
BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (3 of 13)

Saturday, October 20, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:45 CEST

ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Good afternoon. Welcome to the Outreach and Engagement session at ICANN 63. I'm Daniel Nanghaka, the Chair for Outreach and Engagement.

Every time we speak about outreach, everything is a plus. We are succeeding at outreach. We have seen the growing numbers. We have seen ALSs coming up. We have seen individual memberships come up.

But, what is the biggest challenge that we have before us? That is engagement. I hope our Vice-Presidents for Global Stakeholder Engagement are around, as we are going to continue dialoging and understanding why.

I'll reiterate from what Jean-Jacques mentioned, that there is constant engagement and collaboration in EURALO. We have seen the same thing happening in APRALO. But, if we look at what transpired in the At-Large Reviews, three months ago the Outreach and Engagement Group came up with a document, which is the outreach and engagement strategy.

Could you please put up the document?

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.

In this strategy, we have highlighted issues. What are some of the issues that we have highlighted? One was collaboration. We believe that every region comes up with their strategies, which they discuss together with their RALO Chairs or leadership. After coming up with them, then it goes through the approval by GSE, which is [really] perfect.

But, then, still, in the At-Large Reviews proposal that came up, Item #5 of that proposal, [and #12], highlight that there is limited collaboration between the Global Stakeholder Engagement and the RALOs.

We have some an example, like in EURALO, whereby an activity was organized without the engagement of the EURALO Outreach and Engagement team. [inaudible] that there is still collaboration or there is no collaboration.

If you look at that diagram, that organogram, which was brought forward two meetings back, it highlights where we are as far as engagement is concerned. Where does outreach and engagement lie? We have been hearing “outreach.” We have been hearing “engagement.” But, what is our position as far as enhancing discussions or engagement in the policy development processes?

So, still there is a lot of collaboration together with the GSE. Outreach and Engagement will have joint collaboration meeting to discuss what the impact of outreach is their respective regions are. But, there is no joint strategy between GSE and Outreach and Engagement or At-Large.

Allow me to get to our V.P.s for our Global Stakeholder Engagement team. How can we leverage on the engagement between ICANN, the GSE, and together with the RALOs?

I'll begin with ...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Since we have our chair, Maureen, here, she could be willing to answer the question, how we can leverage the GSE to engage more with At-Large?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Daniel. We've just had a discussion with the GSE staff. I think that each RALO is at a different level of developing that relationship between the GSE and the RALO.

But, I think that, first of all, the important aspect of this is the RALO itself. I'm just sort of looking at, for example, with AFRALO and APRAOLO – well, APRALO; may as well take it from the perspective I'm aware of – there is a [strength] within the RALO itself. We're already in a situation where are already working together so that, when we're actually engaging another partner into that relationship, it's an easy progression for us to be able to work with the APAC Hub.

We've been working with Jia-Rong and his team for several years now, but I think that, when we were actually putting together our strategic plan, it was something that was quite energizing because there was everyone – everyone. There was Jia-Rong. There was Joyce. There was Save. Everyone in our senior leadership team, including ALAC members, had input, and we all critiqued each other's input into the plan so that the plan actually made sense.

We already knew we had buy-in with our GSE team, so our plan is actually how it's going to be implemented during the year. I think, first of all, in order to make sure it's going to work, the RALO has to be working effectively first.

[CHERYL LANGDON-ORR]: Excuse me, Holly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Exactly. Here's me trying to say that APRALO works collaboratively.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The left hand of Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: For me, personally, I think that that's the first point. Also, there's an acceptance by the GSE team that they are willing to work with the RALO.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Maureen, for that highlight. That shows that there's a close relationship between APRALO and the GSE as far as organizing some of [events] are concerned.

Allow me to get back to one of the issues that came out of the GSE discussion about the activeness of the ALSs. I'm still going to bring it back to the members in the room. It keeps on coming up that we have a growing number of ALSs, but then there is limited engagement between the ALSs, or their participation is really low.

What could be the challenge coming in as far as getting the ALSs to be engaged? How can we engage more our ALSs?

Let me bring it back to the floor. Is there anyone from AFRALO to highlight the issue of engagement?

Mohamed, you have the floor.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Daniel. I think there's two issues here, and they're distinct. There is the internal RALO activities and how the RALO could have active ALSs participating in meaningful policy development and engagement within the RALO and how that could be facilitated. And there is the RALO relationship with the GSE.

In our case, we have a very good working relationship with the V.P. for African – his team. The RALO has been invited to be part of a drafting of the Africa strategy before it has even been proposed for comments. So, that’s an early engagement that has happened. And it’s not just us. Our representatives were among representatives of other constituencies as well, from ICANN, in those meetings.

We also contributed positively to our regional strategy in terms of that we highlighted some shortcomings. We asked for more support for the Africa region, for the office that has been opened in Nairobi, more resources for Africa, so at least they can cover the region and actively help us.

So, I think we have a good working relationship. Maybe we just need to stress on the issues so that could be resolved. Maybe some budget issues. Maybe sometimes the region is under-resourced, like the case in Africa. Africa is huge, and I think it’s covered by three staff, maximum – two staff and a V.P. So, those there are the issues that maybe we can help with as well. So, that’s in term of the relationship.

Our internal ALS issues? Yes, I guess that’s something that we need to work with your working group on, as well as how we can ensure that our ALSs our active and engaged and have useful webinars that explain issues and active participants from the ALSs and identify active members who could contribute to the policy development and have them come to meetings and do lots of other stuff.

But, I think, in terms of the GSE, we have a very good working relationship. It’s useful, really, to have this engagement continue.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Mohamed. Can we hear from EURALO?

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Hello. I just want to give you a quick report about our outreach and engagement in our region. First of all, I want to emphasize that we are constantly improving our outreach in our region in sending regional people to regional events.

What do I mean by that? Like IGF. So, we had domestic [attendants] in Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, the U.K., Austria, Ukraine, and Switzerland. So, there would be only costs, maybe, for traveling by train. So, we try to keep the budget cost very low.

Then, coming to the next point, to the CROPs in general. So, we will compare the CROPs. In 2017, we had, for the EuroDIG, five slots, and, for the IGF, one.

In 2018, we had for EuroDIG, only three slots, and one for [Republica]. For the IGF this year, there was also only one. It seems like, for the 2019 CROPs, there will be only, finally, three slots. We would be almost reducing off half.

Then, coming to the next point, to the ALSs, there we can say that we have one new member. We got one new member from the Norway chapter of the Internet Society. It seems that we will have two foreseeable decertifications in 2019, and we had one decertification in 2017.

Then, the next important point is also the MOU with the RIPE NCC. We signed an MOU at the meeting in Abu Dhabi, our Chair with the CEO of RIPE NCC. He also attended the RIPE 76 meeting and tried to get deeper relations. We are also planning to have further events with RIPE NCC.

We are also planning to sign a memorandum of understanding with CENTR, but it's just in negotiations. Maybe there will be the signing at the IGF or at some further event.

What I almost forgot is the individual user membership, which is also a very important thing in our region. We have, still, a lot of members which are applying by the website. It's a very good opportunity for members which don't have an affiliation. The barrier to participate is also very low. That's the reason why a lot of people are joining. It's very easy, also, to do that.

We can also see that we have a lot of active members in our working groups from this association. I think it's a very positive way and will push, also, the policy process in our region.

Then, to the last important point, the CROPs Strategic Plan for 2019, I will start with the meeting here. We will have a joint outreach event with the NCSG. There we will discuss some current policy topics and some important things between these groups.

Then, starting with the first event in January, this would be in Brussels: The Internet Governance Week, which is a very interesting event. [We would very like be a participant, as we were] most of the last years, but it seems not very realistic that we will get a CROP slot for this one.

Coming to the next point, this is the DNS Forum in Moscow, which was also very interesting. We would be also very much looking forward to participate, but, unfortunately, we think that there would be also no chance to get a slot for that because we only have [the three].

Another important meeting could be the CDPD (Computer Privacy and Data Protection) event in Brussels, which would be in January as well. Maybe there is a chance to participate. We need to talk with the Regional V.P. of ICANN. [It's] also very interesting, and there are a lot of interesting stakeholders there. I think that could be very fruitful talks as well.

The next event would be the EuroSSIG Summer School in Meissen, which is also [inaudible]. There are almost every year 30 Fellows. Most of them are based in our region. So, we already also recruited a lot of people from there. I was, for example, also a Fellow and can just say, from my own experience, that this is a very, very nice event. There are a lot of like-minded people there which already need to show some ideas and have knowledge in the field of Internet governance. I think this could be also very helpful for the policy process in our region.

The next event would be in May, the [Republica]. I already attended this, thankfully, this year as a CROP-funded participant. I can just say it once again: this would also be very interesting. There are a lot of fancy and young people there. I think this could be also very helpful for our region, to get some new, fresh blood and minds in our policy process.

There are also different stakeholders, like a lot of privacy advocates and people from business as well. It's not directly a multi-stakeholder

model, but still, I think it would be a very good chance just to get some people from different points of views and from the whole of Europe, because it's the biggest event, with around 10,000 participants. There's a chance we can maybe also there have a booth, and maybe a little speech about Internet governance or some related topic.

Then, the next event, as you already know, is the EuroDIG. It would be also likely to have slots there, max. [We] prefer one. There are also several [inaudible] there, which attended every year. Maybe there could be also the chance to focus again on [inaudible] which are very close to The Hague so that we will reduce the cost when people will travel, for example, by train. It's much more cheaper than flying from [inaudible], or maybe directions [inaudible] further away.

Then, the [inaudible] in June. We've never been there in the previous years. We could also consider to allocate a CROP slot there.

Then, lastly, the RightsCon, which is in North Africa this year, so not in our region. But, maybe the next year's could [be] a nice and fruitful conference, where we maybe could do some outreach or even try to present something related to our region.

Thank you very much. Feel free to ask some questions.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, [Matthias], for those updates from EURALO. I'll just simply jump straight to my queue. I have Patrick, then John Laprise, then Alberto.

Patrick, you have the floor. And then Yesim will read the comment.
Thank you.

PATRICK JONES:

Hello. Patrick Jones from the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement team. Thank you for inviting us here to talk to you. So, this was the first I had seen of the outreach strategy document. It would be interesting to hear from you how you think the timing of this document would be factored in. We're already operating under the FY '19 Budget and Operating Plan. So, if this is a brand-new document – and it looks like it is – that would have been created after we had already closed the cycle of community inputs on FY '19. So, we're well into the current year.

But, fairly soon, there will be an opportunity for community input on the FY '20 budgeting process, which will provide a lot of information about the work of Global Stakeholder Engagement. This document might be a very useful input into that process, but we also need to see how we can take the ideas here and align them sooner rather than later.

So, again, this the first we've seen of it, so we need to take this as an input back. We've provided some overview of how the GSE team is collaborating with the Regional At-Large Organizations and collaborating directly with At-Large in the regions.

But, at the higher level, we need to take this an input and see how we can build this in to the larger description of engagement in the ICANN operating plan.

So, thanks.

DANIEL NAGHAKA: Thank you very much for that. I'd like to invite you to the Subcommittee of Outreach and Engagement still, whereby we can still collaborate more on this document.

Thank you very much. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. One comment that was made earlier – and this relates to engagement in ALSs – is that we have to remember, I think, that not all ALSs are equal. Not every ALS is going to be equally engaged, regardless of its membership.

I know we've had cases in the past where a handful of members of a particular ALS are highly engaged in ICANN and the bulk are not. So, we have to be honest with ourselves when we're evaluating the ALSs in our regions about what's the likely level of engagement because there may be a cap on that. We may not ever be able to get the level of engagement we want with a particular ALS, but that's for the ALSs' side, not for us to decide.

So, just a call to be realistic about ALS engagements on a case-by-case basis. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, John. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

I agree with the communication and outreach we are carrying out, but I believe we need something else which we should do. We have been talking with the incoming ALAC members, with the Chair and Secretary Elect of our region, and with the V.P., and I believe we are smoothing out the cooperation and collaboration, so much so that we are not going to one IGF or one multi-stakeholder event, but rather going directly to the end users within the umbrella of the meetings that our ALSs are holding already. So, maybe GSE will cooperate with us, and they have committed to do so, maybe with some [inaudible], with some [inaudible].

But, basically, we need to share the information through the meetings that are already being held by the ALSs to communicate that message and take that feedback from the end users because we are the representatives of the end users, and we need their feedback.

I really commend the fact that we all may go an IGF meeting, to a large meeting, and communicate what we are doing. But, I believe, if we go beyond that, we will be putting a cap to some criticism we are receiving. We might be able to say, “We are doing this with the end users and for the end users,” because we will [inaudible] this.

When I say this, it means that maybe not even the funding is the most important thing. But, what do we need? Which is a trending topic right now? Ecuador will be holding, in a few weeks, some meeting. So, what is the message GSE wants to spread at that Ecuador meeting?

I am thinking of what Maureen said earlier on, a metrics-based system where we are all sharing things with everybody else, why we’ll need to

work with Daniel. Because I will need some information, some input, and we will have to share ideas about what I have just been mentioning. That metrics is an all-encompassing one.

So, with one step we take, we will be reaching one, two, three, or four themes simultaneously. This is an answer to what you said (he's pointing), a question she asked. This is a question Sarah asked. Sarah asked this, and I'm telling her that the way we're going to work is that we ourselves will discuss all the issues and define how we can tackle those concerns. But, it comes from a metrics. It's not a vertical kind of work.

This is my opinion, at least. I believe it's something cross-cutting.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you, Alberto. When we begin speaking about the metrics, the metrics is one of the key tools. Thereby, we need to begin identifying ways in which we are going to measure all this.

So, probably an action point that I'm picking from this is suggestions of what we should be able to consider for the metrics. That is probably a discussion that we can probably prepare ourselves or put at the back of our minds before the next outreach and engagement meeting.

If I'm to go back to the agenda discussion, there is still a challenge of collaboration and outreach and engagement activities. Every region has identified their ICANN-organized events with are CROP-possible trips.

How many of us are having engagement sessions in this or reaching out with this? Are we discussing with [inaudible] which activities they are organizing or they are not? Then, how can we be able to leverage on some of these organized events to be able to enhance engagement and contribute to the PDPs? Because we are always seeing the same new faces discussing the same mindsets and having the same knowledge. How can we be able to leverage with this?

John, is that an old hand?

JOHN LAPRISE: Oh, sorry.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Also, Maritza wanted to say something, and Vanda. So, Maritza then Vanda. Maritza, you have the floor.

MARITZA MINANO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm going to speak in Spanish. I believe what Alberto has said is very interesting. But, nevertheless, I'd like to mention something which should be borne in mind so as to be able to tackle this issue of engagement of Latin American people in the IGF meetings, for example, because, if we look at the participation and at the themes in which the Latin American people are interested within the IGF, it's very limited.

Why? Because there is no incentive for those people to go to those meetings. Even if they get the sponsorship, they don't get the funding.

This happened to me. I had three proposals that were approved, but I wasn't able to attend a meeting because the funding wasn't there. Many people, even within ALAC, were aware of this. I had three proposals, but as there was no funding, I wasn't able to attend the IGF meeting.

Of course, there are a few people in Latin America who [don't] submit proposals because, if they accept it, how would they travel to that place? And, if they get the proposal authorized, it's not easy. Sometimes you submit a proposal and a committee decides whether to accept them or not. In IGF, it's different, because you have to go through several approval processes. And we know how the processes go. It's very difficult to get a proposal approved. Sometimes, you don't get your proposal approved or authorized.

From LACRALO, and the leadership of Humberto and myself, we suggested that, in the case of CROP, which was later on reduced – and we know that there good will there, but, well, unfortunately, the funding for this was not accepted.

But, I believe we should have some incentives for the people in the community who get a proposal at this approved, because it's very good for the community, from the [repetitional] point of view. I'm talking about this from the academic point of view, because this would drive ALSs to do research because most ALSs participate, communicate, and share. But, through research, they should be able to reach more people in Latin America. Latin American has very powerful ALSs.

There are also similar ALSs elsewhere, but the funding for the ability of traveling to those meetings is not always there because we could tell these people, “Come along, learn, and research, and you will be able to reach another community – universities and other organizations – that are also sponsoring communication and collaboration.”

Thank you very much.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Before you go, let Yesim first read the comment. Then, you can have the floor. Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Daniel. This is Yesim Nazlar from staff. We have a comment from one of our remote participants. His name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev says, “It would be good to have outreach events of interest to At-Large posted to the outreach calendars. Awareness of possible outreach events beforehand can assist RALOs deciding on what events should be prioritized for outreach. Thank you.”

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. As Alberto said, I have been doing these kinds of agreements with many organizations in Brazil, together with our [inaudible] for ICANN.

That is Daniel. We have been working for just presenting during some events that [are already] running there. They open a floor for us for some minutes, and we can talk. We can distribute fliers.

That is very interesting, especially in large country like Brazil. This can be expanded. It seems there will be some formal intention of agreement, like an MOU (memorandum of understanding), from LACRALO, with other organizations related to the issue, like ISPs or universities related to intellectual property. Well, there is a lot of them that LACRALO could make some, in my region, formal agreement with, and we can go again and talk again about the issue that we are deciding to talk about in that specific meeting.

So, there is no money involved in that, so it's more for people in our country, that is a large one. People that live in the northeast go to the northeast. People from the south go to the meetings in the south. I'm from [Sao Paulo and Rio]. I go in that region.

So, I just come from one large one that is [inaudible], and we sit together and do some presentation about the new gTLDs just to talk about this with the businesses over there.

So, there's ways that we can always improve our participation with less money involved in that. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Vanda. You bring up a very interesting. I think this is a very interesting point for GSE to note, in that, once GSE happens to organize activities or events within a specific region, who are the

nearest ALS members who can be able to attend the respective event? And are they available? Then, at least, speaking [inaudible] information can be shed during that. I think that also helps to attract different ALSs, because who are these key targets? These key targets are found in these meetings that are organized because we need them to promote the mandate for ICANN.

Still, based on the comment that Dev gave from the remote participants, it's really interesting because there is this calendar that is being tracked. So, it's the duty for the Co-Chairs to keep on updating that calendar.

But, also, since it was mentioned that, also, GSE has their respective calendar, how can these calendars be managed together? Because, previously, we happened to participate in a call for where we're going to find the potential Fellows for the Fellowship Diversity Program? There is a series of activities that got listed. All these begin to act as potential for reaching out to new members, individual members, and new ALSs. I think that is one important thing that we need to look at.

Still, to continue with this discussion, with all that is happening, there is always a review implementation on what the respective deliverables are. So, I'm going to ask, still, Maureen, or Cheryl, if she's in the room, to be able to update us on the At-Large Review implementation [inaudible] deliverables as far as outreach and engagement is concerned.

Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Daniel. One of the important issues that we'll be discussing as far as the impact on At-Large of course is the At-Large Review implementation plan, which we're also very much a part of.

But, I think there were about five different implementation issues that actually impacted or included in some way outreach and engagement. I think that one of the things that I've actually asked Daniel to do is to try to incorporate into the discussions that you have here – to try to get some feedback on how we can improve some of those areas in which outreach and engagement seem to be an issue.

I'm just going through some of these. For example, in the actual review, there were 16 issues. What we've done is we've pared it down to eight, eight in which we are going to focus. Of those eight, I think there are about four that are to do with outreach and engagement.

So, it seems to be that even the reviewers – and it was something that the ALAC agreed in part, that there were ways in which, I think, as Daniel said – it is the outreach, and it's good that we're having discussions on ways in which we can do outreach. It's not so much the outreach that we need to be worried about. It's the engagement.

I think, if you actually had access to the implementation plan and the issues that relate to outreach and engagement, one of the things that the ALAC is very concerned about is how we can actually address those issues that are part of the project that we're actually having to do. And

we've got to get it to the Board by December. But, how can we address those particular issues that relate to outreach and engagement?

One of the things that was brought up earlier was the ALSs and the effectiveness of our ALSs and whether our ALSs are actually a good fit for what it is that we are doing in ICANN and what we are doing in At-Large, more specifically.

So, as part of the implementation plan, there is an issue that is actually going to focus on a review of our whole ALS process. It probably won't affect the ALSs who are already engaged with us. We will have to work with them. But, it will impact later on the ALSs that we actually engage. We'd like to think that they actually know about ICANN, they know about what we do, that that knowledge base is already there in order for them to want to become more engaged.

I think that, for us, that has to be the starting point because, otherwise, it gives GSE a very difficult road to hoe, if we, say, open [inaudible], put in a whole lot of [people] and say, "Okay, you guys. Help us with engagement." I don't think that that's actually going to be an effective way of having real engagement within At-Large.

So, I think that there's a whole lot of different issues that we need to be looking at. What we're doing within the implementation plan is that we will look at those issues that relate to outreach and engagement. We'll look at the steps or ways in which we can address the issue that was in the proposal, but also look at continuous improvement. How can we actually move some of those issues that were in the At-Large Review, which I'm not supposed to mention? But, there were some realities in

there which I think we need to take note of. We'll do that down the track. It's not something that we will need to address urgently.

I think everybody is pretty on track as far as saying, "The engagement part of this whole outreach and engagement is what we need to address."

I don't know whether I've answered your question or whatever, but that's on top for me, anyway. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Maureen. And for that, I can see we have Humberto. Or is that an old hand? Or ...

Okay. So, we have Satish. Satish –

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Oh, sorry. I really want to speak.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Oh, okay.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I'm going to speak in Spanish. My comment is related to what Maureen has just said, specially Item #13, the need for more participation in regional events. That, in turn, is related to what Marita said.

For example, my idea was that we could describe defense mechanisms [abusers] in the light of reverse domain name hijacking in Latin America

and the Caribbean. But, for that project, I need to have ALSs in the corresponding countries, and there's no way I can encourage them to participate in this type of project. If ICANN does not help all of us, I will not be able to do this. I think this is an important tool to make progress in defending the rights of Internet users, at least in the Latin American and Caribbean region.

Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Daniel. From what Maureen just stated vis-à-vis the ALSs and improving their performance, I think outreach and engagement has to factor in the issue that ICANN has changed. Our ALSs have been building up for I don't know how many years, from 2008 onwards. That's about ten or twelve years. Maybe ten years. With the ICANN of then and the ICANN of now, there is a lot of difference.

The expectations from At-Large have changed significantly. We have a lot of ALSs which have originated at a time when the situation was different.

So, the question is, how does one address that issue, together the issue that we are no longer focusing only on organizations. We have individual members, who also have to be taken into the equation.

Our outreach and engagement process also has to consider the individual membership. The outcome of our outreach should not be only targeted at organizations, and, consequently, the metrics, as well as their activities, I think should take into account the issue of individual members as well.

So, in summary, what I'd like to propose is that, given the fact that our ALSs are not necessarily what we would like from a futuristic perspective as we look forward, what do we do to ensure that all our activities, including outreach and engagement, also fall into this pattern?

Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Satish. On the line, we have Dev, who is going to walk us through a very short demo of the tool, just a gist of what he's going to have.

Dev, are you there?

Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Hi. Can you hear me?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

We can hear you loud and clear.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, great. [inaudible]. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Just a note that the ICANN stakeholder tool has been updated. I'll post a link to the direct tool right now. It has been updated in time for ICANN 63. It was literally rebuilt from scratch [inaudible]. It should be a little bit faster. Also, the stakeholders by country is much more streamlined.

I'll be doing a more formal presentation when the GSE meets in the next At-Large session. So, [inaudible] be doing a more formal demo.

But, my point is that this stakeholder tool does allow everybody in At-Large, in one place, to find out what our strengths are and what our weaknesses are in terms of our – and we can then decide in a more targeted outreach study, “Okay. We have this list of countries that don't have an At-Large presence. Let's go through the list and see which ones to prioritize for outreach.” Given our limited CROP, we have [a little] discretionary funding, etc. I think that's it. And of course I'll be happy to answer any questions.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Dev. I invite you still to be available for the comprehensive demo of the tool that you'll be coming in later on for during the day.

Just to continue with our discussions, still on outreach and engagement, we have the IGF that will be coming up. Glenn, could you please update us on what is transpiring at the IGF? Glenn, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yeah. The IGF is Paris this year. It's three days. We have a booth. It's an ISOC and ICANN ALS booth. It's a shared booth. We managed to get one that's number 24, if I recall. So, we're looking for people who are here that are going to Paris to volunteer and help us with the booth, but there's a lot of people from ISOC who already said they will volunteer. But, I think we'd like to kick up that number of ALSs that are going to Paris.

A number of us are doing presentations. I know Satish is doing one on blockchains. Maureen are you doing – oh, she's tied up. Anyone else doing a presentation? I have a long list, and I've created a flier that I'll be distributing at the booth. Tijani – sorry – is doing two sessions as well.

I think that's basically it. We will have a request to make sure, before I go, brochures from all of the RALOS [are made]. We didn't have anything from LACRALO in Geneva last year. So, pins. I'm not sure about banners. I have to talk to staff about supplying banners. But we'll have a booth. We'll have a tablecloth. We'll have it throughout the entire time that we're there.

Plus, we have an online sign-up sheet. So, last time we had 137 leads, and then we distributed it to the various different people. But, we had just a manual sign-up sheet and lots of Mickey Mouse and Donald Ducks. There was a lot of scribble. It was really hard to read some of them. I think they're just to get the power converters, so they came back in droves. I said, "Didn't I recognize you before?" "Yeah." So, this time

we don't really have anything to give away. I'll be attending it. I'm not using any CROP or discretionary funds.

So, back to you, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Glenn. I also encourage everyone who is going to be at the IGF to please sign up to be at the booth, as, so far, we only three sign-ups to be at the booth – three or four. Glenn, are you going to be able to work on that?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I apologize. He was whispering in my ears. Would you please repeat the question?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah. I was inquiring how many have signed up to be at the booth at the IGF?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Well, it's just like this problem here. People keep saying, "I'll help, but I don't know my schedule." So, it's, again, repeating for people who, if they know their schedule, you should really know your schedule if you're going to the IGF. There's really not enough people yet who have signed up. I know Satish and Tijani are very reliable. They have signed up, but we really need more bodies.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. I'm short on time, but I'm going to ask Marita to give her remarks in one minute, and Satish to give his in one minute.

Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Okay. I just want to harken back to something Humberto said. I hope I understood him correctly. This was about rivers and streams and talking to your ALSs about how they feel about that. I think that's what you were concerned about or trying to do.

Absolutely. If we could get any input from a bunch of ALSs that said, "This is how we feel about it," that may coincide with how I feel about it, and it may not. But, it would hold some weight. It would hold some weight in the Work Track 5 stream, where nobody except people come from a certain point of view. Very few other people are saying anything.

So, this is the sort of place where I see the outreach and the policy work coming together. It's not happening to me. I don't see it happening, certainly not in this particular area. So, if we can get anything like that going, that would be wonderful.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Satish?

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Daniel. Just a technical point on the booth at IGF Paris. Since this is EURALO and other RALOs are not allowed to spend any

funds on whatever little costs that might happen, all of us are traveling on our own, and there's no funding from ICANN this year. But, even the discretionary funds cannot be used outside the region. So, in case there are some small expenses at IGF, EURALO alone can help out.

So, I leave it open to you, Daniel, if you can talk to EURALO and see what they could do. We were happy to provide funds, but we are not allowed to.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. I think we shall engage that discussion. [I] probably shall be updating you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can I just make a comment on that? Sorry.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Let Heidi make a comment on this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. Just very quickly, exactly on that topic, Maureen and I have been discussing that. As we move forward the fiscal year '20 additional budget requests (ABRs), you might wish to ask that those criteria that, again, for this past [year] expanded to go from local travel to regional travel be even more expanded to allow for travel. So, you could go to the IGF.

So, just a thought there.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much for that clarification, Heidi. Amrita, you have the floor.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you so much. When we are talking about the outreach, since I work a lot on capacity building, you might be discussing a lot of things, a few points from me.

Funding is an issue. So, I am looking at issues where funding is not so much involved. One is the more proper coordination with the GSE team, which, to a certain extent, at the Asia-Pacific region we have.

For example, the GSE team already has a set of events which they would be participating in or sponsoring. Similarly, the RALOs that their own events. Perhaps a merger or a discussion that, wherever GSE is going – and if there is an ALS member, etc. – they could be invited. They can participate.

So, that would also, to a certain extent, take care of the issue we have today of many ALSs not participating. 100% participation is never possible, but we can increase it from 30% or 40% to at least 50%. So, that would be an achievement. A least when they go to the local country or the city, we could have the ALSs invited. They might go there.

Many ALSs who have joined at large at some point – ICANN might be changing, but they joined with a certain objective. So, it is not that they are not interested. Perhaps they are not excited enough to participate.

Or, the leadership has changed, so perhaps people below do not get the information because, after all, the mail goes to one person. It doesn't go to everyone. So, perhaps checking who is getting the mail, whether they are involved in the organization, may make sense.

So, those were the two points I wanted to make. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much, Amrita, for those remarks. Yeah, time isn't our best friend, but also, our interpreters are doing a tremendous job. Unless you have something that is really burning, I'd like to give the floor to Maureen to be able to tell us her strategy for ATLAS 3 engagement and outreach because I know this has been a discussion that has been happening over time. What are they going to do with the metrics? Which kind of metrics are they looking at? Is there something new?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Olivier.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Olivier could also contribute to this, but I'm not sure ...

MAUREEN HILYARD: With regards to this ATLAS 3, which we are working towards, Olivier is the Co-Chair who's actually – and I'm talking about just Olivier as the Co-Chair in charge of programming. He is working with Eduardo.

The programming is something, of course, that's going to be the whole focus of the ATLAS when we actually do organize it. But, there are some very interesting processes that we must put in place before we start looking at what we're actually going to be doing at the event in Montreal.

Of course, the biggest thing – I'm sure a lot of people who are here have already been part of those earlier discussions, where we were looking the fact that only 60 travelers will be invited to go to this event because of the constraints that we have with the funding, which we won't mention any more about. It's a reality, and the issue – that's something that the ATLAS 3 will be looking at – is to do with the metrics that are involved in looking at participation.

I think that one of the things I must mention is that Humberto mentioned before about the metrics, that usually, when you're talking about policy or participation and engagement, which is really what we're going to be looking at – and the participants who do eventually come to ATLAS 3 – it may not necessary knowledge about any of the high-level knowledge. It's to do with participation within – for those who may have seen the way that At-Large will be operating within three different streams, one stream is policy, but the other stream is outreach and engagement. The third stream is organizational activities.

People participate in different levels and in different activities, so participation is sort of relative. We will be keeping metrics on all aspects of engagement within At-Large. That's how it will be monitored.

But, I'm not quite sure if Eduardo – I don't know if Olivier is actually even listening to this, but, Eduardo, would you ... Eduardo, have you guys been planning anything with regards to programming or anything like that that you could perhaps convey to our group here at the moment?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Programming is for what we're going to do in ATLAS 3. [inaudible]. Yes, I have been thinking about some ideas from lessons learned from the previous ATLAS.

For example, if we're going to have these work groups that are going to break out in small groups to talk about specific issues – whatever things we're going to talk about – those things are to be very structured.

What happened last time, for example, is that somebody made a comment [inaudible]. That was a thing that came out of the final report. We didn't know who said it and what it was all about. We went, at the end, all crazy finding out what this was doing here.

That's why we have to get something very formal: so we know who said it, why, what was the motivation behind it, and stuff like that. That's the type of programming that I'm talking about.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much.

EDUARDO DIAZ: And, probably we have some event for fun, like networking and things like that. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: So, obviously, a work in progress. But everyone will be ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now is [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh. Hang on. Hang on.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm the Chair.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: So ... Time isn't our best friend. Unless it is really very much a burning issue, I'm going to ask the interpreters to give us, like, an extra two minutes [inaudible] and be able to hear from ... how many? I have Sebastien, I have Olivier, and who else? I saw one ... okay. Let's hear from those two, and then we shall be able to close.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I know there is work done by some people already, but it's not yet open. I want to come back to what I tried to say during a call. It happened that I was in Montreal a few months ago. It happened that I spent some time to meet all the ALSs who are in Montreal. I even met people living in Montreal who are not ALSs, like the Chair of ALAC. From those discussions, I can say that they are really willing to engage and to participate. But, we need to ask them.

My second point. The local leader is the head of .quebec. It could be also useful to have him involved in one way or another. He's a good friend of us. He's a good friend of ICANN. It could be useful.

My last point is that, when we talk about the 60 people, they're the ones who will be supported by the ICANN budget. When I discussed with the Chairs of two ALSs, we were talking about, for example, Francophonie and what Francophonie can do because the Minister of Francophonie in Quebec can be a good tool to invite people from other countries from Francophonie. [inaudible] from Africa, I guess. Therefore, we need to see all that. If we involve them now in the discussion, it could be a good way to have more people participating.

My last point is that, if there are local people who are engaged and participate in the ATLAS, is it something we want? We don't want? We need to think about that. If you have 15 people or 50 people coming from Montreal, what do we do? Are we happy, or we unhappy? It's something we need to discuss. I hope that you will find that information useful. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Olivier, you have one minute.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Daniel. I just knocked my knee, and the whole length of the table went. I was going to, since I've been asked on the ATLAS 3, add to a few points that were made. Thanks, Sebastien, for mentioning the points that you have made.

60 is the base that we're working on, the base number of travelers, in addition to the already traveling 30. So, were always saying 60 people. 60 people, yes, plus the people who are already traveling here, which is another 30. So, that's 90 people, plus the people that will be local, whom I believe will probably not require travel funding but will be able to use discretionary funds from the RALO. So, that's going to be another set of people in addition to this, plus any sponsorship that we might be able to get, plus, as Sebastien said, anything from Francophonie and these organizations.

There are several groups that are being created for ALTAS 3 that are going to be populated from this point onwards. One is about sponsorship, and it's not just sponsorship about getting ourselves some free meals and nice little events with a band or something, but we're talking, perhaps, of sponsorship of participants if we can find this. We have to put our minds together and make up a list and then approach these organizations, like the Francophonie.

Second, the other group is the Program Committee, as was mentioned early. That's actually a sort of hold-all group type thing, an umbrella group that will then require several subgroups underneath for specific points. One will be the actual program itself. One will be the actual workshops themselves because, when you look at the overall room allocation, which we've already had to work on this Gisella – trust me, it's not exciting to deal with room allocations. A bloody bore. But still, we had to do this already so far in advance because we had to know how many rooms we needed at any one time.

So, we've got a vague idea now of how many workshops and how many Plenary sessions. A Plenary session can be anything between a capacity building session or a session where everybody discusses a topic. We've got that. We need to fill this up now with the different things. We will need several subgroups to come in there, and several chairs of those subgroups.

This is where I make the appeal right now that I don't want to be the Chair, the Sub-Chair, the Sub-Sub Chair, or the Triple-Sub Chair. I know friend Eduardo here is also in the same situation. We have – well, we're supposed to have lives outside of ICANN as well. So, we're going to need more chairs and more groups to work on these issues and share the load to build the thing.

Last before I go, I know, with outreach and engagement, as was mentioned earlier today, it's going to be hard to do outreach as such with having new people coming to this meeting because of the selection criteria. But, what we're trying to do, actually, is to take

people who might already be active and boost them. In other words, [some would say, if there was a payment], “We’re going to boost your career. You’re going to go to the next level.” That’s exactly what we’re looking for. Unfortunately, the only thing we can offer is pins. “You’ll get a new pin.”

Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Olivier, for that. Just as I wrap up, thank you very much for coming to the Outreach and Engagement session. I’d like to thank our interpreters for the great work that they have done.

Also, one thing is that you realize that we did not go through the items on our agenda. Please, we are going to continue with this discussion in the next call. Today is the 20th. We’re trying to keep the days constant, so probably on the 20th of next month we shall be having the next Outreach and Engagement call taking place.

So, lastly, please sign up to attend the EURALO booth. The sheet is there, and you’re all welcome. Thank you.

El gracias.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Muchas gracias.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Muchas gracias.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, everyone. Thank you. We are running a little bit late today. Maureen, would you like to give everyone a three-minute break, so we can start on time? Or would you like to give them a ten-minute break and start a few minutes late?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just three minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: A three-minute break. So, okay. Everyone gets a three-minute break.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]