
LONDON – ALAC Work - Part II
Tuesday, June 24, 2014 – 16:30 to 18:30
ICANN – London, England

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome back, everybody. Let's start the recording please. Good afternoon, everyone. I hope you've had a good break. We're starting. Ladies and gentlemen, please? Yes, there was a break. It didn't feel like it. It went very fast but there was a break indeed. Thank you very much. Okay.

Welcome back, everybody. This is the ALAC Work Part II on Tuesday, June 24, 2014. Same house rules as before. Say your name before you speak. Speak slowly, which is something that I sometimes don't do, so don't do as I do but do as I say please.

And now we have the next part and the first thing is a feedback from all of our working groups, an update, and looking at the next steps. We have the Academy Working Group, the At-Large Social Media Working Group, the Technology Taskforce, the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, the Capacity Building Working Group, the Internationalized Domain Name Policy Working Group, the new gTLD working group, the At-Large Ad Hoc ICANN Accessibility Working Group, the At-Large Subcommittee on Metrics.

And the final thing which is the incorporation of the ATLAS II thematic groups into the At-Large working groups because, as you know, we have several thematic groups and we will have to fold them after the At-Large Summit into our regular working groups. And I hope that the

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.

members of those thematic groups will be very glad to join the ongoing working groups.

So without any further ado, let's go over to Sandra Hoferichter for an update on the Academy Working Group. And having sat earlier on the overall ICANN working group that deals with the Leadership Training Programme, etc., I can see that there's been a lot of work done. And there is going to be a new leadership program taking place at the AGM this year in Los Angeles. Sandra, are the slides ready? Yes? Over to you, Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you, Olivier. It was announced in the program that I want to get – or that I want to ask a question on the ALAC specifically and all RALO chairs to agree on the procedure how to select the fellows, the participants for the next Leadership Training Program. Slides are up. If you just go to the third slide.

We had our working group meeting today already and it was a very good working group meeting. I just want to show you very quickly where we are. This is fine, Suzie. If you just go to the first. The one with the dots. Exactly. This is where we start and then next slide I give you a sign. Thank you very much.

I still owe you this presentation because I remember during the last meeting in Singapore, I was not able to show that to you because it was due to transformation into a PDF and it was not really visible. You might remember that we were looking at the Academy as a pyramid model in the past and it turned out that this pyramid structure was not sufficient

in a way to mirror all the efforts and to describe the complex ICANN system very well.

So after the pilot program in Buenos Aires, the group and some other people worked on a new form of explaining all the efforts within, learning efforts within ICANN. And what you actually see are all the different programs which are currently underway or going to be developed.

We have the online learning platform, which is now launched as the ICANN Learn. We have a Leadership Training Program which took place for the first time in Buenos Aires. We have the fellowship program. We have ICANN.org's website as a great source of capacity building as well. And we have special programs from all SOs and ACs, which perform their own little capacity building programs. Next slide, please.

Here you can actually see we added the different groups and we decided not to look at the people from their constituency or from their stakeholder group but we look at the people as they come into ICANN either as a fellow, as a newcomer, as an observer, as a research expert, as a contributor, or as a leader, as an ambassador and staff.

And if you think about it, you can actually enter and exit this circle on any stage. Yaovi Atohoun was a very good example. He was assigned, or he was at least one point, he was a fellow. Later on we became an ALAC member. He was a contributor and a leader, and now he is ICANN staff. He might end up as a researcher later. Pardon? No, he reached not the peak. He can go back actually to enter as a newcomer in a new

constituency. So that's actually the beauty at ICANN, that you can become any role at any time. Next slide, please.

Well, this working group, we're looking into the options how to find your way. This is probably a good example. If you enter as a newcomer, you take all the green dots and take all the programs which are very helpful for a newcomer, and might leave the circle as an observer and come back later on at a later stage. Next slide, please.

The same applies for if you enter as a researcher. You might get back as a researcher, as an observer, you might get back as a researcher or an expert. There are various ways in entering and exiting this circle and looking at the different things. I don't want to go too much into detail. Suzie, next slide, please.

I just want to give you a very quick update. And further, further. No, skip that all too. One more. No, next slide, next slide. Next slide. Exactly.

Now, I want to quickly give you a review of the Leadership Training Program which took place in Buenos Aires – next slide, please – which is going to place in Los Angeles. The Buenos Aires pilot program was a four-day program and it was stated that it's actually too long – four days – to keep people away from their offices with the subsequent ICANN meeting.

We will have again around 25 participants from all SOs and ACs, and of course the Board. And it will be more of a combination between a facilitation skills training and an orientation training. Last time we did it separately. We had the facilitation program first, two days, and then we

had the orientation course on the other two days. And overall this was four days.

We were, from the feedback we received, people said it's better to merge those two elements to keep the interactivity up for all these three days. So therefore we are now looking into a combination of this and it will be three days only.

I'd just like to remind you – and this is important now for those who which where we asked, when we were going to find consensus about this – the target group for this Leadership Training Program are incoming and current leaders, which means – next slide, please.

When you look at the list of participants later on, you will see that you have ICANN veterans like Olivier. He is a Chair. He is a current leader. And we had also participants like Rafid. He was an incoming leader through the NomCom. And the balance between those two groups, it's very important for this program because we cannot provide just the program for newcomers. We need also those who have the experience within ICANN already to explain and to mentor the incoming leaders.

This is the distribution of seats for 2014. It is more or less the same as for 2013. We have generally assigned two seats for each stakeholder group, except the ALAC which has five regions so we will have one seat for each region, except for the GNSO because they have a very diverse structure with their two houses and the constituencies within, so they get nine seats. And the GAC, because it's quite a big group, requested also three seats.

Overall we are dealing with 29 participants, knowing that some of them will – not all of them will be able to participate. You have always late minute cancellations. So we expect around 25 participants on site. Next slide, please.

This is the program, how it looks like. This year it's not important that you can't read the details now. It's just to show you it will be three days and it will be a mixture of interactive facilitation skills part, of breakout sessions, of orientation sessions, and it will be a three-day full-day program, and it will be the three days before the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles from Wednesday to Friday. We have to take these dates because on Saturday, the GNSO starts already working and we had this problem last year that they had to leave early, which was really a pity. Next slide, please.

And now it's really important that we agree within the ALAC how we are going to select the participants which participate in this program. The call for application will be out after London. We will invite all the SOs and ACs to send us according to the seats they got assigned their participants. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned, we have one seat per region. It should be decided within each RALO and the ALAC because it is for the leadership level, only it is for RALO Chairs, RALO secretariats, ALAC representatives and so on and so forth. It is extremely important to balance the incoming and the current leaders, as I said already, because the experienced leaders, they are also asked to facilitate a session. So we will not assign a special trainer for the Leadership Training Program, but we will ask the experienced leaders to give us a session on a topic they are very good

at. And we have to consider also the NomCom selectees, which we don't know yet. Next slide, please.

So this is the list of participants from 2013 from the ALAC. Beran was unfortunately not able to participate because she didn't get the visa in time, but all the other people who are there on the list participated in the last year's program.

We had a very good balance. Avri Doria and Olivier Crépin-Leblond were the experienced leaders, and Rafid and Leon were the incoming leaders via the NomCom and I think this was a very good balance to reflect how the ALAC works and how we are going to function and bring the new people up to speed. Next slide, please.

Regarding the selection procedure, last year there was a huge discussion on the list. This was not very ideal, the way we did it but I apologize again. It was a pilot program and we had to keep the balance somehow and include the NomCom incoming leaders.

I see two possibilities to deal with that issue. The first one is we leave it to the RALOs. We ask each RALO to decide whom they want to send to the program. The problem or the challenge I see here is how can we ensure that we balance between incoming and experienced leaders? Because if very RALO, for instance, sends an incoming leader, then we have not the balance we need for this program, and we might end up with a group of newcomers only and are not really able to contribute on a substance about the ALAC.

Option two is that each RALO nominates two possible participants, one incoming and one experienced leaders, and then the ALAC decides

finally whom to choose, keeping gender balance and balance between incoming and experienced leaders, and also considers the NomCom selectees which are not yet known.

I would like to ask at this stage if there are any questions, any comments. And then I would like to ask the room if we can agree on one of these procedures.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sandra. And I wasn't paying attention as to who was the first one to put their hand up. I'll go from the closest to me to the furthest. So let's start with Leon Sanchez, then we'll have Alan Greenberg, and then Eduardo Diaz. So Leon, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Olivier. Sandra, this is a very useful program as we spoke in our earlier meeting today. And I was wondering, there are five seats for the ALAC, one for each region, but then again, I think that I don't know if there's the possibility to increase the number of seats for people participating on the program because it would be useful that while – for example, I have been a participant on previous programs. For example, Fatima, which also belongs to the LACRALO region, didn't have the opportunity to take that chance.

While I am willing to share what I've learned with others, then if I'm considered to that, Fatimata would automatically be unable to participate in the next round of this program. So I was wondering whether there's a chance to increase the number of seats so both the

ones who have already participated in the program and those who haven't had the chance to participate are able to share those learning with each other.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Leon, of course Fatimata can apply. She can apply as an experienced leader, meanwhile. So this is possible. I know I work very close with Heidi that the budget is still very tight for this program and each participant means more costs. And this is at the moment truly not realistic.

On the other hand, I must say knowing or having the experience from summer schools and other foras, I know that a group of 25 to 30 is the best group you can work with in this manner. Everything which is broader than that is not such an intense training anymore with breakout sessions and so on.

The third point is we have to look for the needs of the other groups as well, because if we can justify the five seats because we have five regions, we can justify nine seats for the GNSO because that is the way the GNSO is structured. But if we now ask for six or double seats, maybe ten because then we have to give two to each region and we end up with ten, this is not justified against the other ICANN community, I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. I'm sorry. I'm just answering an e-mail. Alan Greenberg? It was urgent. It was urgent. So, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. You stole my microphone again. I'll make the same comment I made in the first round, except now we don't have the excuse of time is very short. I've participated in an awful lot of training programs over my career and I have never seen a case where you set up a pool and then put the instructors and the students out of the same pool and trade off one for the other.

In this case, I can easily imagine at the next training course that Olivier is the best person to select as a trainer but the new incoming NomCom appointee from Europe is one of the best candidates for training. So I would really like to see that if there's truly only five slots that we could use, that we name who we think should be good trainers and then select the best three candidates or four candidates or two candidates, whatever's left, not trying to allocate one per region obviously at that point, for the people who can best use the training.

This concept of taking them out of the same pool and trading off one for the other is just something I've never seen before. To be honest, it doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Do you wish to respond, Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Just that I make clear, I get it right, do we have doubts about the way we are going to select the people? Or do you have doubts about the

way how it works with experienced and incoming leaders in the same class?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The two questions, I think, are merged. I think we should decide, we should be told or decide how many people we can have as trainers and either as a separate number or a sum total as students, and then pick reasonable trainers. But I don't think we should, just because a trainer comes from one region, that we should automatically exclude any students from that region. I think that doesn't make a lot of sense.

And that also works against, not the argument but the case you said, if we have more than five, then we need ten. Say we need to two trainers. Then it's reasonable to have five students and the number seven, not ten. But even if the number is limited as five, I would like to see the trainers rationally and reasonably selected and then the students selected, in that sequence.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. We have a queue in operation, so we'll go to Eduardo and then Wolf afterwards. Eduardo Diaz. Please don't cut me off. Over to you, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

My question is only about budget. Just make clear when you talk about this budget, that these all these people are going, they get funded for those days per diem. That's what we're talking about, right? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks. Thanks, Olivier. Listening to the last exchanges, I was asking myself why make life so bloody complicated? It's quite easy. We only have one potential incoming candidate. In summer, the new ALAC member to be selected by the NomCom. So this will be the only newcomer as far as I know from the region, possibly for another position, another one. But from our community, it's one candidate.

From our community, in context with EURALO, etc., At-Large, to my knowledge, it's one candidate. If the NomCom selects another European for any other ICANN position from Europe, It may be a second candidate. This would, in my opinion, be more or less preferred two candidates for the training.

As far as you need trainers, there is a load of experience people, ICANN, old hands, etc. We could in five minutes suggest from the region and you can finally make a selection out of the good candidates. So the situation is rather easy and we can give you a definite answer in August when the candidates have been finally selected and will be announced by NomCom.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolf. We're going to have go back to Sandra and then I don't know if you wish to do a consensus call or how we do this but we have to move on because time is ticking. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. I expected that there is a lot of confusion in the room about this and I just want to make it clear. First of all, we have no chance to get more than five because this was agreed within the ICANN Academy Working Group and this is also within the budget line and there is no way to change that.

Second point, the concept – and this was under discussion for Buenos Aires as well – the concept of mixing and experienced and less experienced people and asking the experienced one to be a trainer worked out perfectly. This was actually one of the best outcomes of this Academy. So we keep that concept. There is no way of changing that.

We are not talking about trainers. We do not hire additional people because this makes the group bigger. We had very great budget constraints last year so this was actually born in a way that we had to deal with the low budget, to say, okay, we ask the experienced ones to say something. But finally, this worked out perfectly because the interaction within this group was much bigger than if there is a trainer coming and going later on.

Because Olivier, he was a session facilitator – wouldn't call it trainer but a session facilitator. He stayed with the group for the whole time and they saw him giving a lecture, giving a presentation on a certain topic, and could go back and forth to him. So this will stay as well.

When Wolf now says that for Europe we have one incoming selected via the NomCom. For EURALO we can of course decide we just send this new person and we don't have an experienced one for this. But if it

happens that all the other regions decide the same way, “Oh, we send a new one as well,” then we end up with having only new elected people in the group, and this is not according to the concept that we have also experienced people, which are then able to give a lecture on a certain issue.

So therefore, I see the challenge for this group, for the RALO leaders and for the ALAC leadership, or the ALAC to agree on the procedure. And we can go back to the slides, please, to the one that we had up last. Yes, this one. Exactly. I would actually see only the second option as a possible way forward. It might not be the most perfect one. We might change it next year again, but this would be my proposal to proceed.

And I would like to ask the ALAC specifically and the RALO leaders if they would agree to proceed in that way, making a suggestion for an experienced and an incoming leader, and leaving the final decision to the ALAC. And I think we have to discuss this on the mailing list then, or maybe during a monthly call. And we have to decide it on such an occasion.

And I’m not sure how to take the temperature of the room, nor how to call for a consensus. Maybe, Olivier, you can help me at that point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. Thank you very much, Sandra. I think we have already got a temperature of the room, which is a bit chilly. And chilly in the sense of the chilliness towards the proposal of having only five and restricting this as the At-Large community would be the only community that would have to basically give up some of its newcomer slots for

experienced people. I don't see any of the other communities sending experienced rather than newcomer. Is that correct? Go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: When I remember, we had a lot of experienced leaders. Mikey O'Connor, Thomas Rickert, they were old hand veterans and they actually proved the concept – because Thomas Rickert said it today in the Academy group meeting that he as an experienced leader, he learned a lot himself from the others how they work, how they function. And we had incoming leaders who could learn from all of them. You were an experienced leader as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. Okay. Let's take the temperature of the room then. Let's find out as a consensus call how many people on the ALAC, how many ALAC members are against this proposal? Against the proposal of five from At-Large including any experienced that would take the place of non-experienced for each one of the regions. Yes, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's point of order. The consensus is, it's not about that. This is decide on, Olivier. Only five people from At-Large. This is a decision.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, but if you let me finish my sentence, I might be able to give you the full consensus call because I was going to describe what the whole process was. So we have five of that, irrespective of whether they're

experience or non-experienced. And with all of the description that Sandra has provided with regards to the program, are we agreeing with the complete program on our side as far as At-Large is concerned?

Now, we can have either a vote or we can have a consensus call. A consensus call would just ask for anyone who is against the idea, and that at point if there are objections to this, then I would have to punt this back and we would have to have a special conference call specifically on this because I think there might still be some confusion. We'll see anyway. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

What I heard Sandra say is we have no choice that we can get more than five so it's an option or less than five, if we want less. And so it becomes a matter of how do we choose the five, and she's offering option one and option two. So the question really is, do we have consensus as Sandra is recommending that between one and two, we pick two? I think that's what Sandra is asking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Any objections? Rafid Fatani?

RAFID FATANI:

No objections. I just wanted to put my hat in the bag and say I support Sandra's number two option.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. We've just said... Okay. So let's start again. Let's take the temperature on the room on two. And now I have to restate it again, so thank you very much. Sandra, please restate two exactly as you stated it originally.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Option two would include that each RALO nominates two possible participants. One must be an incoming leader, one must be an experienced leader. The final decision who is going to be sent, one from each region, to this training program is going to be taken by the ALAC, and they will also consider NomCom selectees in the final decision, keeping the balance between incoming and experienced leaders.

So for instance, if the EURALO decides we send a NomCom selectee, regardless we don't know the name yet, then this is a decision in between EURALO but they have to nominate an experienced leader at the same time. So they have to nominate two. And even if they don't know yet who the incoming is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to support two as per Sandra's recommendation, but that was on the assumption that we make the decision of who the people are after the NomCom names people. For instance, if in Canada, if in North America, they end up naming a complete novice, that's the right person to send. But if they appoint someone who's participated for

seven years, that's the wrong person to send. So I think we need to be able to hold off on that at least for the regions that NomCom is naming someone for. We need to hold off until we know who that is. If that's acceptable, then I certainly support two.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Okay. So let's start again. Consensus call, is anyone against this? Seeing no one put their hand up or voice their opposition. Fatimata Cambronero, question?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: I have a question. Why the final decision should be taken – sorry. No, in English. Why the final decision should be taken by ALAC and not by the member of the Academy Working Group or the working group of [inaudible]? I don't know. Why by ALAC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fatima. Because the working group originated, as far as we're concerned, the ALAC has to provide its green light with regards to a cross-community working group and this is a cross-community working group. So the ALAC has to vote on it. I believe that the other parts of ICANN will also have to undergo the similar procedure.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Every group has its own procedures and I understand Alan's point to say we wait until the NomCom selectees are out and decide then finally. Why we are taking the decision within the ALAC? Because it's only

about our stakeholder group. It's not about the ICANN Academy group. It's looking at the broader level and we are not going to decide for any other stakeholder groups whom to select. They just send it. And we have to find an accountable and transparent procedure how we are dealing with this within the ALAC only.

And a question, Heidi, a question to ICANN staff, I remember that the travel arrangements after the NomCom selections were quite difficult. We should ensure – and I think this was also a problem for other constituencies. We should ensure that travel arrangements after the NomCom selections are being announced is still possible so that we can have the decision then.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

One of the key challenges and criticisms of the program last time was that there wasn't enough time. It was announced too late for various reasons. And then also some of the other groups, the ACs and SOs, don't have their elections or selections until very near the annual general meeting. So that's also a problem.

But just a reminder that this program does not offer flights. Only accommodation and a stipend. So if someone is selected that is a new person that does not have travel support in terms of flight, then that raises another concern that needs to be considered.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. I'm going to cut the discussion now. We're really very late on this and this wouldn't be fair to people who are coming

after for the other working groups afterwards. If you want a discussion, we'll have a webinar after this call, after this day, maybe the week after next week, sometime in July, and then we'll be able to iron these things out.

The consensus call is as we've said. I haven't heard any opposition to this so this is passed. Thank you. It's not a motion. It's just a consensus call on it, whether we're moving.

So let's move on to the next thing. And the At-Large Social Media Working Group, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, but he's also here to speak to us about the At-Large Technology Taskforce and the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program Review Team. If you can do all three in a total of ten minutes, you will have a free drink tonight. Non-alcoholic. From the Fayre, of course.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, I don't drink, so that doesn't appeal to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I did say non-alcoholic.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'll do my best. So let's bring up the slide then for the Social Media Working Group. Excellent. Next slide, next slide.

Just to remind what the Social Media working group, it's to raise awareness of the ICANN At-Large community and enhance end users'

engagement with the community by having a sustainable presence on social media. Next slide.

How it will work, how we are doing the work is that we are implementing the social media strategy for At-Large. There's a link of the strategy on the slides and you can go there and review that presentation. It's quite extensive, about 20-30 slides with notes. Next slide.

The background behind the Social Media Working Group was that it was initially called a Curation Working Group, and the reason why was because the intent was it will be content curation. So it was interim Curation Working Group was formed in late April, early May 2014 and then formally approved by the ALAC on the May 2014 monthly call. Next slide.

So what does the task that the Social Media Working Group does? Okay. It creates templates for fluid content and the fluid content is content that comes from the ALAC Announce mailing list. That is call for comments, vote announcements, those type of fluid content. And then also we plan and draft a quantity of static content. And the static content is like capacity building information, slides and so forth, things that don't change as often. Next slide.

And also what we do is also provide coverage during the ICANN face-to-face meetings and any events on social media. And also we also facilitate cross-community interactions via social media. We have been working with other ICANN social media accounts, for example. Next slide.

We also we're going to be monitoring our key performance indicators on a regular basis and assess additional social media channels for expansion. Next slide.

And also develop any best practices and organizational knowledge and social media management. Next slide.

Okay. So the Social Media Working Group has members from all the regions, including the Outreach Subcommittee, the Capacity Building Working Group, and from the Technology Taskforce Working Groups. Next slide.

These are the Social Media Working Group members from all five regions. Glenn McKnight is in parentheses because he's not officially on but he's been contributing a lot. So I'm including him in there. Next slide.

So these are our Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube accounts. Ariel had already shown some of the Facebook and Twitter feeds. If you go to those links, you will see that it's been very active in the months before the ATLAS II Summit and during this ICANN meeting. There's been a lot. It's actually worked out quite well. Next slide.

Okay. So future work and ideas. Ongoing curation of content for sharing on social media. We are also looking at experimenting with sharing of content in other languages. We will compose some tweets and some content in other languages, post that and see what the key performance indicators show. And again, evaluate other social media platforms. Should we use Google+, LinkedIn? That would be ongoing. Next slide.

It's a pity Ariel wasn't here, but Ariel Liang from ICANN staff was really, really instrumental in working hard to finalize the social media strategy on the Technology Taskforce side. And she's been working very hard during this. Actually because [inaudible] is that the social media work feeds the content to staff and Ariel is the one that actually does the work of actually posting it to Twitter, posting it to Facebook, and she's been doing very diligently twice a day. Now during the ICANN meeting, at least quite a lot of content being posted. I think sometimes 10, maybe even 15 posts a day.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Put your hands together for Ariel.

ALAN GREENBERG: But it would be nice if we spell her name right.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I will correct that. So that's it for the Social Media Working Group presentation. Any questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think we have much time for questions, Dev. I'm sorry. So you're just going to have to continue with the next one.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right. Well, then does it matter what order? I could load up the CROPP Review Team. Okay. So you can load the CROPP Review Team.

Okay. The At-Large Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program. ICANN loves acronyms. I wonder how long it took to come up with that. Next slide.

The background behind this is that ICANN's constituencies, because they often make travel requests during the budget process for ICANN, as part of FY 14, ICANN developed this pilot program to support outreach efforts. Next slide.

What we have is five individual regional trips allocated to each of the five RALOs. The funded expenses include flights, lodging and a per diem up to three days and two nights. So all travel is booked by ICANN Constituency Travel. Next slide.

And how it works out is that there's an At-Large community review and approval. I'll get to that in a few slides. There also has to be approval from the regional stakeholder VPs who were in the room earlier. The travel proposals have to be filed six weeks with ICANN. And also the travelers that go on these trips have to file a trip assessment within three weeks of the return date describing how the purpose of the trip and the outcomes were realized.

The outreach event can be attended by multiple persons. However, each traveler is counted as utilizing one of these structure's allocated trips. A RALO could decide if it wants to send one person to a trip, or it can use all five of its travel slots on one trip.

There's no trip compounding or splitting of expenses. There's no way for one RALO to share a travel slot with another RALO. There's nothing like that. The trips have to originate and conclude within the same region

and also it has to be completed before the end of ICANN's FY 15 year. That means that the trip has to occur before June 30, 2015. Next slide.

How do we utilize this process? Some of the harder RALO budget requests are reviewed by the Finance and Budget Subcommittee before submitting to ICANN Finance. The CROPP Review Team was established to review and approve RALO travel requests, and to actually confirm with the regional stakeholder engagement VPs, and to submit the travel requests to ICANN once approved by the CROPP Review Team. Next slide.

The CROPP Review Team has ten members and two members will be from each RALO, one member from the Outreach Subcommittee, from the ICANN Finance and Budget Subcommittee. Next slide.

These are the members from the CROPP Review Team from each of the RALOs. Next slide.

Regarding our guidelines, it's the same for the ICANN's CROPP guidelines but there's one key requirement. The travel requests must be submitted eight weeks before any travel takes place. That's because ICANN requires it to be submitted between six weeks but we will need two weeks to evaluate and comment and update the proposal as needed. And also to get the approval from the VPs. Next slide, which I've just explained, so next slide.

I could go through the FY 14 travel proposals, which is on that Wiki page, but I guess we're running out of time. [inaudible] the CROPP RT members and also the CROPP coordinators, Janice Lange, Rob Hoggarth, Ken Bour. On the CROPP mailing list, our team mailing lists have been

very helpful with their interventions and so forth. I've had several calls with the coordinators to improve the process for FY 15, which is now much more streamlined. The FY 14 process required us to really do a lot of work. We had to design our own forms and so forth. The CROPP coordinators noticed this and improved the process immensely.

Just two reminders. The RALO leaders should coordinate with the CROPP RT members because there's been some instances where an At-Large member randomly sent in a travel request without any knowledge by the RALO leaders or even the CROPP RT members. Coordinate carefully.

And also the RALO should consider their trip proposals for FY 15. So you have until – to have five slots for travel between now and June 30, 2015. The RALO has to really look at its calendar of possible outreach events and think carefully how to allocate it because you may not want to allocate so many in early and then you've discovered a new event just one month before June 30, 2015. Keep that mind. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I did ask you to make this sound exciting, but not like playing poker because this sounds very much like a game. I'm going to allow three minutes of questions for any of those three topics that you've covered: the CROPP program, the social media, and the Technology Taskforce. Siranush Vardanyan?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I'm sorry to intervene, but I haven't done the Technology Taskforce one. Do you want me to do that first?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thought you had done them in order and you had folded it with the social media because you did mention about the technology with Ariel.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Indeed. It will be very, very brief. One and a half minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go for it and then we'll have the questions.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Time it. The Technology Taskforce, there's no slides for it so I'll just talk about it. One of the key things that the Technology Taskforce had done was to develop the social media strategy. We had an interim social media strategy where content was being re-shared from the ALAC Announce mailing list but the social media strategy has now improved on this immensely. That was our key deliverable between Singapore and now.

We have done some Adobe Connect plug-in testing with ICANN's IT staff. ICANN staff had implemented a dial-in/dial-out plug-in from Adobe Connect and we have also tried out several new Adobe Connect plug-ins.

One of the other things we have also done was solve the Wiki translate plug-in problem. We will be evaluating the alternatives to be installed, but fortunately the translate plug-in, there was an update, and IT staff was able to install that immediately and have it working on the ICANN At-Large Wiki.

One of the other things that the Technology Taskforce also looked at is how the Social Media Working Group was to coordinate the updates happening during the ICANN face-to-face meeting. And we're using something called Slack. This is an interesting application. I don't know if Suzie could bring it up on the screen there.

How Slack works is that we can channel updates – group chat updates into channels, Slack calls it. We can group, post things by topic. And once we do that, it was a much, much easier. We were looking at doing a Google spreadsheet at one point, and after we discovered this, it was much, much easier. There's four different group chat candidates and I think it's very, very useful. Could be very useful for At-Large. I'm sure most people will agree that we receive lots of lots of e-mails. So this could probably reduce the e-mail overload.

There's also been an update on the LACRALO translation mailing list. We've been pressing hard on ICANN's IT staff. This is a pressing problem. This is a painful problem. Please work on it. They have updated the LACRALO translation for testing and that testing is ongoing. They released a new update just a week ago. That will be a priority after London. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Dev. My goodness, the Technology Taskforce has been busy. I think you might have been even missed one, which was a compatibility with Adobe Connect and Linux.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: That is true. Thanks for reminding me. Yes, indeed, there was an Adobe Connect with Linux. We noticed that many persons were using Linux were having difficulties with Adobe Connect. We have documented a page and some suggested work-arounds. There's been one work-around described that's been fairly effective. Most persons that have used that fix have got their Adobe Connect session under Linux working. So that was another thing done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Dev. And for this we have to thank the one particular [ALS] the one with Scott Sullivan. Scott, thanks very much [applause]. Recognizing the knowledge in our communities. Questions? Three minutes of questions. Siranush Vardanyan, you have the floor.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Chair. Just technical question related to CROPP Program. You have the online form for submissions so whenever someone is submitting the form and the whole information goes directly to CROPP members. Is it possible – and it happened to our RALO, that is was not preapproved actually be leaders. So it is possible to make it in a way that it may go first? It can be online form but whenever after submission it can go to RALO leaders? And there will be one additional

place there, a button, approved by RALO? And whenever the RALO leaders are going through that and approve, we can do that online and it goes to CROPP. Otherwise, CROPP will be receiving many, many disapproved or not agreed forms. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. To answer that question, as part of the updates to the CROPP FY 15, there's now a Wiki space where's the draft travel proposals. So once somebody fills out the draft travel proposal, we can all look at it and decide whether to – well, obviously we can also reject it but whether to approve it, modify it, and so forth. So it's not how – we didn't have to use the Google form again. That makes it much simpler.

I believe, however, in regards to the draft – the filing of the draft proposal – it's still the CROPP RT members alone that could do it. In other words, there's no way for any proposal to be actually filed unless the CROPP RT member actually does it. The RALO does really need to work with the CROPP RT members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. The three minutes for questions are up, so now we'll move over to Tijani Ben Jemaa for the Capacity Building working group.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Before I speak about the capacity building, I would like to add that my understanding of the CROPP program is that any project, any trip, should be approved by the RALO before because it is a

project of the RALO. We have slots for the RALOs. It's not for persons. So the project has to come from the RALO. It's clear.

I come back to capacity building. As you know, we worked very hard to prepare capacity building program for the ALSs before coming to here so that they are more or less prepared for the summit. And after we selected the topics based on the wishes of the ALSs, we prepared the program and we ended up of with seven webinars that were done before London.

I think that it was really helpful for the ALSes. Some of them were very well attended. Others were not. I can understand that because sometimes it is a problem of time shift or so. Sometimes people are working during the webinar. Others are sleeping perhaps. What is good is that everything is recorded and they can come back to the webinar and they can listen to the webinar. And they have also the slides. Normally, people who want to attend and who didn't attend can come back to the webinar and can have the information.

The first assessment is that I think it was useful, but the final assessment will be done after we meet, the working group meets or has a call, and after we have worked with Gisela about the evaluation sheets, and then we can say if really it was good or not.

This was the main work of the Capacity Building Working Group for the last few months. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani, for this very good report. Any question? Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to ask was there any way in which you could record who listened to the webinars? You're saying that for some of the webinars, the attendance was low, but I know that I actually used the webinars if I couldn't go, the recordings. So was there any way in which we could record, so that you got a better idea of the usefulness or the use of the webinars?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe I can answer that. Rephrasing it, basically the number of times the webinars have been downloaded, etc. – download figures effectively. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, it will be done in the final report of the program. After the assessment we will do very soon, after a call with the group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I think we'll have an AI on two things: collect the data of course about the number the people who attended the webinars, but then also ask IT to find out how many times the recordings were downloaded. I understand, in fact, from discussions we had in my thematic working group that people had downloaded the recordings,

even though they had missed the session itself. So that's a good thing to note.

Okay, let's move on then. The next person to come up to the microphone, we have Edmon Chung and Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I think Edmon is in the room. Yes, right here. For the IDN, Internationalized Domain Name Policy working group, Edmon, you have the floor.

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you, Olivier. I sent a few notes. I don't know whether Suzie is able to put it up, but I'll keep talking to it anyway. There are three ongoing in parallel items that are related to IDNs. One is the IDN Variant TLD Program. The second one is the Universal Acceptance Program. And the third one is Internationalized Registration Data.

For the third one, the Internationalized Registration Data, actually there are three areas that, again, are in parallel. There's an expert working group that is focusing on what aspects, what data fields should be internationalized. That's regarding the WHOIS. There is one that is focused on translation and transliteration. And then there is one study on the feasibility of translation and transliteration. So altogether, five.

There are five particular things that are ongoing in parallel right now that's related to IDNs, two of which have an open comment period and I would recommend that we respond to both of them, one of which is a roadmap plan that is put out by ICANN staff. We covered that under hot topics yesterday as well. That's on universal acceptance. And we have a number of preliminary comments, especially on the community involvement and some proactive work that we think the ICANN team

should look into, and especially on getting our own systems ready for IDNs including ICANN itself and also including registries and registrars.

That's one open comment period, and the other one is the study on the feasibility of transliteration and translation. This is on WHOIS data essentially, and which parts of them should be internationalized, and if so, whether translation or transliteration tools should be used and who should be bearing the burden of doing that particular transformation process.

On that particular item, I haven't read it through very deeply but I think in any case it is one of the aspects that ALAC should be spending a little bit of time on because I think this touches on quite a bit of the areas that we should be concern ourselves on, and that's especially on people using different languages. Today, we can only use ASCII characters for submitting contact information for registration of gTLD domains. This series of work is looking into the possibilities of and what and how people can submit their contact data in their own language. That's the item.

We've already covered quite deeply the IDN Variant TLD program yesterday, so I won't go back into it. Basically, the call for more volunteers to look into the languages and scripts, not necessarily only for variance but any language and script. We're creating a language table for the root, for the root system, which is the top level domain system for ICANN. So anybody is invited to participate and we need more people to participate in that process. That's pretty much it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Edmon. Yes, that is a real call for volunteers and if you have the skills of being able to write in another script, in the Latin script, then please go and see Edmon. What kind of level of knowledge does one need?

EDMON CHUNG: On the IDN Variant Program, that particular language table program, we need all sorts of expertise, both on policy aspect as well as on linguistic aspect as well as on technical aspects. The idea of forming that group for a particular language is we need the various experts. It's hard to describe in particular one, but again, we are looking for volunteers. Please e-mail me or anybody if you need more information. There is a pretty big session on that at the ICANN site as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you have no specific skills on the linguistics and the technical stuff, but you actually are pretty much aware of how to write in your language, which might be, I don't know, a language XYZ script, is that still useful?

EDMON CHUNG: In my point of view, at this time that would be. We should get it started because the thing is, if we have people from a particular language at least getting started, especially from this community, we can then reach out to the actual linguistic experts because we've got to get the ball rolling first I think at this time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Edmon. That confirms exactly my point. So we have Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I'm Sivasubramanian Muthusamy from India. Edmon, on the task of universal acceptance, you are examining the acceptance of IDNs at an application level. IDN on a technical level. Are you also planning to examine what I might call universal acceptance of IDNs and universal recognition of IDNs at a human level? What I am talking about is if you have a domain name in Chinese, I will not be able to recognize and I will not be able to use that. Is this problem also examined by the working group?

EDMON CHUNG: First of all, this is not quite a group at this point. This is a roadmap document that staff has prepared and I think there is a comment period, which I think we should respond to. And what you just mentioned, we could definitely look into whether we would add it to our comments to it. And we could add to that.

However, I guess two points. One in terms of human perception. Let's say it's on a billboard or on a poster, whether we can decipher that that's an IDN. That's probably an interesting question. The other aspect that you mentioned in terms of people speaking different language being able to go to that particular domain name, I think that's a more fundamental issue that when we first discussed IDNs – it's a very long discussion, let's put it that way. It might not entirely fit into universal

acceptance but it is certainly a philosophical issue that is interesting to talk about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Edmon. I know we have people in the room that are able to write in Armenian scripts and some in various flavors of Cyrillic scripts, and I think we might also might have Greek scripts as well and perhaps several native scripts as well. So I would urge them to come and see you afterwards and to register. Or if you have to leave early, then to register their interest with staff and then we can develop a nice, good expert center in all of these different scripts.

As you said, the important thing is to actually get these scripts on the map so that someone, even if you're not an expert in that script, you're bringing it forward and you will benefit your community by it being on the map and thinking, "That's the next one we need to work on," and find experts for it. Very important.

Next working group is the new gTLD working group. Evan Leibovitch, do you have just a minute or so? Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: In more ways than one. Thank you, Olivier. Essentially the core of the work being pursued right now in the New gTLD Program has to do with the issue of public interest commitments and as a method of asserting the public interest in new gTLDs and a proposal that we put forward during the Singapore meeting of using something called policy advisory boards as an alternative. So the PICs and the PABs.

During the Singapore meeting, that's when the public comment process actually went out. Since then, it has closed. We received about 25 comments. Normally staff would collect this information and put it into the form of a digest that would then be perused. Because of the ATLAS and other issues, staff has been swamped, and so I've asked the rest of the committee to try and consider and read the documents since there's not that many of them to essentially look at them in their current form, not wait for the summary to be done. We'd still like to get the summary but I don't want to wait for that to happen.

So we're not going to be doing that during this meeting because of everything that's going on here as part of this summit, but soon after we'll be convening the working group again and figuring out how to move forward. A number of the comments we received were in favor of moving forward with continuing to advance the PAB model.

At the Singapore meeting, we found that we did have the support of some members of the GAC in helping us advance this within ICANN. We have noticed, however, that the GACC is sort of involved in a number of other issues right now that may be pushing the PIC issue to the sidelines while they debate some other things that it has prioritized more highly.

That's really the status. There's nothing going on through this week. We've been continuing to solicit feedback on it and the working group will be essentially coming up with a plan of action for consideration by ALAC long after this meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Are there any questions on Evan’s report? Seeing no one put their card up, I assume there are no questions. Thanks for the work that’s being done in that working group. Now we’re going to the next one, which is the Ad-Hoc ICANN Accessibility Working Group, and that’s Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I gather a microphone will make its way to Cheryl? Or Cheryl will make her way to the microphone? There we go.

Two or three minutes? I thought you would be doing everything in two or three minutes. This and the NomCom. Over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Oliver. Now I’m settled. Thank you very much for squeezing in a little bit of reporting time on an initiative, which as you all really have heard a number of times today in a number of venues is something that’s relatively new and has only started formally in our inaugural meeting at the last ICANN meeting, number 49, in Singapore.

However, notwithstanding the fact that most people have been particularly focused and engaged on activities to do with the getting here as an ATLAS II and of course the usual enormous number of pieces of work that ordinarily need to be done leading up to an ICANN meeting, and noting that the time between these two ICANN meetings wasn’t terribly long, there hasn’t been anything other than – and I’m not apologizing for this, I’m just stating it for the record – the working group’s list setup. So a mailing list exists.

If anyone has any interest, and I do mean any interest in the accessibility issues, specifically as it affects ICANN and helping ICANN to

be a best practice model for accessibility, then please let staff know and you are more than welcome to join our working list. Our working list obviously is going to be a place where some people will be more or less engaged. And the same can be said for our Wiki space, which is public and open. And I'd also encourage anybody who's interested to bookmark the Wiki space and just keep an eye on what's happening.

For example, I hope you're aware but in the Dropbox for all of your resources for this meeting, you've got the excellent – I think it's one page and a bit because the references are over a page. Terrific. It's two pages now. That must just be the way my computer works it. The two-page document -- very easy to read is what I'm saying – “Web Accessibility for People with Disability Guideline.”

That is a variation on a theme of work that Gunela, one of our very treasured members of our working group, has put together for us. And made it the ICANN At-Large owned one. This is a build of already acceptable term of art and work. We're not suggesting that there is anything earth-shatteringly amazing or new in that but what we are suggesting is it's a simple one-pager, the sort of material that your own At-Large structure may benefit from, and more importantly, promulgated it to other people who are looking at their own web presence and web space. I think you may very well find this extremely valuable.

I also would like to mention that Gunela has just back from presenting a very short but perfectly well detailed presentation to the ccNSO. And whilst the ccNSO space will have a copy of that PowerPoint, Gunela, I'm assuming that you'd be delighted for it to be tethered to the meeting

memory of this page at this session. So if that could be part of the reporting for this session.

In addition to that, I would like to say that because – and it was my decision. Let’s be very, very clear here. I said everyone including staff will be too busy. So I said as Chair of this group, we won’t have a meeting this meeting.

Despite that, the keen enthusiasts who’ve got the time, the energy, and the inclination, including staff – and more power to them – are gathering informally at, I believe, five past one on Thursday. They’ll find themselves a place and space to sit down with hopefully a cup of coffee, tea, or some similar libation and just chew the fat on some of these issues, in particular how useful or otherwise what sorts of others things we can do. Should we have a portfolio of one-page or two-page guides? And if you all think that’s a good idea, then the Taskforce can get onto exactly that.

I want to thank everybody for their self-motivation to get that done, but remind them all, it is utterly and absolutely informal. Nothing you say or do will be binding, and all it will do is be a sharing and caring experience. That’s still a very good thing.

Even though we haven’t had a meeting this time, we will be meeting leading up to Los Angeles because the staff in ICANN that we’re working with are so keen to do a significant focus in L.A. And if we’re doing a significant focus in L.A., we’ve got to start working about three days after you get back.

That's it for this section. Shall we move to the next? And if so, let me know which one it is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's your time you're wasting. I just want to make sure you don't cut me off in the middle of my sentence. Just saying that Christopher Mondini is the staff member that you were speaking about, and Christopher was indeed in the room earlier today for those of you who weren't here. Very keen indeed and a man of action. So we are looking forward to some progress on this. It's really great to see that this is all starting in At-Large, so we have to recognize that.

Right. On to the next part, which you know full well is yours as well. No, we've got the subcommittee on metrics. That's right. Yes, it is still you. Back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I thought it would – I knew he was going to do that. If we can't have a little bit of fun? It's the silly end of the day. But metrics. Maureen, you're in the room. You told me you'd be elsewhere. I'd like to make this a tag team so would you care to bring yourself here so the viewing public – and there is a viewing public and a recorded viewing public – get to see us both.

Because whilst the Metric Subcommittee, which is a small section of the rules of procedure review and we've bored you all on any number of occasions about all of that, the Metric Subcommittee is at the very, very vital part of its work right now.

Maureen, who has of the three parts of the Metric Subcommittee, Dev's dealing with the technology, Tijani's dealing with the general processes and making sure that it is in keeping with the work that of course you all know Alan and the rest of the review working group for the rules of procedure have put into play, but Maureen's been the interface with all of you.

So it would be silly for me to report on the work done between now and last meeting, when in fact it's Maureen that's been doing all the work between now and last meeting. So I'm not in the business of taking credit where it's not due. All work that I've reported on has been this woman's, and therefore, if you'd like to give us a very brief update, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl. Just to recap, in Singapore of course we recommended two measures, and that was in respect to addressing the expectations that are in the ALAC rules of procedures, and also taking into the account the concerns that I actually was getting back from the responses from the RALOs when I was actually consulting with them about it.

We decided on two separate measures: one measuring attendance and the other measuring performance, as such. So the attendance of course is being done in a very complicated technical way that I don't understand, but Dev does. So he's organizing that side of things. And it actually measures attendance, face-to-face meetings, online meetings, membership and attendance of working groups, whether ALAC working

or other working groups. And these are all collected and collated onto a database, which if you want to know more about it, just ask Dev.

Then we get to the performance side, and this is where, which was the one that was—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bristly.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Bristly is a good word. I think that what we ended up with was a report that was actually done by the ALAC member but the responsibility of the RALO. The RALOs would actually make the decision about the timeframes, the frequency, and that sort of thing because it is the RALO's decision. The only thing is that we would very interested. In fact, we'd appreciate from the RALO exactly what your decision is about the expectations of that performance report.

And I think by doing it this way, it just means that we are putting the responsibility back on the RALO. And it did seem to be concern amongst the RALOs that we might make expectations that were a little beyond what they thought was reasonable.

I think that although there hasn't been much action in between times, we would really appreciate some feedback from the RALOs about what your expectation is for your ALAC member to report on their performance, contribution, participation, to the work of the ALAC. That's it from me.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. Don't go too far. She's not going to escape. Not just yet. I want to also mention the fact that some of what that is coming into us is actually about At-Large structures and the bona fides and levels of performance that they need to continue and maintain.

And we're not ignoring that, by any means. So feed metrics and measurement information, aspirations, what your regions believe is a good measure of what makes an effective At-Large structure. Or indeed, as all regions should have them now or have the ability to have them now, and individual member, feed that to us as well because we are happy to be the repository of all of this. Then we'll try and come out with something that might come back to the regions in a somewhat more harmonized way.

Why this is important is, as most of your regions know, there are some At-Large structures which if one has very pragmatic measures, like their e-mails now bounce, the entities have been dis-incorporated and they actually no long exist, we do need a mechanism to get these entities off the books. There's some really simple, we all agree on things, but there's some murky bits that we're going to have to work on probably the other side of Los Angeles.

But it's going to be at the regional level but we still have to have parity and understanding between the regions, otherwise the ALAC can't have any uniformity in after all what is its At-Large structures. It's the ALAC's At-Large structures. They just have to be clustered geographically into

the regional At-Large organizations. So it still does belong very much to what our metrics group is doing.

And I want to draw your attention back to the original work done by AFRALO. AFRALO had, I think, a very smart way of looking at this. And this is that you don't necessarily have to cull a lower performing entity. You can modify the rights of a lower performing entity, thereby allowing remedial work or simply circumstances to change, or indeed they may not desire that right and they'll be perfectly happy to contribute at that lower level.

If as a regional leadership you are looking at ways of doing things, be warned that I'm personally feeling really comfortable about what AFRALO has been saying all along, and you could do a lot worse than come up with a very similar set of proposals. Of course, we're going to have to come up with a unified set of proposals at the end, but it does seem not only a very human, a very smart way of doing it because it doesn't give us the bad stuff which happens in terms of if you have to go to vote, you've got the issues of quorum, you've got the issues of percentage, you've got the issues of how you measure a super majority, all that stuff doesn't get cloudy because there's a solution that AFRALO has put forward. I'd recommend, I know it's years ago, go back and have a look at some of this original work.

I also want to take a very brief moment to talk about measurements which we were very keen to work on with the ATLAS II event, and that's these things which may seem very simple to you all, things like attendance. If there's 15 of us in the room, we can all go three by five

and know there's 15 of us in the room. Where there's 115 of us in the room, we're more likely to think it's either 100 or 125.

And so we've been looking at mechanisms whereby it would be easier than what I think has happened in the past where we've got little sign-on sheets. That's how ATLAS I worked. Everyone gathered around pieces of paper and wrote their names in and out so we had little bottlenecks all over the building while people filled out pieces of paper. It's just ridiculous to consider doing that in this day and age. I'm sure Scott's having a [inaudible] just thinking about how silly that is.

And so what we had done is – and look after your best interests, I will hasten to add, pop on your codes, as I know, you all listened. I should have done a pop quiz because clearly some of you didn't. These Q codes which only needed to be scanned and it was going to take a time stamp and say that at this time somebody in a session, which we assume was running at this time, was present. It's not a perfect system. We can get more intrusive systems. This was not one of them.

I spent about 70 minutes of my valuable life arguing the point via e-mail because staff were concerned that some people had particular privacy concerns and that we were somehow tracking identity.

If your metrics team tells you when we're describing what we're doing to count our headcount, that we are not taking any identifiable information with that track, could you do us the courtesy of believing us? Every single one of these, am I being pointed enough? Let me say it once more. Every single one of these Q codes are identical. You'll note every single person, whether they're ATLAS or not. The whole

conference has the same bleeding Q code. So unless we have [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thought I was special.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No way, darling. You turned me off and that's very dangerous when I'm full flight. So unless we have 3,343 – no, we don't. Every single one of those things. It is a watermark. You are not being tracked. It is a watermark.

What is identifiable, and that is why we had special volunteers, and that was our fantastic mentees, the ALAC mentees that said, yes, they'd do this. We would actually be able to know the IP address of their device because their device was registered to scan. But every one of you have an identical Q code on. Fear not. And you're going to have to give us a little trust if these systems are going to work. It was 75 minutes of my life I didn't need to waste and it was a lot of angst on the people who got concerned about it. Let's reduce the hysteria level, even from me. Go for it, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just to add to that about the ALS metrics, and I know that the RALOs have actually been starting to work on that. Although the system that Cheryl has been talking about is very consistent and everything is the same, one of the things about even the ALS metrics is that that also

doesn't have to be consistent. It's got to be consistent within your RALO.

I really appreciated getting LACRALO's mechanism that they're using where they're looking at attendance, active participation, working group representation and the voting rights. And they've got measures. Some RALOs may not be as specific, but they will have their own. I think it doesn't have to be a one-size-fits-all, [inaudible]. And I know that APRALO will get theirs organized.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

APRALO works by consensus. Seriously. It is in our rules. For us to go to vote is extraordinary, including this last lot of elections. There was no vote. We elected six leaders by consensus. Just in case you think it can't be done, we ended up with them spread geographically and equally by gender three and three. We've got leaders from the far west, from the center, from the east and as far as down as we can go to the Cook Islands. We don't have anything in Antarctica, but then it's not really ours. And we've got a three/three list. So you can do consensus.

Tijani, has a question. Just leave me [inaudible].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. It's not a question. It's a comment. I do love – for the ALAC members, I do love that the reporting, the self-reporting is taken as a performance measurement or a metric, but I have some questions about that. You know people who are working hard are very weak in

making reports. They are working. They are running. People who don't work, they know how to make their image very good by reports.

I like the self-reporting, but what is after? Is it only that? If it is only that, it is not relevant. It doesn't make any sense. We need something that really give even for the attendance. I know people who come, put their name in Adobe Connect and go. It is not a real sign of participation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

You take first and I'll take second.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I just want to make one comment about that and I think this is one of the reasons why we have lifted up to the RALO. That's why we've lifted up to the RALO. It will be up to you and your RALO to decide as to what is most appropriate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just on that, of course, meetings is perfectly happy to have not hand scanning we did. This exact same system could scan in and out automatically. All of that's fine. This was just a trial. So it can highly automated. But all it does is give heads in and heads out, unless people agree otherwise. I can certainly collect more information but then it would slightly different.

If you would come to the microphone? I was trying to get you a hand mic. I'm sorry, mate. Okay, there we go. We got you a hand mic.

GARTH GRAHAM: I'm sorry. I'm about to make a negative comment and I haven't been part of the background of something that's obviously been going on for a long time. But I have to say that the thought of measuring of performance in the way in which I'm hearing it described in a volunteer organization that is in large measure a self-organizing system isn't bristly; it's icky.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You are welcome to join us.

GARTH GRAHAM: No, because I don't want it done. And secondly, in a distributed system, I already know what the metric is. It's going to be a power law: 80% of the work will be done by 20% of the participants. I don't need data to find that out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So noted. Next question, very briefly. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Cheryl. I'm only speaking Spanish because it's late. I know that metrics is an issue that mixes [inaudible]. What you're saying leaving this in the hands of the RALOs, I also believe this is quite complicated as well.

In our RALO, we see that e-mails on metrics are not even replied. These e-mails start: we want to discuss the metrics for our RALO. Not even answered. This is a topic we will bring up in our general assembly. This is one of the items to be discussed. I hope we can make progress.

In terms of reporting, as Tijani said, I agree. Up to now, I didn't have any time to write down a report on any of the meetings I've attended. I wonder if we could analyze this even more comprehensive report could be developed explaining what was discussed, what the main outcome was, so that when someone goes back home, when all of us go back home, we have time to process what was done in the meeting.

And I'm really sorry. I look around and I do not see anyone from my RALO when there are so many members. There's only one in the back – two. And I'm sorry for this. I really regret because these are very significant, those we are discussing now. I really regret they missed it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you so much for the question. And I think you are giving voice to exactly why we've continued on why measurements need to be done. The answer to your question is yes, we will. We will put the report together and get it to send back. We will do more work with the RALOs. So you'll see a lot more of Maureen. Or maybe even me a little bit. Dev, if you have the world's shortest question? If not, we need to be finished.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And just in closing off this topic on the subject that the room is not completely full, of course there are ten other rooms out there and I have met many of our members in the other meetings, which is exactly what we ask them to do, especially the newcomers, because speaking about At-Large, with At-Large, being At-Large, all that time with At-Large, no. You're here for the ICANN meeting, not just for At-Large. And I think that's something which will be understood.

One last thing before we turn back to Cheryl in a moment regarding the Nominating Committee. It's to do with the incorporation of these thematic working groups that we've had so far and all of the discussions that we've held in London with the working groups that we actually have. The standing working groups. Somebody cut me off. I've put a link on the chat about these standing working groups. Wolf, did you want to say something? Okay, Wolf, please go ahead.

WOLF LUDWIG: Just a little announcement. I didn't see Jean-Jacques behind Evan, so I didn't know whether Jean-Jacques is in the room. He's in the room but I do not need to make my comment. Jean-Jacques will do it by himself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Put him on the spot.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'm sorry. I didn't get what I'm supposed to do.

WOLF LUDWIG: It was the day before yesterday when we realized in the course of the wrap-up in our thematic group that a lot of the points we touched and discussed touched the long-term strategy working group, ATLAS, etc., and some other existing working groups. So we felt it may be reasonable, even if the thematic groups were conceived at the beginning for the At-Large Summit II only, now having had all these fruitful discussions, I really believe it makes sense.

We cannot sort this out here in five minutes. But pick up the idea and really reflect to what extent thematic working groups could be incorporated in existing ATLAS working groups, or where certain aspects are not covered, to potentially create a new standing working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. And indeed that's what we will be doing. I see Christopher.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a very short comment. I would appreciate if an e-mail could be sent via the various mailing lists of these temporary working groups telling them where the participants can continue their engagement. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. And that's exactly what I was thinking of doing as to next steps. And if staff could take note of this. Of course, the thematic working groups have not finished their work. As

we know, some of them are still drafting. In fact, I think most of them are still drafting.

And there will be some follow-ups after that depending on the recommendations of each of the working groups because once we actually put the recommendations together, we will know what topics those working groups as a whole have worked on. And as a result, we will be able to find out this recommendation pertains to such and such a topic and therefore that could be followed up with such and such a working group.

So there is some work that will have to be done by the ATLAS committee into putting these into the boxes, and then following up with you all. What I'm asking is that when we do follow up on the working groups, thematic group lists, you do volunteer. We cannot draft you into the standing At-Large working groups by saying, "Do it or die." But what we will ask quite strongly is that you please consider joining at least one of those standing working groups that are there.

There is not a huge amount of work as far as the working groups are concerned, except perhaps the IDN Policy working group as you've heard from Edmon. But on all the others, we can pace ourselves. And getting into a working group is a good first step into At-Large.

We have Eduardo. I think no one else. And Suzie as well. Eduardo, Suzie, then we still have the Nominating Committee presentation. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I also wanted to suggest that moving forward after the ATLAS II that we take these recommendations and follow-up on them through the years to see which one of these recommendations were implemented. So when we get to the ATLAS III, we can say we were this effective. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, Eduardo, because that is germane of course to my continuing subcommittee, the Return on Investment Subcommittee, that's exactly what we have to do. And more importantly, the return on investment reporting out of ATLAS II is not going to end with a single report by the end of the calendar year. It'll be a single report by the end of the calendar year that then undertakes to have several points in the next few months and years because you may indeed get an increase of activity and a drop-off. You might not get a very fast increase of activity and then a little bit later on.

So there's a whole lot we've got to do. This actually now needs to become a watching brief. But at the moment, we've got to troll back through reports, things like the chair's report at these meetings three times a year where we've taken a snapshot of how many pieces of policy have been presented by the ALAC and this sort of thing to get any of that data out. And what we wanted to do is make sure, as you know – I'm not preaching. I'm actually trying to influence everyone else, not you, because I know you know – is that make sure that this time we continue after ATLAS II with a proper set of observations about the success of ATLAS II.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Any other questions or comments? None? Okay. Then let's move on to the next thing, which is the NomCom. Back to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Yrjö, did you want to join me up this end of the table so we get to see a teeming force? Well, our team partly enforced. That's all right. We lose people all the time.

As Yrjö comes up to join me, I'll do what I feel I should, which is close my friendliness and camaraderie and come in as a far more formal approach now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If I may add, maybe the camera has to zoom back a little bit to include the three of us, if you wish to have a camaraderie. I wouldn't advise that you come closer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We could. We could crowd you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go for it. No, we're two minutes over time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Trust me, we won't need to take too much more of your time. What we had hoped to do and Yrjö, as you know, Yrjö and I are now being somewhat more formal with you, so I would normally start with, "Hello, my name is Cheryl Langdon," or, "Some of you may know me, " and introduce Yrjö but time is not permitting.

We come from you. Yrjö was the chair of the Nominating Committee last year. I'm the chair of the Nominating Committee this year. And this blank space is left for the chair of the Nominating Committee we assume because it is a chair elect position until it is confirmed by the ICANN Board which is Stephane Van Gelder. So just pretend you've got Stephane there.

And we wanted you to get used to these three faces because just because it looks like at the middle of the year meeting, which we're at now, all the "work" in inverted commas of the NomCom is done, it is far from over.

On Wednesday morning, tomorrow morning, we will be presenting a reporting – and it's just going to be a very informal but hopefully very detailed reporting – on our processes and what we've done and how we've done it this year to the community. And I'd welcome you to come along to that. That would be a very good thing.

But what we're going to be continuing to do after even our deliberations are complete is engage with the community to build a better model. And you, as a significant part of the end user representation that happens in ICANN – I would venture to say *the* significant part of end user representation that happens in ICANN – it's

in your court, I would like to suggest, that trying to get things that end up with the best external influences, external thought leaders, and for some of you who are used to certain types of corporate governments, independent director and leader types on to these committees and boards.

We're going to ask your help directly as well as that of the rest of the ICANN community to help us build a better model. We've already, under Yrjö's tutelage, come a huge way. We'd like to think undermine we've pushed the envelope a little bit further, and I'm pretty convinced Stephane's looking to continue that pathway. But that means we're going to be interacting with you as a community relatively extensively between now and Los Angeles.

The other thing is, and one of the vital things you now have to do for us is find or confirm the members that the ALAC wish to have serve on the 2015 Nomination Committee. That's something. We've left alone very, very generously until ATLAS was behind you. It almost is, Mr. Chairman.

It's time you looked as to whether or not you need to refresh your talent pool or you have to refresh your talent pool, or you're going to leave you talent pool substantially as it is, and you need to interact and double check with the people who are serving in my NomCom as to whether they are willing or able to continue because I might have worn them out. And that's it from me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And we can have an action item actually for staff to issue a note to the current NomCom members from the

RALO as well. I'm totally fried up, aren't I? Yes, it sounds like it. It must be being surrounded by two NomCom people. Somehow the pressure is on. Yes, indeed. I'm not quite sure what to say. Oh, dear, I'm panicking. No, I'm not. Okay.

I'm being very sarcastic here. Sorry. English humor at this time of the day. No AI, and we'll follow up afterwards of course with regards to NomCom. Any questions to NomCom? Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you. I put the question the past two years but I feel it necessary to come back to it this year. It's about the so-called skill set which is a big thing on the Board. Seen from here, from the user community who we represent, I think this issue has taken an even greater importance now that the user interests or the user perspective has been put up front by us, by the ALAC, especially at ALAC in ATLAS II.

So my question and perhaps my comment is this: if in the past we have seen through several examples that the more you have an elaborate and long skill set, and the more there is a risk, just a risk, that one may miss out on more important characteristics such as honesty, independence of judgment, and ability to take in all the aspects of the public interest rather than being the best accountant in the world, or the best reviewer of accounts in the world, etc.

So I would like to caution once again on the limited interest of adhering to the skill set, which have been bandied about in the Board for years and years because for instance, to give a concrete example, when I was on the Board, towards the end what I saw was that everyone was

talking about, “Yes, we need managers of corporations which have at least \$100 million to \$200 million of budget.” And then what you say about the independence of mind of the non-conflicted character of that person, etc. We have seen some very bad examples which we have been led to by self-regulation because what this is saying is actually a form of indirect capture of ICANN.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may very briefly – and I’m going to say thank you for the statement as opposed to the question. And it is a statement that we have heard and indeed worked with the Board Governance Committee this year to make sure that even the Board criteria are not in any way likely to be read by the Nominating Committee Members.

Remember, we’re the leadership team, the NomCom members, the people that the ALAC and the other sending organizations, they do the actual appointment. But what we’ve got is from all of the receiving bodies – Board included – a clear and unambiguous understanding that these are not requirements.

These are some desirable characteristics and indeed they need to be looked at in the matrix of the full and existing set of skills on whatever council, ALAC, or Board we are sending to because it was – and I admit, much to my frustration – being read by some that this was a requirement that you had a particular thing. You’ve used the fund one, the fund management one, but there was a number that became quite exclusive.

So we see whatever the receiving body tells us now as essential or desirable characteristics as indicators not as a set of checklists that that's the only way we can appoint to. Yrjö, do you want to speak more?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Yes, thank you. Just that the skill sets are not the only set of specifications because those more general and more important qualifications – you mentioned some of them, honesty, independence of mind, and so on and so forth – you can actually find them in the bylaws. And that is of course our first Bible, let's say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yrjö, and thank you to Cheryl as well for this presentation, which was not a presentation, as she told me, but which certainly gave us the information we needed to know.

This is the end of this session. We've got a few announcements before we go. First, Thematic Group 1 to congregate around Evan. We've got the fair that is coming up – is it in half an hour it starts? A bit longer than half an hour. That's over in Sandringham, which I believe is the thing we went to this morning, the room we went to this morning with the Board. That's a large room.

Then we have reminder to wear the RALO colors. I don't know the RALO exactly. I think yellow for North America, blue for Europe, green for Latin American and Caribbean, orange for Africa, and red for APRALO. Wear something of your RALO color and then we'll be easily identified by the community. We'll have a lot of people up there.

There's going to be some music by community members and also non-community members, non-At-Large community members. It will be rather fun. A little bit like an At-Large music night, in addition to having Nnenna Nwakanma and Wolfgang Kleinwächter who will be both having a keynote speech and a video message from Vint Cerf as well.

Timing-wise, so is it 7:30? Seven-thirty. Please arrive before that as well because I think we'll try and start sharply at the time. Apart from that, all there needs to be for me to do is anything else from staff? Nothing.

I just have to thank all of you for being here but first I have to thank the interpreters who remained another 15 minutes beyond the time. And they have had to contend with a lot of talking this afternoon, especially with all of the working groups that we've been reviewing. There was a very, very long list.

I'd also like to thank the technical team who have managed to make the sound work fantastically well, and the cameras as well. Great stuff.

And thanks to you all. This call, this meeting, this day of work is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]