've seen two discussions going on in parallel, so it's interesting because you have the discussion that focuses on the Leadership Program and the discussion that focuses on the bigger ICANN Academy picture. And it's fun because it's a little bit like when you have food you have a little bit of vegetables and then a bit of meat and then a bit of veg and you mix the two. But the thing is we really need to get those things clear.

I'd like to lend my support for what Chuck suggested, which was to get the SOs, ACs, and SGs to identify their capacity building needs as soon as possible. And that might be one takeaway that this group might have, which is to basically get their SOs, ACS, and SGs to work to come back within X number of months to have had a full survey of what their needs are, what the requirements are. That would be one parallel track. I'd also like to lend my support to Romy's suggestion that if the Leadership Program is to be implemented soon; one needs to really get down to it and start working on that. So that's it. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. Are there...Chuck? To you please.

CHUCK GOMES: Thank you. Chuck Gomes again. I would just disagree with thing you said, Olivier. That is not months for the groups to give us feedback; I think maybe you give them a month. Because, keep in mind and I think we had pretty good agreement that we need to define the target audiences before we can go very far on other things. Now obviously



that's going to have to devolve down in to a specific target audience for a pilot if we go that route, and that needs to happen fairly quickly. That's why I don't think you can give them months.

If you actually go to the groups themselves rather than the SOs...now in the case of the ALAC you guys have an advantage that you've probably already done this exercise, okay? I don't think the GNSO SGs and constituencies have, at least not all of them. Maybe none of them. And I can't speak for the ccNSO either. But that's important to get going right away. And maybe one of the things, and it's up to the group, but maybe one of the things we should talk about this morning is what we want to ask them though.

I think we need to keep it simple, as simple as possible, but get enough information to really be helpful for us. With regard to going around in circles, I've had that same view that we have done some of that and that's not a criticism, just an observation that we can learn from. I think that if we stay on track, like for example I fully understand the priority of starting to move. If we're going to do something in Beijing, then get that going. But I'd like to give my opinion that if we get this target audience question answered at a broad level and then look at specific projects once we get the needs in it will be much easier to move effectively towards defining a pilot project and what we might be able to do in Beijing.

So I think one of the reasons we go in circles is we keep jumping ahead and trying to get ahead of the order that I think we agreed to in our list. Let's get a good grasp of the target audience, long-term as well and then more specifically the needs, and then it will be much easier for us to



zero in based on the information we have in terms of what target we want to pick with regard to a possible pilot program in Beijing.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Chuck. I have a personal question of understanding in this regard. When you propose to develop an assessment, it is to develop an assessment to define the needs of each constituency, right? I think there is another dimension that the constituencies should also define whom they want to send to what we call a Leadership Program, because we said earlier on and I think it was more or less agreed that this working group should look in to a leadership program. This can be not done by any single stakeholder group.

So actually we have to ask two questions to all the SOs and ACs. The one question is which capacity building needs they can identify and the second question, in my point of view, would be whom do they want to send to what we call Leadership Camp and then they can decide are these going to be incoming leaders or are these going to be ICANN veterans. This could bring the working group to the next point, to identify or to speak about the learning goals. When we see how many incoming leaders we are talking about and how many ICANN veterans we are talking about. Is this...?

CHUCK GOMES:

I agree, and I think another question...and this is, I think we should all just spend a few minutes talking about what questions should be asked again. I don't think we want to make it a formal survey or make it too complicated. But I think we also want to ask what kind of timing



relative to their needs during the year works best for them. Very broad at this stage, but to get an idea. Filiz said something about September is a key time when a lot of new leaders are identified and so forth, but let each group kind of respond to that. But...I'm sorry to cut you off Olivier, because I know your hand was up, but I wanted to follow up on that. You're on the right track, I think, in terms of...it's not just one question. There's a few.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Could you please raise your hand? I saw there were various...okay, so Chris. Then we have Sébastien. Ron, right? And Yaovi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier here, just in response to Chuck. Don't confuse people with the questions, so make sure one question does not induce confusion for another question.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, so I now give the floor to Chris Chaplow now.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Thank you. Like everybody I'm trying, to use the phrase, get my head around this. I was at the Prague meeting but I have missed the intermediate calls. But this occurred to me is that one size can't fit all, and I think we're bouncing back a bit between that. And I sort of think of the parallel that if we were setting up a university...a university, as we all know, has post-graduate courses, it has under-graduate courses,

it has summer schools. And they're all very different. And we're talking about a pilot project.

So if we were doing a pilot project to set up a university, wow it's a big pilot project to set up a whole university. We would surely just focus on one of those areas. And the four on the screen there, the ambassador, leader, contributor and server, that's quite a good breakdown. Now the leader is probably the hardest of them all to set up, because the different abilities of the people that are going to be at the Academy there are all going to be very different.

And it's a little bit chicken and egg. We say to the constituencies, "Would you please identify leaders or would you please suggest leaders to come, either real leaders or potential leaders." But everybody is going to have very different skills, very different knowledges. And when I get an email come through advertising a seminar, in my non-ICANN environment, I have to try and judge what the skill level is at that seminar to know whether it's worth my time going to it.

So we've got that problem as to how it's a little bit chicken and egg asking the constituencies to identify leaders, but unless you really know what the skill level of the Academy is going to be then you don't quite know which is the right person to go, whether it's worth...so maybe as a suggestion to get this off the ground at all, maybe we should be looking lower down the chain. And looking at trying to set something up for observers. I know there's work going on already in the Newcomers Lounge and Filiz and different people. But as a pilot project, just to at least get it off the ground maybe that's an easier route. Thanks.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Chris. Next in the row is Sébastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I think it's really difficult to follow the discussion here. I would like to suggest...I am talking on my behalf, don't see any hat on my head here and what I say here is just for here and when I will act as a Chair of the PPC or as a board member I will act accordingly with my duties. But here I think that my duty is to tell you that if you want to succeed take one objective and fulfill it. Don't try to take five objectives. We have this attribute in this organization to...we love complex things. We love to build something which is difficult to be understood by the normal human being.

Then we are in this situation, let me try to tell you what I think could be the good way to go. And once again, it's just my point of view. There are three issues. The first one, it's target audiences, the tools and the content of the program, of the training. What you call a curriculum in the people who know a lot about what is training. And that's three things different. And when we look to such design, we are mixed up. They are mixed between three of these items and maybe it's good if we can set up three pyramids with those three issues.

The second is, I suggest forget about leading program, training leading program. Why it was pushed to be done here...and I want to take a little history why I think we are here. I guess it's when Olivier takes a lead of ALAC, or it was the next year, I don't remember. But ten of our 15 members of ALAC changed. Then he was supposed to lead a team with ten new people, with some of them with very little knowledge of ICANN, with some of them with some knowledge of At-Large but not



knowledge of ICANN, and with some with no knowledge at all. And it was quite difficult, and when Sandra and Wolf came with the idea of the ICANN Academy or At-Large Academy or ALAC Academy, whatever, it was to try to solve this problem of too much new people coming in and they need to be trained.

And I have seen that also as a good opportunity to stop to have board members trained in these silos and not to have a common training. Then yes, the idea to have all the newbies in the leadership position at Toronto could be a good idea. It happens that the NomCom didn't deliver so much newbies. It happens that in your constituencies there were not so much newbies. Then the fact that we didn't organize something in Toronto was not a big trouble. Then forget about that, maybe something in Latin American next year or at the end of the year will be needed.

But concentrate on what is the broader program because I agree with Chuck on some objective but I disagree with Chuck on saying let's do it not in depth. Because it's like that we start a project with half of the information and we fail in the long run. Then I suggest take your time to put the basis of the program. And the basis, I agree with you, it's to ask each and any constituency, SG, SO, AC, whatever you want to name them, to define their needs. And their needs are post the content, what they want to learn, and to whom they want to deliver this knowledge.

And if we can get that right we will have a figure, an image, of the training needs for this organization and I hope that there will be a lot of common things across the SO, AC, and so on and so forth. And that could be the common program, and then there will be specifics.



Specifics will be organized by each SO, AC, and so on, and with the help of the ICANN Academy in global...but that will give us a picture of what we need to set up and where we need to go. And I don't want to commit any...it's not my task at all, it's a staff task. But maybe you can ask staff to help you to help each SO and AC to do this job of defining their needs because it's maybe not so easy to be done by each and every SO/AC.

Some have done already, At-Large I guess and some of the others may have done it. Maybe the BC are already thinking about that. And if there are needs to have help, why not ask for that? Because it's absolutely, I think, the basis to the success of this overall program. I hope that I didn't confuse you and I am ready to answer questions if you have questions, but please take the broad picture and try to go ahead and I suggest to forget about the short-term things like the Leadership Program for the moment. It's not that it's a bad objective, but it's maybe not your main task as I see it today. Thank you very much.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Sébastien. And we have a queue in operation now. The next one is Ron, then Yaovi, Peter, and Tijani. Ron, you have the floor please.

RON SHERWOOD:

Thank you. And thank you, Sébastien, for clarifying this in a better way than I can. But in exactly the way I wanted to. When I look back this was originally an ALAC idea for an ALAC Academy, and I think it came out of the fact that ALAC is in a unique position amongst all the other ICANN silos, groups, departments, call it what you will, in that ALAC



membership is the end-user, the person that does not fit in to any of the other categories. A lot of the participants here, probably all participants that are not attending ALAC meetings, are here because they are a member of a specific group, a specific community if you will.

So they tend to be very limited in what they bring to the entire forum and what they expect to get out of it. For example, I am liaison between the ccNSO and the ALAC group. Well everyone in the ccNSO group already knows what they're there for. You'll get new people coming in and they have to learn how that group behaves within and reacts to other parts of ICANN, and they will learn that just by participating but they're participating as one particular group.

The more they attend, the more they participate, the more they will learn within that group. What they don't know is what every other group does. And the people that come to ALAC need to learn all about everything. And therefore they're in a unique position and I think that when we moved from an ALAC Academy to an ICANN advanced outreach leadership course that was a major step and a major difference. We got away from what the original need was.

When I hear Leadership Academy or Leadership Courses I say to myself, "Are we teaching people how to be leaders?" Because I don't know that that's what we set out to do. Leadership is sometimes already there within the participants that have worked their way up through any of the individual groups. We aren't really teaching them to be leaders; we're teaching them about the rest of ICANN. We're teaching them about the people that they're going to interact with. We're teaching



them, presumably, things that they don't know. We're not going to teach them things they do know.

So I see the whole purpose here of getting knowledge of what ICANN is and what ICANN does and what the various components of ICANN are to everybody. And I think that's what we desperately need, and I came to this because many years ago I found that going to my community, which is the Virgin Islands, and going to the university in my community, I'm finding that the Dean of Computer Sciences in that university hadn't a clue what ICANN was. Didn't know what ICANN did, and certainly wasn't teaching it to anybody.

And I was horrified and felt that I could take to that university some knowledge of ICANN, and I put together a program for them. I wasn't able to...I'm not an educator; I wasn't able to do that very well. But I believe that what we should be designing here is something that could be spread universally and used universally by teaching establishments outside of ICANN. And I don't want us to feel that we really know what it all is and everybody here knows what we're doing and therefore all we have to do is to prepare people for leadership. I think the broader base that's being described is the most important part. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Ron, for your valuable comments. I just have to contradict to one point. It was never meant to be something for ALAC. It was always meant to be something for the whole ICANN community.

RON SHERWOOD: Thank you for clarifying.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: You're welcome. The next one is Yaovi.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you. I come back again to the picture that the picture is very clear. Very, very clear for me, to me. As Tijani said, the intention of the program at the beginning was very clear. Anyone that is talking about leadership, and also as I said, people are not coming to this particular program to become leaders. Because, as I said, you can have a Cisco Academy certificate but you cannot perform for me.

So people are coming to the Leadership Program because they are leaders and they are coming there to learn more about ICANN, what other ICANN constituencies are doing. So they are not coming to that program because they want to become leaders, they're already leaders and they need some knowledge. I was in NomCom for two years, some people are selected to come to various constituencies...they have a very good background, either a university or a professional background. But there is something missing for them.

And this Leadership Camp is a unique opportunity for them because they will serve time; they don't need to be in...somebody can be in the constituency for maybe one year without being able to catch up. But I find this program, Leadership Program, to maybe fill this gap now. This Leadership Program, this is my understanding. When we talk about in Africa you want to join the ICANN Academy, you have to look at this picture, "Where can we go?"



I can apply for the Fellowship Program. I can come to ICANN meetings and attend the beginner's session. I can go to the welcome session. So the picture is very clear. So my suggestion is that we just take now one program that is one like the Leadership Program. Maybe we cannot do it in Beijing, but it is very clear, the picture for me.

And asking for the videos also, to provide something maybe in a more...may be a bit difficult. And I'm not sure that if you focus on that then we can move. This one requirement may be some months, but at the same time I think we can take one...what is the core pilot, one of these modules like the leadership, and talk about this. And to conclude, when I talk about the target, when we talk about the new leader and the old leader, one of my contributions before is that the old leaders, they're also because they've been in the group for maybe a year, they have something to bring to the new people.

So the target for me, we talk about the new leader and the old leader, at least in my understanding of a target if I took the Leadership Program. So for me the program is clear and this will help ICANN to have a broader picture when we talk about ICANN Academy. Anybody can fit in; he has just to look at the picture. But for now we'll just take one and we'll work on this one but in parallel, it can take some months, a year, we continue the rest. This is my suggestion. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Yaovi. The next one in the queue is Peter.

PETER KNIGHT:

Peter Knight, for the record. I'm a newbie to this group and to ICANN and I've had a great learning experience in the three days I've been here. But I do have a lot of experience in organizing trainings, global trainings, because I was a division chief in the World Bank in charge of training for market economics around the world, and we trained people in the former Soviet Union and in China, Africa, Latin America, every region.

And I don't know if this has already been discussed, but normally when one organizes a learning event the first thing you set forward in the announcement, preferably electronic in this group, are the learning objectives. What is it that you will have learned at the end of that session or that training unit, whether it be called a course, a camp, a seminar, or whatever? And say, "By the end of this you will have learned A, B, C, and D." And then you say, "What is the audience that you're reaching?" And, in this case, "What technical level is required to be able to participate effectively?" Whether it's a degree, their experience, previous courses that you've completed.

And the other thing is we generally worked with three levels. We had courses as long as several weeks or months for in the case of training in market economics for former Soviet Union countries or China. And then for senior policy seminars, never more than three days, and a totally different format where a great deal of the learning was one, talking to the other...their own experiences and not sort of being taught at the blackboard.

So maybe for this new leadership...very short sessions, either online or face-to-face, given the fact that most leaders have very little time to



learn. I mean they're learning all the time in their normal jobs but they've got their daily jobs. With our retirees we might have a little more time, but that's just a few observations from someone with a lot of experience in this field.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you very much, Peter, for your comments. We have in the queue now Tijani, Wolf, Young and Hong. The next is Tijani please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Tijani speaking. I will not comment on any intervention, but I will try to make things very clear. The pilot project is today on our agenda. It is not the ICANN Academy. It can be on our agenda, it can be out of our agenda as other capacity building running now. Not all RALOs today are running capacity building programs, that is not on our agenda.

What I mean here...I don't mean that we have to remove it, to remove the pilot project at all. But I strongly ask that in the future our meetings will be dedicated to the pilot project or to the ICANN Academy, separately. I do want that we stop turning around as we are doing now. We need to go forward for the pilot project if we want it to be implemented in Beijing.

So we need to dedicate meetings to this project. And this project will need a target group, will need a budget, etcetera. The ICANN Academy will not need that. We are still working on the frame, on how it will be organized, what will be in, what will out, etcetera. So for more clarity, I

do ask that in the future our meetings will be dedicated to one or the other project. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Tijani. The next one is Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Sandra. It's Wolf Ludwig speaking. I must admit I'm getting more and more confused about this increasing confusion here, because as far as I can recall, the idea is rather simple and good and I still believe the basic idea of the whole Academy project was a very simple and basically good idea. And it was meant not as an At-Large project. It was introduced by At-Large, but it was meant for the whole community.

And we were very clear from the very beginning, and we were clearly stating it's something different from the ongoing Fellowship Program. It's something different from the ongoing capacity building programs. So we wanted to have an overarching capacity building project at ICANN. And then we specified three levels of how we could start with it in our first draft of the project proposal. And then ICANN said, "Okay, basically we think you have a good idea guys. Let's start with one element."

And this one element was the leadership element component. And then it was said, "Okay, a pilot would be a good idea. Most likely a pilot won't be perfect right from the beginning, but let's give it a trial." And then we continued the concept by developing the curriculum phase. We realized that the whole thing needs to have a modular character because depending on whom you want to train and depending on the



level these people have and depending on the goals, the teaching goals, etcetera, you need to have something very flexible.

What may serve different parts of the ICANN communities, on the At-Large level, on the business level, on the government level, etcetera, etcetera. And all this can be done, I think. It needs a lot of detailed reflection. It needs still a lot of asking the right questions. And it must, at the end of the day, serve the community. And I think my last remark, at the end of this look back; there are still different ideas, different projects, concepts, in the community.

And when people talk about capacity building I've learned they mean different things. Okay, let's take this as a matter of fact, but let's try that everything that comes or pops up from a constituency has to be seen in a complimentary way and not in a competitive way to this project. And let's try our best to bring all the energies, to bring all the knowledge of the community together to create something modular, flexible, useful, and rewarding for the community. Thanks.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Wolf. The next one is Young then I have Hong and then I want to close the queue for the moment and would like to conclude and find out if there is agreement on some certain issues which I will...okay, I put Filiz in the queue. And then we should conclude at this stage to find if there is agreement on something. Young, you have the floor please.



YJ PARK:

Yes, YJ Park speaking. And I would like to build on what Tijani and Wolf said. I think sort of we have discussed more like conceptual damage of this enough, for almost like two hours long out of three hour meeting. So I'm wondering whether we can move on to more practical kind of discussions, how this Beijing project can be shaped, because we have just six months ahead and which it can be long enough or but very short depending on how we are ready for this.

So one of the things I want us to think about is how many people we can afford to invite to this program and how we can kind of shape this course and who can be training these kind of new leaders or old leaders, whatever, and also how we can kind of contribute to this project as individuals in this room. So maybe we can move forward with just one hour left. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Young, and as I mentioned already we will conclude this topic soon so that we have one hour for the rest. Hong, you raised your hand as well?

HONG XUE:

Okay, I fully agree what has been presented is pretty clear. We've been talking about strategic plan for quite some time. Let's move on to operational plan, have a work plan. We have to start from the easy part and experiment these concepts in practices. Like the former Chinese paramount leader Deng Xiaoping said, "We can cross the river by touching the stones." So let's move. And so I guess Sandra is going to summarize what we've been talking about, but I assume that what



we've been talking about is some practical nudges that could be implemented pretty soon.

So it's whether we're going to have a survey or a study or an assessment about the need from the SOs or the ACs. Whether we're going to ask the two questions to these SO/ACs, the target groups, the training need. And I also agree with Sébastien, probably need more foundation. Before asking these questions we need to define what the meaning of the target group. What could be in that training need?

So on the next one, this is more important. I'm from Beijing; I know that it's not so easy to go there. And for everyone in this room, you need to get a visa so if we are going to do that pilot project in Beijing let's plan very, very early and especially I don't believe you are only targeting to the people who have determined to go to the ICANN meeting. What if someone is not going to the ICANN meeting and they're going to join this, they're only going to join this pilot project.

In that case it should be not defined and different from Toronto, when we've only learned is a few weeks before. That's really not sufficient for Beijing. It's not possible. It's completely not possible. You need to take months to get your visa, so I guess the first step for this work plan is whether we want to move to Beijing or we want to move at Durban instead. I guess that's the very easy part we can talk right now, okay.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Hong, and the last in the row is Filiz now.



FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you Sandra. Filiz Yilmaz here. I really want to get back to this focusing part. I think this is quite critical. I agree with you all, in a lot of ways. Doing the small thing and then going out and doing the bigger thing. But one point of reference really here is you're talking...I very much agree with what Wolf said.

Capacity building, it does not equal to training. Training is a tool for...one of the tools of capacity building programs. It's just one thing you can do within the whole capacity building area. And capacity building, outreach, these are all concepts that overlap each other. And may I remind you that there is a bigger conversation now going on within ICANN community on outreach internalization and capacity building generally.

Through the Africa strategy through...we have actually a conflicting session right now, starting at 9:00, for the Outreach and Capacity Building Programs for Latin America. So all these things need to be mapped there too, because one the aims, as you said Sandra, is to make sure that we don't redo work. We make sure that resources are used only once for the same type of goal and we don't repeat work or if it's done already we are informed about it.

So I think that we need to start looking for the bigger picture for capacity building, what the needs are for the assessment bits. I think we need to also bring in those other activities going on, and maybe channel the message through them, combining the forces, merging the forces. But I think focusing on the specific details; yes it needs to move on. Also for the staff side, as you said, if you want something to be implemented and if you need our help and I think you will at some



point, at least for the logistics, we need to know certain things in advance. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Filiz. So it's Sandra speaking. We are now...we are just entering the third hour of our meeting, and I'd like to conclude the discussion at this stage. And I want you to agree or disagree and give me your final comments on this. I think we are pretty much in the same opinion that an assessment to all SOs and ACs would be a good thing, to ask for their needs.

The way I see it, personally, is that this assessment will have two dimensions. One dimension would be on the pilot project for whatever time. And the second dimension would be or would address the green part of this pyramid over there. It would question the specific needs, the specific target groups, and the specific learning goals, which should shape our overall picture for the future.

So we have both dimensions, the long-term goal and the short-term goal, in this assessment. I think we cannot decide today if we will have something for Beijing, because one of the questions on the assessment, in my point of view, will be to ask the SOs and ACs what would be their preferred timing. They might say our preferred timing would be the other meeting which will be in Latin America next year.

But they may also agree that they can do it on any stage, so we should wait for that. I also agree that we have to keep the time in mind if want to get something for Beijing, we have to do the assessment right now. One month. I mean we are rather lucky because we have six months to



go to Beijing. The other dimensions would identify the specific stakeholder group needs, the specific target groups, and the learning goals, which should then fit in to our broader discussion. On the other hand, before I ask for your comments, I would take down one action item which leads us to the next point of our agenda, role of staff.

I think it is very critical that staff gives us an alert or identifies repeating discussion as you mentioned we have currently now another session going on where the Latin America is focusing also on this issue. I think all those efforts should be brought together because this avoids us from talking or from remaining in our silos. But we can discuss this later, on how we can resolve this. So I saw already, waving your hand, I saw Young, I saw Sébastien, was there anybody else?

[background conversation]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sébastien has to go, so I give the floor to Sébastien first.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Once again, I would like to advise you, don't mix short-term and long-term questions to SOs and ACs. If not, you will screw up everything. Don't ask for something for the next six months. With this program I understand that you want to do that quickly because you are working since three years on that, but take a breath and decide that you have time. You have time.



If you want to build a good program, take your time and then ask the long-term question to SOs and ACs and when you will get that you will have the material to be able to build a training somewhere, sometime because you will have the basis information. If you ask them two questions you will have mixed answers and you will have difficulty to understand. My second point, it's for many reasons and I'll only give one, really I advise you not to try to do anything in Beijing. It's too short, it's complicated for...it was complicated for here, as I imagine, and I hope you imagine the many other reasons.

Long-term, ask them and it will be a good input for the work of this working group. I am really sorry, it's not because I don't want to listen to the end of the conversation but I have to go to the meeting on the Latin America and Caribbean Regional Strategy. Have a good end of the meeting; I will follow what you are doing. Thank you very much.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Sébastien. Young, you raised your hand as well.

YJ PARK: Yes. YJ speaking. And if I understand, Sébastien kind of suggested maybe we have to wait enough to have more mature and prepared program, so maybe Beijing might not be the right place. But my opinion is somewhat different because, as you may know, the Asia region is one of the sort of key regions which has some difficulty of embracing this kind of more like Western-oriented decision making processes.

So since we all agree that this part of the region is one of the strategic regions we wanted to work with in this down the road, I think that



Beijing would be the ideal place for us to try this project. Otherwise it will really take lots of time for that kind of...the people in the region to kind of participate in this process.

So the suggestion I have in this table is we can think about the Beijing project as more like pilot so we can see how that goes and we can kind of evaluate later about what happened and whether we have some things we can learn for the next of stage. So I strongly consider you to think about implementing this academy in Beijing because that will really bring lots of benefit to this community rather than harm to this community.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Young, and also Sébastien, who had to leave already. I think, and maybe I made it not clear in my remarks, that the assessment we will do without any rush but still in a month's time because we are having now the fresh discussion and so on and so forth, will give us the answer on if we will have something for Beijing or not. I think they should decide and they should decide when...the way we're asking the right questions.

They will decide which time will be the most suitable and I think we have to take this decision soon so we have to go through this assessment rather quickly to get the answer on yes or no. I think that's the only way we can do it because I see there are two parties, the one up for doing something in Beijing or make it possible, the other one doesn't. I see Tijani and Chuck in the....



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Sandra. Tijani speaking. I think that since we have already the budget for FY13 it is a good thing to do this pilot project, even if I didn't agree with the later project. But it is better to implement something than not to do anything. And anything in the capacity building is useful. And if we want to ask the SOs and ACs about this point we have to tell them that we have a budget for FY13 and it is good not to lose it.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Tijani. Chuck, you have the floor.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks Sandra. Let's see if I can try and be helpful to you because I think your assessment is right. And I think we can mostly accommodate what Sébastien is saying in terms of the survey. We don't want to confuse people, he's right. But when we ask them for their needs, and by the way I think maybe we ought to avoid the term "capacity building" because that may be...

[background conversation]

CHUCK GOMES: Was the mic not working? Okay, sorry. I didn't recognize that. So it's probably good to avoid the word "capacity building" because I think the point made was good that it might mean different things to different people. But we need to ask them for their needs, and leave that open. What are your needs? That's good information.



Some of those things will ultimately be long-term things that we have to meet, but we need to see the needs. Okay? We'll have to decide later whether it's going to be accomplishable short-term or long-term, but let them tell us what their needs are and then I think you're right too that it's helpful for them to tell us what type of target audience would come from their group, what those are. That's immediate information we need.

And then timing, we're probably not going to be very specific there but any timing information we get will be helpful. We're going to have to take information then and see where we have commonalities like several people I think suggested, and then see if we can do something in the nearer term like Beijing. We've got a timing issue, but again like we've said before, when we were looking at Toronto, we've got to do it right or it will really put a negative tone on this whole project. I don't know if that's helpful or not.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Chuck. Any other comments? Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi speaking. Me, I understand the way you think about the assessment very clear, very clear because you want to do something very shortly. And by getting this in the short-term we will have to plan what can be done in Toronto. So I don't know if you are going to give them...you have do it in a way that they know that we are expecting the answer for to do something and that should be clear.



If not that will take time to talk about, and my understanding is we come to an agreement that we want to work on something that is clear, the pilot program. So the assessment should be in a way that they understand we don't have...we are not planning for something for long-term and this is why putting to compliment the need. But anyway, you may take the first one and send it but I want to be clear that people don't take their time and think about something for long-term because we want to achieve something now, to write something now. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Yaovi. Other comments? Chuck please?

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Chuck Gomes again. Would it be helpful if a few people did a draft of some questions to send out and then send it to the whole group? We need to be fairly responsive time-wise, so that hopefully within a week or so we can have something that can go out to the various groups. Is that helpful rather than if we try to do it, every one of us all together on the list; it's probably going to be hard to do. But if we get a straw man that a few people put together and then the whole group can then comment on that it might work.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Chuck. This was my next question. My hope and my wish that we set up a drafting team for such a survey, to be sent out shortly and I will take this opportunity to ask for volunteers for such a drafting team. Romy, you have a comment?



RUMY SPRATLEY-KANIS: Yeah, just a question because you've mentioned a drafting team before on the list. So this drafting team, would it just be for the survey or would it also be a drafting team for starting to work on the material which I think would also be a good idea while we wait for replies to come in. I think maybe some work can be started on a very ground level. So are these two drafting teams you're talking about or just one?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: At the moment, I'm talking about only one drafting team for the survey, and I think we have to wait for the outcome to set up the next drafting team which works on the content. That's my personal opinion but there might be others. Questions or volunteers for drafting? Chuck?

CHUCK GOMES: I'll volunteer to help draft.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Who else will volunteer? Okay. Ron? At the moment I have Chuck for this drafting team, Young, Ron. Yaovi you'll volunteer as well? Okay. Hong? You want to be part of the drafting or...?

[background conversation]



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: We are...to be clear, we are talking about the drafting team for a survey to be sent out to the...you want to volun...? Okay. Okay. Questions should be...try to approach other participants from other constituencies that we have stakeholder balance. Chuck?

CHUCK GOMES: Personal opinion, I mean it's always nice to have the breadth there, but it's already a pretty good size. Keep in mind everybody's going to have input that wants to, I would say that we go with what we have. You do need...are you able to kind of take the lead with the drafting team and put a straw man out, email to all of us and then we can all give feedback and work together? Is that doable? Because we do need to have somebody that's kind of taking the lead of the drafting team.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I would be happy to do so. Actually this was the way we were working within ALAC, we had a so called program committee which was doing the groundwork and it was sent out by me to the working group and then the working group could comment on this. I see Tijani is waving the hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I think that we don't need to go and find other members from other constituencies. Those who are here are committed. They commit to work; we will not go and ask for other people.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, thank you. So I take this as agreed now. We have, I repeat for the record, we have in this drafting team for a survey to be sent out as soon as possible to all SOs and ACs to identify their needs, to identify their target groups, to identify timing. We will discuss these questions and we'll let the working group evaluate this and the persons who volunteered for this drafting team are Chuck Gomes, Young...I'm sorry I forgot your last....Young?

YJ PARK: Yeah, YJ.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: We have Ron, we have Yaovi, and we have Hong, and it's me taking care of the lead and the communication with the working group. So Matt I would ask you to take this down as agreed and as an action item. Okay. So I think we covered Point 1 and 2 of our agenda. And Tijani, you have a comment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Can we add a point so that in the future we never hold a meeting discussing both the pilot project and the whole project?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I disagree here with you, because I always think we should look at both dimensions. I explained this various times on the mailing list that if we are talking about the bricks and the framework we have to look at both. As an architect, I'm by origin an architect; we have to know



implementing one single part in a building we have to look at the whole structure.

So this is my personal opinion and I would be interested and actually I thought this, and it was my intent, it was my opinion that this has been discussed during our last conference call. And it was more or less agreed that we are working or this working group has two scopes. One is the overarching picture, or the framework, and the other one is looking at specific implementations. So I think this was more or less agreed. Tijani, you want to reply?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I do agree. I was the first one who thought that we have to agree on the long-term and the short-term in parallel. But we have to do it in separate meetings.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Okay, thank you for this clarification. What's the opinion of this group here? Ron please?

RON SHERWOOD:

To use your metaphor, the architectural one, I think we're building a foundation. And the foundation is learning what the target group is and what the other constituencies believe the use they're going to make of this. And the way we're doing that right now, our first action item, is to devise a methodology through this document that we're sending out asking for input. That will give us a foundation which we can build and let's concentrate on doing that right now.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. Yaovi, you raised your hand?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yaovi. I just want to say that the idea is, what Tijani said if I understand, to be more clear on the agenda. Because today when we talked about target groups, we didn't say if it's the target group for the whole program or for the Leadership Camp. So I agree with him, it should be clear. If not, we'll have two hour discussions. This is the point, and you said we can have these things in different meetings or we have to be clear, as he said, we are talking about the whole Academy or we are talking about the pilot program. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Chuck, you have a comment?

CHUCK GOMES: Sure. And that's what I was trying to get at earlier in the meeting. The information we're going to get back will be broad. And that's fine. We're going to have to look for commonalities and then we're going to have to narrow it down because we can't do a lot of things. Tijani's right. We've got to keep our focus narrow. One of the things we keep doing is that we keep jumping ahead to other things.

Once we have this information and we work on it then we'll be able to narrow it down like you're talking about, and we'll have to, because we can only do so much. It's going to be limited what we can do. So you have this...we're going to get this broad base of information. Only some



of...we're going to have pick from that then. The things we don't pick will be for later.

But we'll pick some things that we agree on this is realistic to achieve and it meets a lot of the needs of the different groups and at that point I think we'll get to the point you're talking about. We do need to narrow the focus at that point, but not in this survey because we need that data to see whether we're really meeting needs. And we know that the communities, that the groups are going to come back with a range of things. We know that's going to be really broad.

But we shouldn't conclude from that we have to tackle all those at once. We won't be able to. But we'll have that for future use and then we'll be able to make a decision in terms of, "Okay, let's zero in on this." And then that will also help us with timeframe, maybe with some of the timeframe information we get. Does that make sense? Did that make sense in terms of the concern you were expressing?

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

It can make sense for the survey, if you are talking about the survey in some ways. But if you have in mind that we are talking about one of the program, that is the most important. But in some ways, having something broader in the survey can be used for the whole picture, yeah.

CHUCK GOMES:

Right, it can. And then we're going to have to pick, "Okay, now do we want to try a pilot? What should we pick out of this to do that?" And we need to keep it separate then, like Tijani is saying.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hong, you have a comment?

HONG XUE: Thanks. When we are doing the study probably we need to be aware of the different structures in different constituencies. I was aware that in GNSO the many stakeholder groups. Unfortunately, in ccNSO there's no stakeholder groups, they're all ccTLDs. So it's treated as one big group. In the future study development we may need to think about those geographical regions, and ccNSO would be equivalent to the stakeholder groups and these more detailed considerations should be taken into the picture.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. I take these comments as something which I will keep in mind by leading the discussion, setting up agendas, and so on and so forth, that we have to be very clear and to the division of talking about long-term or talking about short-term goals. I also agree with what Ron said that we are getting the material for the foundation and I think in the future we might not be that confused because starting from scratch gives us the possibility to build up and fit in the existing things and maybe this question will be somehow obsolete when we say, "Okay, we're starting from the scratch now. We're building the foundation with the material we get."

Okay. I have a quick practical question in this regard, to the group. How can we facilitate or how can we ensure that the survey which will be sent out by this working group will address and will be properly handled



and discussed in the SOs and ACs? I have very less knowledge about other constituency procedures. I can only speak about for the ALAC how this would work, but maybe, Chuck, you can give us some advice how we can handle this and can ensure that we get the feedback in time.

CHUCK GOMES:

Chuck Gomes again. I already mentioned my opinion is the best way for the GNSO is to go directly to each of the stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO. And staff can help with the contacts there in terms of the leaders of those groups. I certainly will push it on the GNSO side and try to do what I can and get the councilors...I'm not on the council, but to get the councilors through that.

With regard to the ccNSO, Hong, you bring up a good point. And I don't know, maybe the ccNSO experts are going to have to tell us there but maybe it goes to the council there. That doesn't work so well on the GNSO. The council could be a coordinating body but it's probably better to go straight to the individual groups. ccNSO is different.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Ron, you have the floor.

RON SHERWOOD:

Yes, I have direct access to the council, and the council I think will be very cooperative and we can easily go to the list. Our job is to make a document that people are going to take notice of, understand, and respond to.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. I see we have covered this. The ccNSO, we have a good contact in there. We have a good contact in the GNSO. Rummy, could you say something about the procedures within ASO?

RUMY SPRATLEY-KANIS: Yeah, at the moment Adam Gosling is in charge of...and he asked me to make sure I keep him informed, he had to leave. So I'll catch up and follow up with him and make sure we...and I have contact with the representative of the ASO as well so if Adam can't do it I'll take over from him.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you very much. We have nobody here from the SSAC, but I have a good connection, a personal connection to Patrick Falstrom from the SSAC so I will contact him personally and Olivier will follow up with the GAC because they are not contributing at all at the moment, but we need but we need him contributing as well. And personally, I will also try to get some information out of personal contacts which I have to the GAC. Did we forget anybody? Chuck?

CHUCK GOMES: Yeah, I'm not going to answer that question because I'm not sure yet. But with the GAC, as I think everybody here knows, we just need to be really careful. They're not going to be able to come back with GAC feedback, okay? But if some leaders within the GAC would be able to



respond just to tell us whether they maybe would benefit from this and if so what would be helpful, that would be good.

But we need to be really clear that we're not looking for GAC official input. We'll never get it, okay? But Heather, maybe the Vice-Chairs of the GAC, maybe even their staff support can help us just kind of get some personal ideas that might be helpful to us from people in that group.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Filiz, you want to answer on this?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Yes. Filiz here, for the record. Filiz Yilmaz. Olga is actually part of ICANN Academy working group here. She's part of the list, so I believe if there is a call out there for that she will be notified, and otherwise we can contact her. I remember her contributing to the previous discussions, especially asking questions about how this could help GAC. So it can be an option. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. I'm still desperately looking for this ICANN overall picture, if I missed a stakeholder group. Did I?

[background conversation]



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. Okay we have agreed on this. We have only 30 minutes left for the discussion, which I would like to use to bring in your ideas about the role staff could play. I want to mention this issue on a very early stage because when Filiz and I were drafting the proposal, the pilot project proposal for Toronto, a pretty controversial discussion came up about staff giving presentations or staff leading this whole project.

And I want us to discuss here, with Filiz representing ICANN staff, what could be the best opportunity to collaborate because I must admit at this point as long as ALAC was pushing this forward we had a very good relationship and a very good collaboration with ICANN staff and we brought this project forward together. And I think in the past there were simply some misunderstanding in this working group and we should use this opportunity to clarify this and to be very clear about our future collaboration. Tijani, you have raised your hand.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. The concern expressed during the last time about the role of the staff in giving the courses or training the group is not founded, in my point of view. I have had a capacity building program for a whole week in Dakar and it was done exclusively by the staff and I was there the whole time and I never felt that the staff tried to bias the trainees in any way. So they are experts in their fields, they are doing their job as technically skilled person and I didn't feel that they politically tried to make a certain bias for the trainees.

So we have to make use of their expertise, we have to make use of their availability. If we want to make the training with external experts we need a lot of money. So I think that we need to make the community



and the staff do the training together. We can make use of the expertise of the community and the expertise of the staff.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Tijani. Hong, you have the floor.

HONG XUE: I fully agree with Tijani. There's nothing else I can say, so he's expressed what I want to say.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I also fully agree. The one thing maybe we just need to do is to find maybe a word. Maybe some people are not comfortable when we are talking about teacher. But we cannot have people...other people than the staff that can very contribute to this program. So this is what I was also adding. Apart the staff, me I can see also the current leaders.

So the staff has to play a very, very important role in this program. So my only comment is we talk about it. We just find a word to use as some people say in the comment. But the staff is the group that can really contribute to this program. This is my comment, so I support what people say. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Any other comments? Chris?

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Yeah, Chris Chaplow. Well just to say, to add really, it looks like something we're all 100% agreed on, that as much help from the staff with this as possible. Yes, thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I'd like to give you some background information on why this discussion is very important for any concrete planning. No matter when we will have a pilot started or on which budget, and Tijani raised this earlier on, budget constraints are always there and we have to organize everything in the most cost effective way. And when we were planning the pilot for Toronto, Filiz and me, we found out that accommodating as much participation as possible can only be done when we use staff, which will not affect the budget, in a very effective way.

So it came up that some of the presentations we proposed where we put some staff member in as a proposed presenter. And this was received not very well by the community because they said this is indoctrination and we don't want this. So when we think about the role of staff we should also think about how much involvement do we want or do we agree on and the training and the teaching process. Chuck, you have a comment?

CHUCK GOMES: I'm a huge fan of staff support because they've helped me in so many ways over the years. But this is a question I don't think we can answer until we first know what target audience we decide on to focus on first,



and the learning objectives there. Then we're going to look at the right skill sets to deliver that. And it's fine with me if that includes staff.

That's fine, but I don't think we can really talk about anybody's involvement in terms of the actual delivery of the training. Sorry about that, I know some people don't like the word "training". I've got to come up with a better one. But we're going to try to get the best qualified people to do it when we get to that point. Until we know the target audience and the learning objectives it's really hard to answer that question.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Chuck. Filiz, you want to say something?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Yes, Filiz Yilmaz here. Thank you. And all I can say is as staff we are happy to help, which ever you see fit. Just let us know. In some cases we will need some time. And in some cases, depending on what you request, we may come back and say unfortunately we cannot do this but we can do partially this part or that part. And we will always rationalize this with what the cause of the problem is, if there is a deliverable issue. But the main point here is we are happy to help, whichever you see fit. Just let us know and we're there for you. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I have a very concrete proposal or request in this regard, to you Filiz. Now that we have Sally Costerton and she will be responsible for



capacity building on a senior level and report directly to Fadi, I think a lot of action and a lot of ideas might pop up in the future about capacity building. And I would ask here again that you or whoever is able to do so can identify those issues and maybe alert the working group and keep them in the loop so that we really avoid any double effort.

I have the fear that when other initiatives are coming up now that we still remain in our silos and that one group is discussing similar thing than actually this working group is discussing. I see the broader scope of this working group; it should not be an ad hoc working group anymore. I think it should be something more like a sub-committee or a committee within ICANN where all the efforts on capacity building are summarized because otherwise this framework we were talking about would be obsolete.

And I would ask Filiz here to help to get all the efforts on one point. If there is a decision that not this working group is in charge of this overarching issue then this is another decision but then we have to...they have to explain and we have to know and we have to discuss. But I think this working group should not be a working group. Maybe rather a subcommittee and all the information and effort should be here. So Ron was first, and then Tijani please.

RON SHERWOOD:

Yes, Ron Sherwood. You know a survey, information gathering which is what we're doing here, falls under communication. And Fadi has said this is one of his prime building blocks for his new methodology for ICANN. And I believe that the staff will be very ready to support us in this particular instance where we're trying to gather information in



order to build our foundation. I think we should take advantage of it. It is cross-community communication, is what we're endeavoring to deal with.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Question, do you have any specific proposal how to start with it?

RON SHERWOOD: Well first of all, within this group we need to come up with the basics of our survey. What information are we trying to gather? We need to do that ourselves and as soon as possible I would think. Once we have that I think if we go to the new communications department in ICANN and say this is what we're attempting to do, we want to do it fast, we want to do it well, we want to do it thoroughly, we want to get to everybody, I think they would tell us just how it can be done and with staff support.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. Tijani, then the next is Chuck.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Until the working group is adopted this working group will work as it is now. When the ICANN Academy is adopted we need a standing committee or a standing anything. Something which is paramount because this structure will be in charge of the work of the ICANN Academy, which will not be a very heavy structure. But something that will be able to harmonize or to look after all things related to the ICANN Academy, which will be working, in this case, day by day.



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. Chuck, you are next.

CHUCK GOMES: Just a brief comment. It would be great if we can get the communications department to support. Let's be careful because they're used to doing pretty formal things and if it causes...unless it can be turned around pretty quickly I think time is more of the essence in this particular case because we're not trying to do a formal survey. But good suggestion, let's just not go that route if it's going to take weeks for them to come back with...if they can do a quick review or something that might be okay.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. I have...Sandra speaking. I have a question in this regard. Will it be possible to set up this survey as an online tool or do we have to work with paper? Staff? Filiz?

FILIZ YILMAZ: I will suggest to keep it simple for the timing reasons as well, and not to make it too official because you are not asking all aspects of ICANN Academy at the moment. You are working for the foundation, the basics. We already have a list that we maintain for communications of the SO/AC leaders, SO/AC leadership. So we have one list that we can push information out for their information.

Once you have that draft...this drafting team comes up with the draft and the working group approves it or even before the approval I can get



it back to our communications department for a proof read, if they have some suggestions in terms of readability and structuring the text because they are experts with writing skills if you would like to use that opportunity. And then we come back, you approve the final version, and then it can go to the SO/AC mailing list. I'm part of that mailing list; I can send it on behalf of the working group. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I consider this as very helpful, also in terms of the communication, how to read that and I would take advantage of that. Any other comments? Ron?

RON SHERWOOD: Can we have a timeline for getting together for making this happen?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Good question. I'm just opening the calendar and we are now in the middle of October. It was mentioned already that the survey, the assessment, should not take longer than one month. One month to be sent out or one month to get feedback? I think one month to be sent out, right?

CHUCK GOMES: That's not what I think. I think we should send it out before this month is over with. Now that means we need to allow time for the broader group to review it, so I would hope that those of us that are on the little drafting team, via email, could get our draft out to the group early next week and give the rest of next week for them to respond, and hopefully

get it out as early as possible in November. And then give them a month to respond. That's my thinking. That's just my thinking.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Chuck, this would mean that we actually have to start working on this survey immediately. Do you think that's realistic, looking at...?

CHUCK GOMES: That's more of a question for you. Can you get a first draft out in the next couple days and then if each of us can just be responsive on email, I'll do my best. Everybody else should speak up.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: My doubt is that many people will not be very responsive on the mailing list because they are caught up here in meetings. That's my fear. What I can do is setting down a couple of questions, which I took from this meeting, to the drafting team for evaluation, to be sent out to the working group for evaluation because they have to have a look at this too. It can, in my point of view, only be done middle of the next week earliest...end of next week. That would be my estimation. Hong and then Ron, please.

YJ PARK: Yeah, YJ Park speaking. I think I support what Chuck just suggested. As Hong mentioned before, just in case if we plan to hold this Academy in Beijing the whole process really needs to be more facilitated in terms of time. So I think even though it might not be convenient for us to send out those things earlier, since we are all attending these meetings



maybe we can organize some meeting for writing the draft together or...if that can help for us to come up with a draft maybe sometime next week. I think otherwise it might be very difficult for us to move forward.

RON SHERWOOD: Yes, if you could get this first template, let's call it that, to us by the beginning of next week I think I certainly will be back by then and I can work on it and have responses to you. I think that we ought to be able to deal with that next week, by the end of the week be in a position to have something that could go out to the working group.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Chuck, you raised your hand? Okay. I have just a question because we have scheduled a more or less informal meeting on Friday, from 10:00 to 12:00. Who is, from this drafting team, is still available on Friday? I know you're agreed already? You're probably not...

RON SHERWOOD: I'm sorry; I'm leaving very early Friday morning.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, Yaovi is not here. We cannot ask him. And Young, are you still here on Friday?

[background conversation]



SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Would you be able to participate in a drafting team meeting on Friday?

YJ PARK: I'm leaving Friday morning.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay.

YJ PARK: So Thursday might be...

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. So Chuck, I would I would propose that we agreed already that we are available and we can actually discuss this draft, which I will set up immediately after this meeting because I have some spare time today. I will send it out to you and we will then put this on our agenda for Friday, next to other issues. I think that's a workable way that's the fastest we can get. Okay. Other questions and comments?

HONG XUE: Yes, so when you finish your draft would you also send out to the whole members of the drafting team as well? Okay, thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, of course, we have to exchange emails after this. Okay. If there are no other questions we almost reached our final meeting time. I would just use the last 15 minutes to summarize. We summarized already the first part of our meeting, how to proceed in a political way. But now I'd



like to summarize how to proceed very concrete. And you might help me if I forget something or let me know if something is unclear and you have questions. So we will send out...and Matt, do you take this down as action items? So I will be rather slowly and you tell me if I'm too quick?

[background conversation]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, so a drafting team was set up by the names already mentioned. You have this in the record? They will draft assessment, a survey, to be sent out to all SOs and ACs. Very general questions, not deciding between two levels but rather very general questions which will build the foundation for any future effort of this working group.

The drafting team, or the first draft will be made by the end of this week and will be discussed, or to be sent out to the working group by the beginning of next week with an expected feedback from let's say one week. I think this is realistic. And we can then, once the survey is evaluated by the working group, we will then send out a survey to ICANN communication. They will have a final look at it, if they can suggest any improvements in terms of wording or clarity.

And it will be then sent out to the SO/AC leadership list as well as to the Chairs of the stakeholder groups, advising committees, and supporting organizations. For the more personal contacts we'll be helpful to engage those SOs/ACs to reply on this survey and we will give them about one month to reply on this survey so that we have an outcome of



our assessment by the middle of...let's say by the end of November to be realistic. Any addendums or questions to this? Ron?

RON SHERWOOD:

Yes, please forgive me if I heard this incorrectly, but I think I heard you say that this will be completed by the end of this week and sent out to the working group early next week. The end of this week is sort of 48 hours away. And I won't be here for part the 48 hours. Did you mean that? I rather thought that we would need next week to complete our work as a drafting team and get it out to the working group, which I believe is everyone that was here today by the end of next week, not the beginning of next week.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Yes, I think you propose a better course of action and I would ask...now that Yaovi is back. Yaovi, are you still here on Friday for a meeting for the drafting team?

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Unfortunately I'm leaving tomorrow.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Okay. So I really think you are right and we should reschedule and say the drafting team has one week to discuss the survey, which is next week. We will start this week and meet on Friday. But we will have time to discuss it for one week. Then it will be sent out to the working group list for evaluation and then we take the proposed course of



action. Have you noted everything? Questions? Okay. Oksana, you have a question?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: No. I just would like to say is that I did not volunteer for drafting team, but I will be here on Friday and I will do my best to help you with it.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. Thank you Oksana. I think the Friday meeting will also be some more informal discussions about proposed way of action. Any other questions or comments? Okay. This is not the case. I really deeply thank you for your patience, for your attention to attend such an early three hours meeting. I'm really very delighted about the outcome of this session and I think we are on a really good way now; we are on a long way. And I consider this meeting as closed. Thank you.

CHUCK GOMES: Thank you Sandra.

[End of Transcript]