

(0:00:00 to 0:23:40 – Spanish)

(0:23:40 to 0:24:25 – French)

Scott Pinzon: ...or perhaps I should just open the questions, whatever is of most service I'm happy to do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well let's ask the room. Would we like to Scott to focus on ICANN.org or open to questions? Carlos over to you, go ahead.

Carlos Aguirre: In my region I try to talk in Spanish. Okay.

Heidi Ullrich: The question is, or my comment is what is your sound reason or excuse me, you have put this very, very soundly, very, very well in a very solid manner in that many people in many regions do not know what ICANN is at all. We have been speaking about this for a long while and I had an experience two days ago here in Colombia I had to deliver a presentation in one of the biggest cities in Colombia. I spoke at a university, a university with educated people, with people that supposedly are knowledgeable of this subject and out of all the audience when I asked them about ICANN only two people out of approximately 100 attendees, only two out of 100 said they knew what ICANN was about. So I believe this job needs to be done. I don't want to be blunt or show a lack of respect, we don't need to reach 2011 to become aware that many people do not know ICANN.

So congratulations on your job and I hope it comes to fruition. We do need this outreach, we do need people to know ICANN. We do need people to know who works for ICANN. We do need people to know what ICANN does and to participate in what we do. Thank you.

Beau Brendler:

Before I speak have we decided that we want to ask questions or...? Okay, so I have two. My one point is I write a lot about ICANN issues, there's never anybody reasonable to talk to about anything. I mean it's like you have no working, functioning press office. So it would be really great of you to take a first step immediately of naming some kind of press liaison to the public. If you have one I don't know who it is which is a PR problem is for you in a big way.

Second is I don't think that the At-Large should involve itself with the ICANN marketing and PR Department. I think it should have its own way of distributing press releases otherwise it might risk having a lack of respect from the exterior and just seen to be functioning as an ICANN mouthpiece which I think many people already see it as. So those are both questions and comments.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you, Beau. The press relations/media relations person is Brad White. One of the things you'll find across the board in this new department is that it's not fully staffed up yet. So Brad is actually very good at what he does. I don't know who may have seen articles in *The Economist* early in the week that were there as a result of Brad's work. So obviously it would be better if he had

two or three people in order to respond to everything that's incoming, that's not happening yet, but he is the resource and they take press calls all day every day.

To your second point about At-Large, now we don't envision any of the ACs or SOs becoming mouthpieces for some corporation. Our intent is to serve and to work cooperatively. Especially with my new role in having to do with matters of outreach, that is not something that we can do on our own. We've received actually many requests from At-Large people saying what can we do to make the world more aware of ICANN and we would love to work in harmony with you.

And to Apollo's point earlier, even though our survey about perceptions of ICANN will not be done for a while, we're not waiting for it before we take action. The problem here is that there are many things in the works right now that I cannot speak of because some will happen and some will fall through, but I suspect as soon as the March meeting you're going to see that ICANN's profile has been raised significantly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Last time I spoke with [Bagalar], I spoke with him about my point of view regarding communication and I told him I thought we can give ICANN a better image. And I told him look this is not just about beautiful sounding speeches or about distributed documents, this involves ICANN's active involvement in the internet

ecosystem. So the people participating in that workshop organized by AFRALO were the ones with the highest turnout in the entire organization, in the AJF, and this workshop was organized at the same time as the ICANN forum. So attendees at the workshop were more outnumbered those in the ICANN forum, therefore if you want people to respect us as a community we ourselves as a community, as participants, have to make ourselves respected. I must say At-Large can give this or make this good impression by means of active involvement and participation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I suppose if I may, before I move to our speaking order which is currently Sebastien, Wolf, and Yook (sp) and then I see Evan. We have a little tiny bit of housekeeping. We've had two people join the table and who've not introduced themselves which will also help the translators, so actually three now. If I can ask first of all Vivek, and then Andres and then Sergio to introduce yourselves very briefly; please go ahead.

V.C. Vivekananda:

I'm Vivek from India and I'm in ALAC for the last two years and this is my last ALAC meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

But not your last meeting in the wonderful world of ICANN. We like the principle of recycling. We are strong at recycling in this world. Go ahead Andres.

Andres Piazza:

Hi. My name is Andres Piazza, I'm from Argentina and since 2009 I'm the President of LACRALO, but I don't know when my last meeting will be.

Sergio Salinas Porto: I'm also going to speak in Spanish. Good morning to all of you. I am Sergio Salinas Porto. I'm from LACRALO and my next meeting I will be sitting here as a representative for my region. And as Andres I also expect not to finish soon, I don't know when I will be leaving. I hope to be here for a long time. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I appreciate your tenacity and the intensity or LACRALO to be here for the long term, that's excellent. Especially since we're here in the beautiful part of the country which is very much your region and might I thank the local hosts who may not be in the room, but this is just a delight. Many of us have had long hard yards to get here, but having got here your city is magnificent. Over to you Sebastien, then Wolf, then Yook.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Cheryl. We already had the opportunity to talk, Scott and myself, during the last two days about all that issue. I am still in trouble with the word used. Even if it's by the law of California law, we are not a corporation; we are an organization with participation from all stakeholders. And the word corporation is misleading in this word today then we want to communicate, we need to communicate with the right words. The same thing with marketing, I am not sure that we are doing marketing.

We want to make communication and we want to reach the world with the right communication to allow the world to know about us and when I say us, not just what the CEOs, the Board are doing,

but what the ALS are doing, what the other constituency from the edge. We need that, that's a long, long term I guess work, but. And once again sorry to say again and again, but I would have hoped that at least the work you are doing is not to build ICANN.org, but the website or websites we need for the communication in the future because I will say to my colleague, you know already Scott I told you, ICANN is the organization who deals with domain names. If ICANN is just using one domain name we don't need any more new gTLD because each organization just did one and they already got one and then why all this to bother. We need to be the champion of the diversity of extension use by ICANN. It's for me absolutely mandatory.

We have, in fact, there is maybe domain names, but just its appeared during the ICANN meetings, it must be something all around the world as a year and we can discuss that and you have some example, like when I make the study about introducing the first gTLD after 2000. One company was leading in this area was Air France. Air France decide to use some different extensions for different purposes and we need to do the same. It's not to say that at the end of the day you can't go from one to another to have a big picture, but it's allowing you to go, you don't want to be stuck in one silo because you go with one domain name specifically. And that must be a thinking since the start.

If tomorrow we have a dot Wiki, I don't know if we will get so on, but with that dot Wiki we will need to use ICANN dot Wiki not

say ok hat's a dot Wiki, but we have an ICANN dot org and we have a Wiki within. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien. Wolf.

Wolf Ludwig: Well actually most things have already been said. If you talk about corporate communication I entirely agree with Sebastien. Corporate may in a certain sense be sometimes misleading. And it has different aspects. It has technical aspects how best you organize your media relations, your media desk and things like this. The main point what is sometimes striking me, when ICANN on the one hand is talking about multi-stakeholder, bottom up blah, blah, blah, and how you organize the respective processes of communication, whether you still go the traditional way like most of the corporations do; they have his masters voice, what is the CEO normally. And then they have a bunch of people in the communication department implementing what his master's voice told them.

And then it's a top down communication process. And I think this conventional, traditional. Classical communication pattern cannot apply to an organization in the multitude of ICANN with having so many stakeholders involved. If we really want to function on the multi-stakeholder basis and if you really take bottom up processes serious you have to consider this in almost everything that you are panning and organizing in your communication department. There shouldn't be any contradiction in it. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Yook and then our my next speaker is Evan then I come back to Fouad and then I go to Carlton.

Yook: Thank you. It's a paradox to my mind that the media is full of stories that relate one way or the other to the internet. More and more and of course plays such a central role in our life that it creates stories, its news. At the same time ICANN is unknown as you said. So I think that the thing is I know from some experience actually that it's very hard to make people, and journalists interested in organizations, bureaucracies, structures and what they do and so on and so forth. And I think that it would be perhaps it would be better to try to piggyback on the interest of people in these issues that are related to the internet and then try to show that what ICANN's role is here, what ICANN is doing and what ICANN is responsible for and also what ICANN is not responsible for. In other words it's not running the internet as we all know. This is my voice. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. I have two comments. One of which I guess has to do with the nature of the communications. Maybe instead of just saying well we want a better public idea of what ICANN does perhaps we might want to think a little bit more strategically on things that ICANN should be saying as part of its message. And I'll give you a very specific example. A lot of problems that I'm seeing, for instance the whole vertical integration thing seems to be based on perception that there's a very public belief that everybody

needs to be in one specific TLD and the rest are all just fallbacks. For instance if ICANN can do some kind of promotion to remind the world that there's more than one default TLD or dot com plus your country's code or something like that. There's a diversity of TLDs. I think that would probably help also get away from a lot of the perception, it seemed to me that a lot of what was done in the vertical integration group was based on perception that there's this big monopoly power and all these little guys trying to come in and an awful lot of ICANN policy seems to be based on that. If ICANN can do something to change public perception that there's a default global domain, plus everyone's got their own country domain, and to publicize the fact that there is this diversity. I think that's the kind of communications that would be of value rather than just spewing ICANN policy and official statements out to the press.

Now, my second point is talk to us. And the reason for that being what you have in front of you is a body of ICANN's own creation meant to be its conduit to the general public. Rather than going through the media, one of the best things that ICANN has going for it is this supposedly two-way channel between itself and the grass roots. This is a vastly underused resource. When we have been asked for how would you like to do outreach we've come back with answers and those answers have been tossed over the wall never to be heard from again. And I can tell you Wolf and I at one point had been, we were saying well if we could do outreach, we even had a suggestion that would have At-Large volunteers be at strategic trade shows around the world, staffed by

volunteers, costing ICANN next to nothing, doing valuable outreach, we tossed it over the wall and never heard back.

So there have been many opportunities, you have this extreme resource here that exists to do multi directional. The design of At-Large is not just to feed policy into ICANN, but in order to do that good policy ICANN's information has to go back to that grass roots. You can't have good policy without having good foundation information. The two-way nature of that communications has always been problematic. At least from my personal point of view, I don't think it's alone, but I think you really have an opportunity here if ICANN is creating a communications channel, don't think of it totally in terms of corporate public relations in terms of you don't have shareholder relations, you have stakeholders here. So the traditional corporate model of communications cannot be the same. And in addition you have something that other companies don't and that is this.

So I'm really suggesting use this group, talk to us, find out if you want to know what the public perception is of ICANN you go around this table and you'll have no shortage of opinions, but that's not just personal, well... That takes a whole other day, but the point I'm trying to make is you have this resource, rather than create something saying we need a new corporate way to get the message out, use some of what ICANN has already designed. This is a very creative, very potentially useful body to do a good chunk of the work you're saying needs to be done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Evan. Scott definitely wants to respond to that.

Scott Pinzon: First of all I apologize because it seems I may have offended the audience simply by using the word “corporate”. The truth is ICANN is in fact a California Not for Profit Corporation. That word apparently is loaded with implications that I was unaware of and I would love to hear afterwards what to call it if we don’t call it corporate communications.

Evan Leibovitch: Community perhaps.

Scott Pinzon: To respond to your idea of two-way communications I have a proposal for you. We have a desire, and I think that includes all of us not we just meaning some guys in an office in Marina Del-Ray, for the world to know about the opportunity of new gTLDs. One of the things I thought could be a wonderful way for At-Large and those guys in Marina Del-Ray to help each other is there is a rather beautiful presentation prepared about the basics of what is a gTLD, what is the opportunity, why does it matter that there are new ones. The presentation has been translated into six languages and my thought was I wonder if folks from At-Large would like to take that presentation through their ALSs and use it as an opportunity to engage with the communities around them.

You put on a presentation about new gTLDs, you can use it as a recruiting tool and also as a way to inform all corners of the globe about the opportunity. Is that something that would be of interest to this group?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I'm not sure we need to do a show of hands, but does anybody want to just make a general statement on the fact that we have spoken about being able to use ICANN as a mechanism for our own outreach as well as seems like gTLD. Go ahead, thank you very much.

Matthias Langenegger: Well I was going to go back to that because as people are talking. I wrote down two words – I said what should be said and who should be saying it. I wrote down to short notes to myself as to gather my thoughts about what I would say about this. The first one was what should be said and who should be saying it. And I'm bouncing it around with Evan here because we have long advocated that as the conduit to the user community, we the At-Large, are probably best positioned to say what needs to be said. That's the first thing. But there's a lot of general concern. And I'm talking about the next billion users. And in my part of the world we come from we talk about that in terms of development. And development here is social and economic and so on, that's what we're talking about here.

We have long and deposed ourselves between the ordinary user and ICANN and have suggested to ICANN over the years that the messages that we build have to speak directly to the developmental challenges, the perspective development for the next billion users. And we feel that we had a role to play in being conduits of that message. We feel we have a role to play in crafting the message.

We feel we have a role to play in even suggesting the channels for delivery of the message outside of ourselves.

When I first got into At-Large, one of the things that I brought to it was the impact and the desirability of using a radio as a modality to speak to the next billion potential users. We haven't gone very far with that. The other issue that, and Evan kind of said it and then your suggestion, your idea that we look into it comes into play. We've always proposed that what we need is a collaborative approach to developing the messages for the edge. We have always proposed that. Everybody here since 2007 will recall that one of the things that At-Large pushed heavily was for messages, development of messages that were in language that the ordinary user could access. We recall that we have pushed for translations of the messages and even using our own At-Large resources for the translation of those messages. People will recall again that we have pushed strongly against becoming involved in forum that are not called by ICANN but that could be used as a way to message the far reaches of the community.

So for example, we proposed that ICANN would if not sponsor at least provide messaging and materials that we could circulate in important regional forums. We have all put this on the table. What we have not done is translate them into action as well as we could and probably if we need to have another look at that, take another crack at the whip, we might get something done.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you for those comments and I want to assure you how much I resonate with basically all that's been said here today. I cannot speak for what happened before I came into this position, but the very fact that a communications department exists now is because some of your pleas as a group have been heard. One of the things I'm happy to inform you about is that At-Large began a process a while back to create a beginners guide to the domain name system and it took some time to put it together, but by end of business time tomorrow, Monday, you will see it posted. And this is definitely the direct result of ALACs action, or At-Larges action.

And I'm very interested in what you're saying and I'm definitely about translating it into action; that's why I'm here. Great ideas here. Oh yeah, Heidi's reminding me not only do we have now, as of tomorrow, a beginners guide to domain names it will become a series. And at the next meeting you will see a beginner's guide to IPV4 and IPV6 and our intent is to continue releasing a new beginners guide each meeting until we run through a list of topics that actually was provided to us by At-Large. So I embrace working with you and definitely want to, I will even say that as far as ICANN's claim to represent the users of the internet, the greatest validity to that claim at all is At-Large, otherwise we mostly just represent all the other stakeholders who are far outnumbered by ordinary internet users.

One other remark I'll make about developing countries, I also am very excited about welcoming the next billion onto the internet and we do not have time now to go over the whole direction of

ICANN's website, but Vanda and Sebastien have already had to sit through that presentation and a highlight of it is we are about to introduce very strong support for Smartphone's and mobile phones on the website, so that for people who can only access the internet from their phone, they will still find a nimble site that is searchable, that they can get the resources they want and obviously someone has thought about the fact that they're coming and made a way for them to do their task easily. So thank you very much for your comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And thank you on behalf of Arica and large parts of Asia which are mobile phone based for their internet communication. So the billion and the billion after that will also be thanking you, let's hope we can help. Fouad I have you and then I believe Erick because Carlton you were queued next, but I suspect you just dealt with what you were going to deal with. Fouad and Erick.

Fouad Bajwa:

Fouad Bajwa from Pakistan. I like to read something from October 2009 that ICANN was just evil, that's what I thought.

Scott Pinzon:

I must say if that's what you thought you were sure a pleasant fellow in October 2009.

Fouad Bajwa:

Interestingly I was, I've been the person whose career depends on the internet and the web as a web engineer, web designer, developer and so forth. And one perception was that ICANN provides domain names, but the other perception as I moved into internet governance was that ICANN was evil and it was really bad

for developing countries. And I would like to attribute the people sitting next to you like Cheryl and Olivier who actually helped me cross this barrier and actually come in as a fellow into ICANN from 2009.

And that transition process, with the help of the fellowship program, Mandy's been a witness to it, Dennis has been there, that has helped change a lot of perceptions which go directly into the internet governance forum. Maybe now in December 2010 I can say that ICANN is a necessary evil. And we should keep like organizations like IT away from it. And when you think about this and you go all the way to Geneva, you have a lot of stakeholders to convince and these people also look at ICANN from the evil perspective. So this is how bad it is, one is getting the basic message out, the other is the message divided into key messages for specific audiences.

When we say, we talk about At-Large and all the comments that you're hearing, these are comments about the public face of ICANN. And I continuously repeat this in all the meetings with communications staff or representative, why, because we make you look good and we make you look bad and that remains. And if we tend to get the information chaos syndrome, the overload thing, just imagine how bad it is for the layman. So we have to pretty clear in how we want to take forward our implicit or explicit messages.

And the message, for example the gTLD communication, and yesterday I was sitting through the GAC meeting on new gTLDs, and one problem that we collaboratively are facing is that the funding opportunities and money to support such a huge program, such a global program is very chaotic. But if a proper communication strategy was in place and was targeted, for example, if I educated anyone in Pakistan about paying \$180,000 for duty of the applications, they would totally freak out. They think I'm crazy. Why, because it takes 30 years to even make that kind of money in Pakistan, if you do really good.

Income levels are different, perceptions are different, the glasses I'm wearing, these were \$7, the same glasses in Geneva are for \$400. That's how the income disparity is. So if we want to get this message out into Pakistan and South Asia and further on, this isn't going to work. And all the information we place on an ICANN website isn't going to help us because this is what's happening on the ground.

To convince how does it benefit developing countries that we join the business opportunity, we engage with it, but at the same time we do not forget that we're not just users, we're human beings. That's when the digital divide comes in or getting access to the next billion comes in, it's treating the user as a human being, not as a consumer; not just as a consumer. And the value that you see in the transition happening globally is the developing world is becoming a very large consumer and producer of a large scale of internet services. And I can just look toward the east in Asia and I

see the whole new internet being rising from there, from the Asian countries, Asia – Pacific so forth.

So these are really key issues and I was working on the communications coordination team for the website, and I was a bit sarcastic about the whole analysis, communication analysis, because that perspective is a very, very developed country perspective. It's a very, very what you call it Western incentive technology pioneering and view, but we have a great amount of information at the grass root levels that we have to create. And I tell you, I made non profits in the US, I worked with groups in Canada, Evan's been there with me on certain occasions and I've been responsible for engaging, like with partnerships, beyond \$860 million in so many countries and the message has to be different. And you cannot cultivate that message unless I'm sitting with you for my country.

This is something I was even talking to with Mr. (inaudible 1:01:19), we were on the same flight to Cartagena, and the discussion was now at this stage where we have to bring in people through channels, look people still, if I wasn't here through the ICANN fellowship program I wouldn't be sitting here. You can't bring the whole world through the fellowship programs here, right, not possible. How do you engage them? Will the website give one channel, one window of, I would say zero window of opportunity for people to engage with ICANN. How will that happen? Where will they be channelized to? Do we actually need some form of Working Groups?

Something we see in the ITU and the ITU speaks a lot about that and sometimes we remain to see like ICANN wants to be in the planet potentially. And I was just thinking if these same Working Groups existed for the stakeholders of ICANN from anywhere in the world they could directly engage with ICANN, it could become even more productive, more pragmatic than those international distributions. Because that would actually help ICANN get some really serious stuff done. Ideas could happen here 10 years ago, we're waiting for them, but some small things that happen and it turned ICANN into something like OACD. It takes 10 years to just get over something.

So these issues can be reduced and this is part of the communications strategy, that's how important it is. So how do we communicate with the people? Do you want us to be there? Should there be some Working Group formats which happen remotely, people can engage with them? We have to see how we can bring in people immediately into that process.

Second thing – the message on the ground - your communication will have to be very diverse in many, many vertical ways because people at say IGF is just one example, then you have the regional IGFs, people have different perceptions. Evan's example that at a cost effective basis, no cost to ICANN, there are important initiatives that we can pull off on the ground, but we really need to work closely on building these. The website is not the only channel; there's much more we have to do. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And just before we go to Erick and following on, one of the things that we have discussed previously and I do recognize Mandy with her usual incredible resilience and patience is here and we were running a little late when you started, but forgive us if you will. It does lead into global partnerships, this acting locally or regionally does need to be a little bit developed, but we also need to remember that sometimes we need demountable things. We just don't have internet connectivity where we have the opportunity to speak. So give us something on a fancier doing than this and then when we connected to our internet it updates with the latest snapshot of the communication tools that we have. We can help think smart and we'd like to do so we're not going to solve these problems now, but if it can be solved we'd like to be part of the solution.

No, no, no, later maybe. Erick, go ahead.

Erick Iriarte: Thank you Cheryl. Scott, I'm an observer still until Friday, but, so if you want to humor me by listening.

Scott Pinzon: Absolutely.

Erick Iriarte: Thank you. The ICANN has been fairly successful communicating to the CCs and to the governments, so to territorial jurisdictions at the nation/state level ICANN has been successful in communicating. Most of them are present or involved in some way, shape, or form. But if you're looking for targeting your

outreach, your communications effort, just the top, the largest 25 urban aggregations count for .44 billion people and ICANN doesn't communicate at all to cities. If you look out to the 479 urban aggregations with a population of a million or more, that sums up to 1.5 billion persons and presumable that's pretty close to the 1 billion next users. So rather than sort of being general and diffuse in your targeting of your communications effort I recommend, or I suggest the taking a look at cities as being the targets of communication. That's 25 to 500 urban administrations to develop some kind of a marketing collateral that communicates some message to.

There is another kind of territorial jurisdiction that is also overlooked by ICANN. Those are the, now I'm speaking more to the North American perspective, the 565 federally recognized Indian tribes in the United States and the similar number of treaty status or constitutional status tribal band organizations in Canada. And so I want to say something that may sound critical, but it's I hope illuminating. And that is that ICANN lacks the specific competence to communicate effectively with these two forms of territorial jurisdictions which represent a significant number of users globally and overlooked minority in North America specifically.

And I'll stop there, thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you. Sylvia and then if anyone else is wanting to be on the speaking list for that I'll give you a very short period of time and I

will give you the tiniest few words to say what you want to say, but then that is it, we need to move on. Ok, Sylvia.

Sylvia Herlein Leite:

In Spanish please. Taking into account as Carl's advice on outreach with the new gTLDs guidebooks, I think this is a good idea. There's plenty of material online that we can have available online, but the issue here is how to reach the end user. We in Brazil, in my organization, when we try to hold an outreach event and reach people we find serious hurdles to give them some material and to let them know what ICANN is about. We even run into trouble in organizing an event and letting them know that I am an ALAC member because I need a sort of official permit to use ICANN's name in some events or functions.

There are plenty of potential elements in the air so to speak, but we cannot come to fruition, we cannot reach any concrete results and reach the layperson that sometimes doesn't even have a computer because we deal with digital inclusion in some civil societies organizations.

We, in Nairobi, I myself together with Sheba from India, we prepared a presentation that we sent to Barbara. We focused on a program, both an outreach and inreach program, and unfortunately since Nairobi we have had no reply or no feedback. Nobody told us way to go, you are on the right track, keep it up; nothing along those lines. So thank you.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you, excellent comments. Here's another interesting thought. There has been a lot of emphasis in parts of ICANN on finding people to sponsor these meetings. Barbara asked me a very interesting question in September that I still have not answered, she said should ICANN sponsor some others. And you bring up digital inclusion. If At-Large wanted to propose charities or projects or campaigns that they believe ICANN should sponsor in order to help people get online or to obtain laptops or I don't know what, there would be a receptive ear to actually seriously consider the idea and see if funds could be allocated.

That would be something I would love to hear from At-Large about. And I think we're getting close to having to wrap up, I'm not trying to tell you your job, but in case I do not get to speak again, I just want to say I love being here with you, I'm very open to you and please feel free to grab me this week for side conversations. Fouad, hear you loud and clear, very much want to know your perspective and of course everyone else too. So thank you for your time and attention this morning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Scott, but we do have a couple of people who are desperate to just get a couple of more words in before we lose you. Evan briefly, Fouad briefly, then Olivier, that's it.

Evan Leibovitch:

Couple of one liner points. Scott, when you're doing the website for mobile devices I suppose you're going to be using dot mobi for that? Take advantage of your own resources and what ICANN does itself. Just one liner tossed out there. Secondly, please go

we've had the capability to take it a step further from what must have been perceived initially. For example the Board candidate evaluation committee. The system we do have for voting and the scoring systems and all those things we introduced with the ICANN technical team into that. Those are both examples.

So this is one thing for you to take away that if you throw something at us, we're really good at actually coming up with new ideas and implementing it. So that is why I say that if the website is made with the coordination of ALAC and it's At-Large organizations, we will definitely give in significant input and make it conducive to our regions to actually create that and to (inaudible 1:13:36). Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Fouad. And I believe there's someone to my left who seems to want to speak.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. I just wanted to touch on one point which you've very kindly told us about, the fact that ICANN wishes to play Father Christmas and support communities with whatever it can. I'm sorry to use the term Father Christmas as a very Western term for this time of the year and for presents translate it to whatever it is in your part of the world dressed in red or green or whatever. But the point is that as far as Father Christmas is concerned, your little dwarfs helping dwarfs and so on are actually right in front of you. And instead of actually thinking that you would be funding the presents for those people out there, perhaps the first thing that needs to be funded are the people that are in

front of you so that they have reindeer and sleighs in order to be able to go and to have the means to go and do the outreach. We hear language on one side, and Evan very much said it, language on one side which says yes, we want to be doing this and doing that and doing that and as soon as something comes up and the community here in front of you proposes something, the only answer we get is I'm sorry there's no money. Thank you. When there's an answer.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yeah, there's still a little bit of jaded feeling in the room as you might guess Scott, but hey, if it wasn't going to be a challenge where would the fun be in it all? Just before we move to Mandy and we really just shifted around, I basically see we've done a lot of discussions of next steps in this session so we've nailed it. Thank you very much Scott for joining us and hope that we'll have you back as a regular feature item.

Scott Pinzon:

I would love it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Terrific thanks Scott. Alan, seeing as we've done a round robin and introduction, you've escaped from the GNSO room very, very briefly, would you care to introduce yourself?

Alan Greenburg:

I think you've already done that. Alan Greenburg, NOMCOM appointee to the ALAC from North America and the GNSO liaison, or liaison to the GNSO sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Alan. Now Mandy, do you have any show and tell or are we just going to play this by ear?

Mandy Carver: No, I didn't bring a slide show. So we can play this by ear, I can take questions; I do actually have a couple of follow up comments for Scott and all of you and I think that you've done an amazing job in actually outlining all the ways that ALAC can assist ICANN particularly around the new gTLD communications campaign, which is something in the process of being developed and ramped up and I think that the point about needing targeted messages based on the audience and that you have the capacity to help define what that message should be out to the user community. Because as others have commented, we have existing relationships and channels of communication and so there's a mechanism for notifying the national governments and this is something that Scott and I need to sit down and talk about, I would argue that the message has to be different for all of those organizations because the interest is different.

So the interest in new gTLDs on the part of a national government or a jurisdictional entity, is going to be very different than the interest of a corporation that might be looking at trademark, which is also very different than an entrepreneur or a linguistic community or regional community that's going to be looking at new gTLDs.

So the communication strategy has to be different, the message has to be different. There's a certain core of materials, what is the

application process and why does it look the way it does, but and this is speaking a little bit out of turn, national governments aren't going to care about necessarily the nuts and bolts of the program with the exception of what are the levers for objections and what controls do they have. Many of the, I mean you've all seen the draft applicant guidebook and you know the volume of information that's there, that's important for the people who are going to walk through those steps, but we need subset, targeted information.

And I think that yes, you all can absolutely play a role in helping, well this is, I'm not in the communications department and I don't want to speak for Scott, but I can definitely see an application there. And he and I can also talk later about the whole question of sponsorship and funding issues because we have been down this road and there are some very valid requests from all of the communities. And then we get into prioritization and budgetary constraints on everything from hiring to everything else. So that's a framing and Scott and I, I know, will have further conversations. And I know there are already questions, but.

Evan Leibovitch:

Sorry, it's not so much a question but an observation that ICANN is already doing this, but it's being very selective about it. But something that sort of stuck in the ear of a lot of people, myself included of course, is the fact that ICANN doesn't just sponsor meetings for registrars, it fully funds them and then makes them closed to the public. And there's a discrepancy there. Everything that At-Large does is absolutely open. Any other constituency and stakeholder can participate. I remember one work group at the

summit that seemed to have half of the room filled with contracted parties, they were welcome, they were part of the conversation.

Yet when ICANN holds its regional meetings, the one that stuck with me was the one that was held in Toronto that we weren't even told about until afterwards, let alone had an opportunity to have anybody there. We got told then that no there's no confidential exchanged at this meeting, this is not contractual things, this is description of the program, but we didn't let you in because it's not a policy meeting. I'm sorry I don't consider that to be an excuse. We're smart enough to know that if it's not a policy meeting than you don't go there to discuss policy. That's not an excuse to make meetings like that closed to public access. If this is something that ICANN is funding, than it should be an open meeting. If registrars or registries want to form an industry association and hold closed sessions of their own and invite ICANN, by all means go ahead, God bless.

But if you want to have something that ICANN is sponsoring, than it should be held to the same levels of openness and accountability as you do for everything else. We've been begging to have, when you do these regional meetings, you're already spending the money, you're already sending the staff, have maybe one hour of a two day meeting that's available to the greater community. It's these little things that if you do them they end up really, really benefitting the community as well as ICANN's image in the community, but you're having a much worse effect by keeping them closed because you invite conspiracy theories. Well you're

telling us there's no confidential information, well why then isn't it open?

And you invite this kind of thing and from an image standpoint this is poison. And I'll leave it at that. I mean it's nice to see that you're interested, but again turning that interest into something concrete when there's so many existing glaring examples of what some people have considered to be bad action, that there's plenty of room to work with, without even needing any new ideas, just work on the old ones and carry them through.

Mandy Carver: I hear you and I understand the history of this and, have Tim and, this is the contracted parties, have Tim and Craig ever been invited to come and speak to this question?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yes.

Mandy Carver: Okay, so.

Evan Leibovitch: There is a photo on Facebook of Tim and me in a very animated discussion in Nairobi.

Mandy Carver: Yes, okay. So not my department, not my constituency, not my funding. I do know that registrars and registries provide sponsorship in the same way that we have sponsorship from other parties for the ICANN meetings. I don't know the details of the underlying budgets for those meetings. I have had them described to me as the days where they're actually discussing what's in the

contract. I've had them described as other kinds of things. I have no control over this and I hear you, I believe that they have heard you and I can't speak to that. What I was thinking about are things like LACTLD events, regional IVF events; those are the kinds of things where, and I believe it was Sophie made a comment about needing some sort of an authority to be able, Sylvia, I'm sorry.

And I don't know the details there, I do know that when we are asked if we will provide sponsorship for entities within the limited amount the global partnership has, sometime those are two entities where then you get on the road show. And so then we have outreach opportunities as we travel through a region for something. There is a very, very simple letter license for the use of using the logo and if there's an issue around that we can facilitate that. It's a very simple document so that we're indicating that yes you have the right to use the logo and this is how you're going to use it and just that's coming out of the Legal department, but I believe that communications and marketing will be aware of that as well.

So there is a limited pool, a very limited pool around sponsorship that is used to try and leverage and the more that can be done, and I know Evan that you've had some very limited financial impact suggestions of ways of extending that out.

Evan Leibovitch:

Actually, to be specific, Wolf, myself, and some others even came up with the idea of even as a trial run having an ICANN presence at Comdex, CBIT, and Computex in Taipei staffed by At-Large

volunteers, providing an ICANN presence to a public that normally doesn't even come near ICANN, which is exactly the purpose of this kind of thing. This has been brought up numerous times.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We're getting excited up here which is always a good thing so go Scott, go.

Scott Pinzon: Two things. First I'd like know if that is in writing somewhere where I can find it? The other thing you might be interested to know that on my own initiative I work with ISC Squared and people who hold any of their certificates, such as CISSP, can actually earn CPEs for volunteering at ICANN functions, which I think might resonate with some of those audiences you just described. So I'd love to hear more about that, that's right in line with the kind of thing I like to see happening.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ok, I'm seeing next steps and opportunity which is always very good. I also have a speaking order – I have Sebastien, I have Andres, I have Carlos, and now I have Tijani. Go ahead, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: (inaudible 1:26:17) I think we, something done by the ALSs in some country. I was hoping to have (inaudible 1:26:34) member and organizer of the conference in February, that next conference, and I think it's a very good place where ICANN needs to be involved, help, sponsor this initiative. And as ICANN staff will not be able within the four months to go everywhere to give the message of new gTLD program, we need really to have a

communication organized with leveraging the what's done by different stakeholder group and here as we are in ALAC I am talking about the At-Large structure.

And one of my ideas after discussing last, two weeks ago with Ken, was to see if we can't with the help of ICANN and our other At-Large structure replicate the same type of meeting that next in other part of the world because it seems like it's an interesting set up and if we cannot reinvent the world each time as we would have just four months for the communication, even if we can start earlier, in February will not be yet into the four month window, it could be interesting to do so I think it's something we need to be discuss and see how we can move it. But I am sure that what the ALSs can do in each and every region for this specific program, for other topics too, it's something ICANN staff must leverage. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Andres.

Andres Piazza:

Well maybe I said this before in I guess in Nairobi and again in Brussels, so I will be brief with this. The same thing Evan is talking about, I don't know if it is a registrar meeting in Toronto, it was a registrar meeting I guess, but in Buenos Aires and San Paolo last year, exactly one year ago there were two meetings that were called like some outreach activities, that was actually the name or at least in the emails I saw there was supposed to be outreach meetings.

And they weren't closed to the public, but the information wasn't, as an outreach meeting it wasn't open and it wasn't circulating the way it's supposed to be done. So I am sharing his concerns about that and I don't know who, which department inside of the ICANN staff architecture was dealing with those meetings, but we were in Latin America, many of the At-Large members, very concerned about those meetings also. Because we didn't get the chance not only to participate, but also to contribute in what is like an outreach activity in region.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Before we go to Carlos, I think Mandy it might be worthwhile exploring how we can get a better communication model somehow. I know that with Theresa in the past we had discussed, and then it stalled, having some shared communication base, a formally shared communication base between Heidi and, at that stage, Heidi and Theresa. But it might be something that if I could ask you both to take up an action item, this is becoming to be a bit of a repetitive theme and it seems that there's probably a very simple tool within ICANN structure that could make us stop looking backwards and start looking forwards, which would be a really good thing. Carlos, go ahead.

Carlos Aguirre:

Thank you Cheryl. Going back to Evan and Andres comments I think that we are watching a movie that we have watched on previous occasions and this shouldn't be the case. I think that it was Mandy who said it wasn't her department, the one organizing at least Evan's meeting, or the meeting that Evan was mentioning. As regards the meetings that Andres was telling us about, I do

clearly remember that Paolo [Inohosa] was in charge of handling this and he was part of Mandy's department and we At-Large representatives at the time when the meetings took place, when ICANN sponsored meetings took place in places that are nearby our places of residence, well we were not invited. So these things hurt. And they are demotivating and they make you feel that you don't want to keep on working. We feel as if we were not part of the same organization. We feel a different probably discriminated against. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay, thank you. Now my speaking order became a little complicated with people using the Adobe connect room and the real room, so hopefully I have not jumped over anybody too rudely. If my calculations are correct we should now go to Erick.

Erick Iriarte:

Thank you, Cheryl. I would like to follow up on the point that different audiences have different interest, this I believe Mandy made. Urban administrations care deeply about eGovernments, possible more than the national governments with which they are associated. Although national governments may have more developed standards, they don't actually intend to implement them in the near future and therefore the city government interest in name space issues contains a much greater urgency for actually something operational along the lines of eGovernment and open standards of linked data, similar issues.

The interest of travel governments, or indigenous governments in the western hemisphere and in the pacific are quite different; they

are sovereignty, economic development, linguistic and cultural preservation. These are interests which are very distinct from the interests of the generic standard gTLD applicant. And in fact, different from many of the motions that we have explorative communities and the development of the communities application type since the November 2007 meeting of ICANN when we first really began discussing it. So my real point is that the message needs to be targeted. The common material will work, but there has to be some tailoring to suit the target. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Mandy, did you want to respond? Did I not look to my left rather rudely I apologize if that's the case?

Mandy Carver:

And I've been told to speak slowly and close to the mic. I think that we have to have a much more comprehensive approach and when we are asked as global partnerships to assist in specific initiatives, and I believe the reference that Andres and then Carlos were referring to, were new gTLD outreach events with specific regional partners. That those should have been advertised, promoted, noticed through this network and this community as well and that we should be doing that on a regular basis. And yes, that was absolutely a misstep and I apologize.

And that is why new gTLDs have been in the works a long time, in fits and starts about what is communicated in what manner and what are they trying to do. And in some instances there were events held in different parts of the world that were about getting commentary on the guidebook. And in others, they were attached

to other people's events to do road shows about this initiative. And I think you're absolutely right, we need to do a better job of consistently, we need to think outside of audience constituencies into regional approaches. And in some settings you do have groups that say look this is for the people in this geographic location who have this type of business.

That's one-sided type of messaging. The general advertising of those things should still take place, it may not be of the same interest. We need to both manage information and manage expectations. And the idea that we are participating in an event and the logo is used and other people feel excluded, is not good. So we need to address that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I think making things better is probably the mantra for the next 12 months and it sounds to me like we've got plenty of opportunity to start looking forward and 12 months down the track be doing a litany of our successes rather than of our failures. Look forward to that with the new team on both sides of me. Tijani and then I will be going to Dev and then we will be calling a halt to this mornings proceedings up until and including desperate needs for coffee which will be met.

And while we're meeting our desperate needs for coffee and other stimulants for those of you who need to go, we just go upstairs for that, we do have a photographer who will be here during that 30 minute period and it would be very much appreciated if we could get a shot of each of your heads for our nefarious purposes, now

it's actually because it's a very good way of getting our own confluence and other pages properly populated with recent photos of us. Now Alan has left because his photo shows him at about 16. We will track him down, we will photograph him and we will have him as he is today. That's part of my mission. Tijani and then Dev.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you. To organize the event the new TTLD, let's talk about this. We were trying to talk about the new TTLDs to organize the workshop in Bemuse, we didn't have the funding of ICANN and we did it all the same. We were very lucky because there were other organizations sponsoring our trips and our stay there. We're not very formal in terms of the organization, we did it on behalf of ICANN, it was an AFRALO/ICANN event we talked about the new TTLDs and the impact of them, about the development, it was very important topic and we did it all the same.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I'm not sure either side are going to do other than say thank you, but I will give them the opportunity.

Mandy Carver:

Thank you. I do, thank you. I mean Tijani, I know how much you've done around this and I know about the proposed panels and I am sorry that we can't do more and more consistently. And I also understand that this is starting to feel like a broken record or an endless mobious loop that we're caught in. And I'm hoping that that will begin to straighten out and perhaps become a forward path.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent news indeed. Dev.

Dev Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair. I think one of the big problems with global partnerships is that while global partnership is doing a fantastic job, finding out what global partnerships is actually doing or what they have done in any region is very difficult to find. I mean there doesn't seem to be anyway, if I wanted to find out what has ICANN done in say the Caribbean region, it's very hard to find out unless I actually talk to that person from global partnerships directly and find out oh you're going to come to this country to talk about this, ok that's great, but it's not available online. And I know it's hard to post it publicly before the meeting, but at least have it afterward so at lease you could go and look back and say oh I didn't know this event took place and I think that really will encourage local stakeholder dialogue, the local internet community dialogue. So if there was an event that ICANN was invited to, I think everybody should be aware of it. I don't see why it should be secret at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would like just to let Mandy take her notes because not only does she take her notes, she actually acts on them. We may not hear about it till the next meeting, but it is something I think that we need to credit the current leadership of global partnerships with. She does take her notes, she does do the action items, and she does act on them. And one thing you've just raised there, Dev, I think is kind of interesting because we have an opportunity perhaps to have a benefit for that how do people feel about ICANN. It sounds like the tow departments we've got here might be finding some

opportunities as well because if what global partnerships is doing is easier for us to find, it's also easier for the general run of the mill human out there, end user, registrar to learn how to spell ICANN and understand what it means. So opportunity yet again, so I think if we can stop on a high note, that's a good one to do, but as I've thanked Scott I now want to thank Mandy and say I assume you are as ever always willing to be accosted in the corridors by all of us?

Mandy Carver:

Yes, of course. And give updates on anything else you have questions about.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Can I ask you all to thank both Scott and Mandy in the usual manner. Thank you very much. Can I say I hope we have been gentle and kind, but we are serious with what we say? We are here for the long haul, like it or lump it you will work with us, you will not work despite us. We will all move ICANN forward. Thank you one and all.

Okay, the photographer is slightly delayed so maybe grab your caffeine and do what other needful things you need to do. Follow Gisella to find the coffee and other needful places to go and be back here some -10 minutes before we start for photographs to be done please. We can do some more a little later, but the more we get today done in the morning session the better. Thank you one and all. Thank you interpreters, you'll get used to us all. We all speak a little differently. I'm sorry I don't speak English.

Australian is an art form, I apologize for that. Back in 20 minutes, thank you one and all.

*starts at 2:00:00 and ends at 4:00:00

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Now admittedly, I don't actually need a microphone, but I will have trouble with recording if I'm not connected. Well as long as someone's seeing a little green light with my voice going up and down, that will be fine. Great, that sounds fine. We are now moving to the very important part of today's proceedings, particularly because it means I need to stand at arm's length from things, so I get to drink my coffee and watch other people play, which is a whole lot of fun.

I'm going to hand over to Hiro because what we're going to discuss now is the ATRT and next steps in development of the ALAC statement. Each and every one of you should have a two-sided document in the language of your choice. They don't do Australian; I am going to make a complaint. There is not a mate or a good day anywhere on this document and it's just not good enough. I just think we need more translation.

Now, if each and every one of you has that document in front of you, I'm not going to hand over to the drafter of that document and we're going to bludgeon it into something wonderful. Go ahead.

Hiro Hota:

Thank you, Cheryl. The ATRT draft proposed recommend, the ATRT didn't touch, as you all know, At-Large or ALAC. It was concerned of other things which of course come directly from

AOC. But we thought that nevertheless, we could say something from the At-Large perspective along the lines of the two first paragraphs of the statement. That is to say that we note that the role and effectiveness of the GAS is discussed there and also that in spite of the fact that the role of the GAC is to some extent defined in the bylaws, in spite of that there seems to be great confusion about the modalities surrounding the GAC advice, I mean what is actually GAC advice, how it should be treated and so on and so forth.

And starting from this, we said that this brings to the light in an even more striking way the fact that other advisory committees have no guarantees whatsoever that their advice is listened to and acted upon and if not followed what happens then? So this is basically the sense of the two first paragraphs here. Then the our team, the improvements Work Team A, those are just bylaw changes that would make it clear that comments, public comments from RALOs are let's say on a higher level or have higher priority than just comments from whomever, Mr. or Mrs. X.

And the last paragraph here, the inspiration for this came from the way that the results, the outcome of this cross-community Working Group on recommendation six, how that was treated. That is to say that it was taken into account to some extent, but not very well. And in this connection we note that that's surely in the AOC. The tasks that were given for this ATRT they, all the others had been covered in their proposed recommendations, but they have not touched the one that says that assessing the policy development

process to facilitate enhanced cross-community deliberations and effective of policy development.

And in light of what happened with recommendation six, improvements are clearly needed also in this décor. So this is what Working Team A is proposing as the ALAC statement on this ATRT draft proposed recommendation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, and we'd now like to open the floor for discussion whilst voting on ratification of this statement will be limited to the serving members of the current ALAC, I would like to open the floor to any current or future ALAC member, any regional lead, and future regional member, in other words the floor is yours; ladies and gentleman, let's make sure this statement has all its "T"s doted and "T"s crossed in a way that we're comfortable with. DO I have someone to speak on this, go ahead Carlton?

Carlton Samuels:

Perhaps I could get an explanation here. The statement says that there needs to explicit rules that indicate the priority for RALOs public comment versus one from a Mr./Miss X. Meaning somebody from an ALS, or anybody, any end user? Is this intended to ask about standing to make comment or the quality of the comment?

Hiro Hota:

Well I would say that anybody has standing of course to make comments. This is more about ranking of the comments. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Follow from that if I may Carlton, is that not clear in this language because I'd like to make sure that it is clear in this language if that's not the case.

Carlton Samuels: Well, I didn't think it was as clear.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Well we might take some notes on potential wordsmithing and spend a couple of moments to do that at the end of this session. I see Xue Hong. Go ahead.

Xue Hong: Thanks to you. I'm sure the improvement team has done tremendous work on this and has made this beautiful draft for us to see. I have the same question as Carlton it's mentioned a very interesting notion that is priority of public comments by different stakeholders. This is actually touching a very critical issue in our internet governance. We so far haven't got a global norm for this internet governance and we don't know what should be the really reasonable regime to treat different stakeholder groups – private sector, civil society, governments, international organizations, this is very rough categorization.

But when we go to a specific case, whether Microsoft's comments or Google's comments or the LACRALOs comments or Mr. X, one individual user's comments should be treated equally or there is a prioritized sequence. This is a very, very critical things. And we don't know the answer frankly. Well I very appreciate your reference to this issue, but I really doubt I can dare to announce we have a prioritized sequence for any specific stakeholder groups. I

can't announce that government will be number one and a company will be number two, users well the last but not least; I really cannot imagine that scenario would happen in ICANN circumstances. But of course I appreciate your work that's been done with the delegates on your team. I'm sure that Fouad has conveyed our messages to you. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Hong, if I may follow up before I move to Wolf on that. Do you feel therefore that it is not a wise move to raise it? Because it was the opinion of the Work Team that it certainly needs to be raised. Just because it's a hard question to answer doesn't mean that it shouldn't be asked. I just want to be, are you advising us to take this section out or are you saying it needs to stay in?

Xue Hong:

No, but we need to clarify it. And especially we are not opposing against Mr. X or Mrs. X, that's not right; we are actually working for users. Probably we should ask to prioritize the user communities input. Either form RALO, from ALSs or from ALAC. Not for, for the individual user it should be equally treated, respected and prioritized.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay. Go ahead Wolf.

Wolf Ludwig:

Well, my comment goes into the very same direction. First of all, I would like to thank the Working Group for this, in my eyes, excellent draft, on the one hand. But I think there's a kind of a contradiction in it and Hong was referring to internet governance discourse. What system we could apply here? Can we apply the

system of net neutrality? In net neutrality we are always, from my community point of view, we argue against priorities and we argue in favor of neutrality. And certainly in our discussion here we introduce a demand on priority what is contradicting our arguments in other fields. And we need to be clear about that.

Another point of concern or consideration just came to my mind; this reminds me to the debate we had on the EURALO bylaws 2006-2007 - status of individual users at EURALO. And at the time we said there's no way that individual users may have the same power in a general assembly than a certified ALS. And we postponed the whole issue at the time to try to avoid this kind of conflict and we learned in our maturity process over the last years that this decision taken in 2007 was not the smartest ever. Because we reframed a lot of individual users, we accepted them onto the EURALO Board, but not as a voting member in the General Assembly; and this is a contradiction as well.

What I'm arguing for is we need to avoid contradictions in this. And once we are clear about how we can legitimize a priority of a RALO in the Boards consideration, if we have a good rationale for this I'm not necessarily against it. But I suggest you be careful to suggest to introduce regulations, a critical observer may show up tomorrow and say on the one hand you are asking for this on the other hand you are doing the contrary.

So we need to be clear and therefore my suggestion is some formulation that indicates a priority of the RALOs public comment

versus one from Mr. or Mrs. X. So be careful about this Mr. and Mrs. X, is a nobody so it can be taken, interpreted in a negative sense that individual users will represent. Certainly it's not being taken serious.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I recognize you, Carlton, but I'd like just to, like we did with Hong I think we need to clarify because we're going to be drafting on the fly in a minute and we need to be making sure that we all understand what our intentions are here. Are you then suggesting, because from my personal perspective I have a problem with Mr. and Mrs. anything being drafting, that's just from my point of view. I refuse to give Mrs. in forms so I certainly don't want to see it in this, but that's perhaps just me. So if we were to replace some terminology when we come to looking at this paragraph to indicate a single voice of an internet end user, as opposed to an aggregated voice of an internet end user, is that what you're saying to us? Thank you, go ahead Carlton.

Carlton Samuels:

As Wolf, than you Chair, as Wolf made an explanation he said something came to his mind as he was talking, there's something that came to my mind also that gives me a little bit of discomfort. There is no reference to the intrinsic value of the comment in this verbiage. And I'm wondering is it just priority or should we be thinking of the intrinsic value of the comment as part of the formulation?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Point of clarification for you too then because I'm being very equitable once in my career. When you refer to intrinsic value are

you thinking the difference between an order, which priority gives a ranked order, or a weighting of? So for example, a piece of advice which is very thin on the ground, me too type stuff, dear public comment period the AT-Large advisory committee thinks green socks are a great idea, is probably not the same intrinsic value as something we've worked up and...

Carlton Samuels: Yes weight, exactly. It's about weight.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you. Beau?

Beau Brendler: I'm just stepping in with regards to the comment about the internet governance forum and how things are moving over there in terms of comments. Yes they have, what happens over there is yes individual users can make their comments and they're actually listed on the internet governance website, IGF website, with the reference of that person, the specific person. But one thing I'm trying to get a grip on is in APRALO we, at the moment, we don't have an individual membership bylaw yet, and it's something we're continually brainstorming on in our monthly meetings. There are some suggestions, but we haven't really stepped into like concrete modification of those because...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can't wait. Look with our numerical values we will simply swamp everyone. It's going to be wonderful. Sorry.

Beau Brendler: It's going to be like half the world population so the internet population. But one thing to note here, our dynamics within this

community and within the scope of ICANN is a bit different from the IGF. So when we look at that we have to see, as Carlton mentioned, the intrinsic value of that comment and how to prioritize that. Would it be that because you know some people even including me would be uncomfortable with the word prioritize, whereas the end users comment does hold value. It may be from a basic perspective, it may be from a complex perspective or from a specialized perspective. And maybe we would not see it in the short term, the benefit of it, but maybe it might have a long terms impact.

And there might be a collective beehive kind of situation where such comments could collect up to something significant. So within this the importance of the RALO comment stands as important as it is and as that moves up from the bottom of process into ALAC and so forth, I think we shouldn't undermine that individual comment, the comments value, but we should find some strategic point for those to be formulated in such a manner, it will be requiring a bit of work on it, maybe some form of graphical representation to say that "X" amount of people said this. Commonalities maybe, build upon the commonalities of comments and maybe have those individually significant comments over there as well, but this a structure, I would say a process should be devised for individual comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Go ahead, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: As you started talking I whispered to, about the IGF, I whispered to Cintra "consensus." She crossed that and wrote "bubble of priority". That's what you're talking about. The fact that a comment might not seem to have a great value now, but as time progresses that comment with the attraction of others than will increase in value and so there's this bubble up kind of effect that happens.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Fouad and then over to Cintra. Go ahead.

Fouad Bajwa: Within the IGF there is a clear categorization of three stakeholders. The governments, the private sector and civil society and then the academia and technical community actually has to either sometimes sit with the private sector or come up through the civil society chain. But within that aspect, no one group within the IGF is representative of all the stakeholders within that particular categorization. Like for example, if you have ICC, the International Chambers of Commerce, it's just one stakeholder of the private sector. Similarly the Internet Governance Caucus of Civil Society is just one stakeholder.

So the idea strips the individual as also a stakeholder and it also treats the grouping as a stakeholder grouping. And IGC itself is a group of individuals as well as organizations within civil society groups, but at the same time the people within its multi-stakeholder device and group of the IGF can have expression of interest from Mrs. X and Mrs. Y from anywhere. So it's a process that was designed in such a way that has inclusions. So that's what I

referring to. If you want to build up a process which allows anyone to step in, so there's something which I refer to that in the Work Team B for ALAC improvements, which is about ALS participation in region outreach.

That we're comparing all of the RALOs membership bylaws and we're seeing where there are commonalities as well as where improvements have to be made, that was I was referring to APRALO, and we don't have the individual there, but in the RALO they have a system of affiliated and unaffiliated individual memberships and so forth and so forth. So there's some groundwork we have to do which actually helps at the bottom up level. So this is going to be very strategic interplay between how we get this included as individual comments because every RALO has a different way of moving those things up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Just before we go to you, Cintra, if I may again, just making sure we are all on a basic shared knowledge here. The ill-defined and unwritten ICANN public comments principle for public participation is a way of insuring all voices have standing, all voices have entry. We do not need to fight for that, it is a given. OK. So let's make sure we're fixing something that's broken, shall we. So that is a given.

Anyone can put in anything anytime, and they do, to a public comment period, but if that mechanism is vaunted as a, in some cases as it is, be all and end all of public participation, then are you happy to have your accredited structures where for example,

(inaudible 2:35:25) may have outreach to its 11,000 members and formulated a consensus based view and fed that into their ALS process.

If they put that directly in, great; if they pass it to APRALO and its gathered again is that the same or is that more consensus. Should it be seen as resonating in some different timber and tone? Now with the bubble effect what I would suspect happens, if I can take the surface physics here is that once you get the bigger bubble and I'd like to think that the ALSs, then the RALOs, then the ALAC should be in a position to put the bigger bubble into the system than all the other little bubbles that are attracted to it contribute and count to the metrics.

And on the metrics, and thank you very much for bring it up, we do have something that might be worth while adding as a suggestion into our comments to the ATRT review, in the ATRT review process we did have the opportunity to look at, but we were not in a position to recommend some of the different types of reporting that happens at the output of the public comments processes.

And we have had a very readable excellent example suggested from the of the GNSO constituencies where the graphing is done, where there is something very easy for you to get a synopsis out of, it's got an executive summary, it shows ALAC said this and by the way so did the following parts, and oh look a whole lot of individuals said something else. And so you can tease out, but

that's something that happens and should happen in an independent neutral and predictable manner, some form of templating and standards to be set at the other end.

I would get very nervous if we tried to fit the input to make the metrics. Less nervous if what we want to advise is a model that gives us graphic representation, some metrics analysis and some measurable and there you look to the document that was prepared by Kieren McCarthy on the triple x matters because regardless of the content the mechanism of the reporting of that public comments was very useful in the way he put that together. I think that could be a template worthwhile linking to say as an example. Because it's language neutral and it looks at the facts, which is a pleasant change.

Okay, Cintra, over to you.

Cintra Sooknanan:

Okay. Cheryl, you actually touched on a few points that I wanted to make. I think we all agree that it's the value of the comment rather than the origin, right? The point is, when does that comment reach critical mass for value before the bubble pops and something is done or a recommendation is actually made, or you know some policy is written? I think we really need to look at what the cycle is to add weight to that. Is it that we are going to be firefighting and just dealing with things as they emerge or is it that we are going to block off say the first three months of the year and really try to get in all the issues that we anticipate could be upcoming?

So are we forward thinking or are we reactive because a lot of the times we end up reacting and our time, we don't comment properly because of that and who suffers.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

My huge smile and giggle is because of course that's something that the ALAC has requested that ICANN consider some forecasting and some forward time management for a very long time and that would make a great deal of use. It isn't germane unfortunately to the specifics of the ATRT issue, but I have a moment to add now. On, help me Matthias, is it Thursday? Yes, on Thursday, help me again, the time is, when it finishes? Ok, basically you're all in this room at our meeting on Thursday. It'll all be beautiful and tidy and the people who'll be coming in after that is the public participation committee meeting. Guess what, we should be able to stuff this room nicely.

So if very few of us leave and some of us say exactly what you said there, I think that's a perfect time and a perfect place to take this discussion into the next level because it is terribly important that we are forced into a reactive rather than a proactive situation and it just doesn't work the way it is. It's not up to us unfortunately; the agenda is set by disparate parts of the organization. And remember there seems to be little rhyme or reason of what constitutes that necessity to call for public comments. Seems to me that some parts of the organization call for public comments on the color of their socks; might be my metaphor for the day. Others you go to the public comment when it's one half moment before going to the board.

Now you don't have the luxury of saying we're going to think about this for three months if it's going to the board next month. So we need to have more predictability and I think the public participation committee is, I think that they would welcome all of us, not that all of us can be here because there are other meetings on, but Cintra, I really encourage you and some others who've talked at this table to stay in this room for that meeting and follow in some more. Please, go ahead.

Cintra Sooknanan:

Also in terms of funding because certainly ICANN needs to know what projects it's going to be looking at or what's really pertinent to everyone in the coming year, two years.

Hiro Hota:

From the point of view of drafting this document I, thank you very much for these comments and I take it from this discussion that the third paragraph, which includes the two bullet points, goes too far or actually is a little bit dangerous. I mean I'm very grateful for, for instance Hong, pointed out that this can lead to all sorts of other attempts to rank the importance of comments and so on and so forth. Basically what I think is that we must adjust in a way to delete this and replace it with something fairly simple and general. For instance, something like this – concerning public comment periods ALAC suggests that ATRT considers the problem of how to compare and rank the representativeness of comments from individuals, groups of individuals, and organizations. We can polish it but just basically pointing out there's a problem, but rather than trying to deal with the problem here we just toss it over to the ATRT.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can I say gee thanks for that? Wolf and then Olivier.

Wolf Ludwig: I feel I tend to complicate the whole issue again because I would like to contradict what I said before. On a simple consideration, before we were talking about principles, and logics, rationales, to be consistent in our argument, but there's also in my exception, a technical argument in this. And we are here in the round of reflecting wording and meaning and therefore, there could be from a RALO point of view a good technical, underlined technical, ground for having, encouraging individual users who are concerned about whatever by passing through the regional At-Large organization and not directing themselves directly to the ICANN structure.

And there could be a small incentive if you do it via the respective RALO, it might be avoided, the whole issue your concern might get a higher ranking, a broader consideration, approvals, there are lots of logical arguments behind it, to encourage individual users to contact an ALS in their country and by the national ALS bring it up to RALO level and then via the RALO level to ALAC. So I'm not completely against the idea behind to encourage individual users to make use of regional At-Large organizations.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I'm more than happy to have my cake and eat it too. And on the other side of that I would see if I as an individual, if I ever become an individual again voice, I would be doing it both ways. I would be making sure I influenced as many ALSs, as many

regions, and whatever representation I had access to in the ALAC to make sure that I was wanting to resonate was being heard in the tune I want it to be heard in and I'd be putting it in as an individual and getting as many other individuals to do likewise. Now that's called gaming the system. Is that necessarily a bad thing, I don't know. Is it necessarily a good thing, I don't know, but I do see a derived benefit for us meeting one of our objectives which of course is not only to have an ALS in each country, but to have a vibrant and very dynamic discussion on policy going on at the edges, which after all is where it belongs, at the edges. I have Olivier and then I have Erick and then I have Evan and then I think we will have to dot the "I"s and cross the "T"s or send you off to a small room later to do so. Go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Cheryl. I have several points I wanted to raise. One is the way in which this paper is written. It points out a problem but it doesn't seem to be coming up with a specific solution. And this is something which we have often been told about some previous comments that we have made is a case of well we know that there's a problem but do you have something that you can suggest to replace what is currently in place; or to improve what is currently in place. So I wonder whether there might be worth, any worth, in actually proposing a solution that is a bit more targeted than just saying the current system doesn't seem to work.

The second thing is listening to Hiro's proposed new text I do not see any specific worth for At-Large. It seems to be a very broad statement, perhaps too broad, and I think that we should drive

something specific that will help At-Large itself, and promote At-Large itself. One specific point, which I think is that currently because of the lobbying nature of those comments that are being made it seems that the quantity of statement seems to be, or quantity of comments sometimes overrules that actual quality of the comments themselves. And I sometimes wonder whether if each ALS currently around the table wrote separate comments in a comment period it would have more impact than ALAC making one comment.

The thing of course is theoretically ALAC making one comment is a lot more powerful than each one of these ALSs making separate comments because consensus has been achieved in making that one statement. So extremes have not been included in that it's the general consensus, the majority of all the ALSs here that went for that statement. There's been a due process followed, there's been discussion upon discussion, it might have taken a lot of time, but it's not a light thing that you would write at 2 am just before going to bed; it's something where due process has been followed and pursued.

And the third comment that I wanted to make I've just forgotten about so it probably wasn't important enough. Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Olivier, it will come back to you. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Actually the timing of that is perfect because what I wanted to say sort of stems directly from what Olivier was talking about. As Co-Chair I have to plead, I have to beg for the group's forgiveness because I've been less active and Hiro's been carrying the torch for this far more than he should be. But I just want to focus on something that Olivier said and think about maybe at the higher level rather than talking about this at the micro level which we are capable of doing. To go back to those first two paragraphs and saying that ICANN has established a concept of an advisory committee.

That advisory committee, whether it's government or whether it's SSEC or whether it's ALAC, has a specific purpose and I'm upset with the fact that some advisory committees are more equal than others. Now granted we're not fooling anyone, governments are going to have more influence and we know that and I'm not trying to say that we'll try to pretend otherwise, but procedurally for ICANN we should be treated with a similar amount of respect and that the bylaws should indicate, here's a mechanism for how we deal with advisory committees; not this and that, but in a generic level.

Here's how we deal with our SOs, here's how we deal with our ACs and that there is a generic way of dealing with them and that they are constituted to get a certain kind of feedback from their constituents. When they come back and they deliver to us a communiqué or a specific thing just right now as the board is obligated to respond when the GAC send in a communication, well

they're arguing now over what constitutes a communication but that's a detail area. But there's a concept that if an advisory committee puts forward something of substance that the board is obliged to respond to it. We're not part of GNSO we're not part of the initial part of the policy making, but we have a role to play in saying this is being done right or this is being done wrong.

And in that respect, I mean notwithstanding everything we've talked about so far about how ALAC internally has to come to these decision, I think one of the things that the Working Group is going to be tasked with at the bylaw level is establishing some level of parody. That there is a function for advisory committees that ICANN has an obligation, it's running into problems with the GAC too as well as with us. That level of relationship has to be defined, it has to be respected and it has to be given a proper place so that we're not just seen as ICANN is the product of GNSO which is 50% contracted parties, but that there is a genuine role to play for the public interest as expressed by ALAC, as expressed by governments; I'll leave it at that. But at least from where I've been coming from with this team, is trying to come at it from that macro level as opposed to micro.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

As I move to Erick I think it's very important that we recognize some of our time limitations here. I think what I'm going to ask you to do is to be willing to volunteer, a couple of you, to do something in a corridor over lunch or somewhere and just get a little bit of drafting public back on the list because I think this is too good an opportunity to miss getting it right. We certainly need

to get it right, so I think now if you can volunteer a little bit on the wordsmithing here and obviously I'm going to leave you in charge of that.

I also just wanted to point out something that might be fairly important and that is that because all the ATRT has done in its public comments, call for responses in public comments to our questions so far is one to see how you feel about the recommendations at the draft stage they are, and they are only at draft, that you do have a slightly different power possibility for what your comments can do this time. So do think wisely on what you put together, but I would very much like this to be being transmitted to the ATR Team by the beginning of tomorrow's business day if at all possible. This did close on Friday; we are in public session with the ATRT tomorrow so when I toss it back over the wall to you guys just be aware of those timetables. Erick, go ahead.

Erick Iriarte:

Thank you Cheryl. Evan points to the duty to respond to GAC communiqués and that really is central to the issue of rule making. So I would, I recommend or I suggest that the ALAC statement on the ATRT draft recommendation proposal refers to the handling of public comments and recommends recording and response that is consistent with the rule making under the Administrative Procedures Act of 1947, which is fairly important in at least one jurisdiction, the United States. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay. Hong and others from other jurisdictional areas and a bit of international law, I would really like to encourage more than one example in that. And I'd like you to take that one example in, but if there is some other examples we can somehow come up with I'd encourage you to throw it at the drafting team because some of us, particularly those of us from Asia, get very concerned about us not having a constantly internationalized focus at this point in time.

There may be nothing and if there is nothing that's fine, but if possible I'd, and I'm just looking to you, Hong, just in case you can find something that would help that. Are you able to now consider putting up three or four hands for someone who will cluster around the major drafting team here? I'm looking to Evan, I'm looking to Erick, I'm looking to Wolf who's hiding, stop hiding Wolf. Are you going to be part of the drafting team? Good man, well done, that's excellent, and Cintra, good. She beat you to it, she beat you to it. Good.

Fantastic, now here's how it goes. Sometime between midnight and dawn those of us who get up for breakfast will promise faithfully that we will look at whatever documentation you have put together and if we have something that we are wholeheartedly objecting to we will make that known on the list. Ok? Or on Skype, I'm happy to do it both ways. So if you really object, this is going to go by exception ladies and gentleman, if you object to what is drafted by our generous volunteers, than make it known. Otherwise we will deem it approved. Are you all clear? This is the reverse of what I usually do because than at the start of

business tomorrow, Heidi will transmit it directly to Brian as Chair of the ATRT, copy to Olive and copy to Alice. And they will micro seconds, open the box, put it in the box and close the box again. Okay?

So tomorrow morning well before it, we'll get started as we're all going into watch things open we can get that done. So around 9-9:30 we'll have that transmitted. So I don't know what you're going to do for breakfast, thank you one and all. Go ahead, yes?

Matthias Langenegger: Yeah, can I just ask that those who volunteered for the drafting, that we would meet here in this room at say half an hour before the afternoon session begins? And then assuming that the lunch break would start at 12:30 so we would meet at...?

Heidi Ullrich: Actually that won't work. We have a working lunch in here today between 12:30 and 1:30. So we have the afternoon coffee break, that's 30 minutes, we could do that.

Matthias Langenegger: Okay, so we use the afternoon coffee break then? Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And you thought you were going to have your lunchtime off. Dear me, dear me. Now don't move because we're going to move straight into at-Large improvements. Ladies and gentleman there's been some. We've had one of the 13 recommendations put forward by the review of the At-Large advisory committee and At-Large in general succeeded. And I think it would be very important to formally note, as we will on a number of other

occasions this week, the landmark situation where we have an At-Large selected director on the ICANN Board.

So of 13 recommendations, number two tick the box, we can call that completed! Well done and in his absence, congratulations to Sebastien.

I'd also like to take a moment to congratulate the whole community that was involved in making that magic happen. I believe that we have had a process that was of highest standard and indeed met higher expectations than any other that exists in any other part of ICANN. Every other SO and AC make whatever magic happen and they just pop whoever they like, I don't know whether it's the color of their socks or what, but somehow it happens and off it goes.

We have got a robust community based consensus developed process, which whilst needs a little tweaking around the edges it's got some rough spots and we certainly can make it better, is an absolute credit to each and every one of you who've been involved in it. And that doesn't matter whether you were in the community cause, it doesn't matter whether you were regionally leading the ALSs in one direction or another, it doesn't matter whether you're part of the ABSDT or the BCEC, stop for a moment and go WOW and look at how long you've actually manage to do it in.

It has also I know it's felt torturously long, but it has also happened in quite short order for the type of consensus building model we've

done. The white paper was out and it got done pretty fast after the white paper and the public comments closed. Can we do some polish? Absolutely. So those of you who have the energy and the inclination and are still on the ABSDT, we still need to close the loop. Can we assist regions and the ALSs with a better understanding of the process? Can we develop slightly better processes along the way? Absolutely. But guess what, we've got three years and six months to do that in.

So if we start that, meet next year, getting it right shouldn't be a problem. And the outreach and inreach that we're doing with our ALSs, we can make that part of the package. So talk specifically for a moment on recommendation number two, I'll open the floor for a couple of moments. Evan, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch:

No, I was just going to follow up on what you said, the ABSDT process in fact included further meeting afterwards to examine how things went and to be able to learn from it in the future. It anticipated that there we would be fits, starts, and burps that we would have to learn from.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And there was a few of those; definitely a few of those. Tijani, go ahead.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Cheryl. I would like first to thank particularly the BCEC for the work done. It was really very good work and I think it was fair, very fair. The second point is the ABSDT to continue

its work and to improve the system and I do think like Evan said, I do think that we have a lot of work to do. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sorry. I haven't got my button pushed. Any other comments before we close off on the specifics of the At-Large selected Board director? Go ahead, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Yeah. There was a lot of work that was done like Tijani says and I suspect that the outcome I believe and the process was also very balanced. I would wish to just put a flag up and raise the issue that we would not wish to make good enough the enemy of the perfect. Say that again. We would not wish to make good enough the enemy of the perfect. That's all I want to say.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, maybe it's just me but I've always felt that we should never have perfect, we should never wait for perfect if there's a time course that we also need to meet. So hopefully we have a shared and mutual understanding there. Oh that's good, excellent. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. I just wanted to make one point which we have experienced at EURALO. ALSs are often accused of not being particularly involved or being as active as they should be or they could be in any of the discussions that we're having in any of the processes that are taking place. What we have found at EURALO though is if there is a good enough leadership and actual inreach in addition to outreach, inreach to the ALSs to show them how important the subject is. We have actually found that there is

a response and I think that Vaughn, well both Vaughn and I were particularly impressed by the amount of response that we got in our region.

It took a lot of work from Vaughn specifically and I commend him on this, but I would hope that in the ABSDT post selection report it will be able to perhaps throw a few ideas for future selections and perhaps use this as a potential inreach to keep ALSs interested in what we're doing. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you. If I may pop on my, did you want to speak? Go ahead, please, Annalisa go ahead.

Annalisa Roger:

Yes, I'm Annalisa. I'd like to make one comment about the overall process of which was the first time for ALAC to elect a Board member and there, I just wanted to comment that there were several stages and several parts of the process as we all know. And it involved, really involved a tremendous number of people – ABSDT, the ALSs, the regions, the BCEC – and what I'd like to say is, speaking from at least what was going on in the BCEC and I imagine this is true for all of the sections that added up to the election, is that everybody did a fantastic job to the best of the abilities of each of us at that time and I think that the whole process was really well done.

But what we're going to have as an advantage the next time is that the At-Large public will actually know what to expect in all of these levels of processes. And maybe there won't be as much of,

maybe the jobs can just be going straightforward instead of also doing a two-step thing. We're doing our job to the best of what's laid out for us, but we're also concerned about what everybody's thinking at the same time. So if the whole process is outlined to the individuals and the ALSs right from the beginning, everybody – onlookers, candidates – everyone knows what to expect and I think that's almost half the issue is the perspective from the outside as well as what is going on, on the inside. But I do want to say I'm really proud to have been a part of something that I think was done really well from the inside. That's that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And it's always exciting to have that landmark issue as well because it was not only done well it was done I think under extraordinarily tight circumstances on time as well. Go ahead Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Yes, a last word. Normally we are supposed now to start the processes used for the election of the regular term of this director if we are working according to the bylaw. So I think that now we have to do what we have to do as an administrative think to make this election valid for this interim term and the regular term. So there is something to be done from ALAC to the secretary.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

If I could ask Matthias or Heidi to pull up the specific bylaw that was resolved. Tijani, that actually was dealt with in the Board resolution. We did have a whereas an exception so that has been done. It is completed. Okay. Rather than pull it up on the screen can you make sure Tijani has a copy and a link so we can give that

tick. Whew! We did get that done which is good. Now what we do need to do however, and that's an action item to insure that staff make the magic happen by the scheduling, the deities of scheduling are going to have to have the BCEC and the ABSDT in a teleconference in the not too distant future because the BCEC does not have the time, the energy, the inclination, and Chair is just also not going to do it, to write the report.

What we will do is have a debriefing with the ABSDT and therefore I avoid the opportunity of writing a report to myself and doing a group interview. So we will have a debrief call and we will try and do it in the, before the middle of the calendar month of December ends if at all possible.

So rather than me write reports to myself I think we'll just. I'll talk to myself, it will be so much more agreeable I think. Maybe I like you, I don't know.

Now with enough fun and games because I like to have fun and games if we can't have fun why would be doing this? We have heard a fair amount from Evan, come on, we have heard a fair amount from Work Team A, but is there anything else Evan that you would like to bring to the table from Work Team A? I mean this is a substantial piece of work here, but before I move to Work Team B.

Matthias Langenegger:

Well just to mention that the Work Team A of course had to work into the bylaws, or into suggested new bylaws, some of the ideas

that were expressed in the ALAC review final report. And that's what we have done in a tentative way, but I don't know why I would not use the time here to read, I mean that's posted so everybody can take a look how we did it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Evan, any words from you? No? No other words from our co-sponsor or Co-Chair? That's fine. I'm a little concerned why I can see the slides in the AC room on my screen but not in the room here in Cartagena so we will just get that fixed and we will move, there we go, now the magic has happened, to Work Team B. So Annalisa and Fouad; now I know you spent minutes planning this yesterday because you stood in front of a desk and said we're planning this. It's not your full presentation, but would you care to share with us where we are up to in the wonderful world of Work Team B. Who's managing this, who's leading it? Annalisa is. Okay, it's all yours, dear.

Annalisa Roger:

Thank you, Cheryl. So do we have, are these our slides, did we get our slides up? It's okay if we didn't but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Seth is in the wonderful world of auditory cyberspace and he apparently has everything in the AC room that we need so Seth you can either talk to us or make the magic happen, but as Annalisa continues I'm sure you'll catch up.

Seth Greene:

Thank you, Cheryl. I couldn't hear all that I apologize. The way we had planned it I would just give a small introduction to everyone and then if you wouldn't mind introducing each of these

Co-Chairs who are going to say a few words about their own Work Teams, that would be terrific.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well let me tell you what's going to happen and that is we've dealt with A, you can do a very quick synopsis on the intro and then we're about to launch into B.

Seth Greene: Happy to, happy to. And I'm sorry just as long as I understand, do you want me to do that Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You said you wanted to make a brief introduction, I'm feeling very generous, feel free to do that as long as it's a brief.

Seth Greene: Thank you, Cheryl. Okay, the slides than that we would need, and I think they're coming up now in the Adobe Chat Room, are these, let me just skip. Let's see slide A, which we happily don't need right now, I can't read. Actually Matthias or Heidi the slides, can everyone see the actual text on the slides, I cannot in the Adobe Chat Room, but I will open them in my own computer if you can see them in the room.

Heidi Ullrich: Seth, are they hyperlinked?

Seth Greene: Yes, there are hyperlinks on the slides. That seems to be, in fact I seem to be only able to see the hyperlinks and not the text.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, let me see if we can figure something out very quickly, okay? But go ahead continue with your presentation please.

Seth Greene:

Okay, thanks very much Heidi. So Cheryl's asked me to go skip to Work Team B. The overview of Work Team B, which is responsible for four of the recommendations all grouped under the theme of ALS participation, has actually come a fairly long way. As far as removing obstacles in the At-Large structure, the ALS-RALO-ALAC structure, the Work Teams work is almost complete. Next steps immediately are that they will be turning towards an instruction pack for the ALSs themselves on the various communication and collaboration tools that the Work Team is recommending be added to the arsenal.

Regarding education and engagement – that recommendation the Work Team has well in progress. Next is to make existing material easier to locate. The feeling is that there is a good bit of material that is available, educational material, but in fact it's simply difficult to locate and in addition, there have been discussions in partnering with identified educational, external educational groups, which I'll talk about in a second.

The review of different communication and collaboration tools as I discussed is in fact in progress. And a discussion of how often the review should be returned to, what cycle this should be on considering the development of new technology is also in discussion.

Finally, as far as translation/interpretation tools go, that is almost completed with the new translation policy coming out in

approximately two to three months as well as an encouragement of the RALOs to perhaps develop their own translation policies. I'll skip down, are the slides visible at this point?

Heidi Ullrich:

Seth yes we have them on a different screen so yes the people in this room can see them now.

Seth Greene:

Oh terrific. Okay, thanks. So I'm actually looking at slide number five which is Work Team B specific accomplishments. For the lack of time I won't go through them specifically, but as you see there, there are some very specific communication and collaboration tools that are going to be suggested to the ALSs and with some Work Team B instructions as well, an introductory manual of sorts, very brief. Those include Posterous you see, of course, confluence the ALAC roll out is virtually complete. The new ALS representative starter kit will be available soon.

Under education and engagement, the accomplishments are listed there; most notably the new, relatively new, entire series of At-Large and RALO brochures. Also partnering with, as I said, different educational groups such as Diplofoundation, is underway. Skipping down to recommendation nine on this slide, as far as strengthening the translation and interpretation policy, as I mentioned we're looking at the new translation policy in about two to three months.

On the next slide, turning to Work Team C, as far as the overview goes, the ALAC planning processes. Work Team is responsible

for two recommendations from the final report, from the ALAC review final report. Those are five and six. And the Work Team considers its work to be in progress, I would add well underway, but certainly in progress without either of those recommendations completed. The Work Team has completed however a fairly thorough SWOT analysis – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats or barriers – regarding all three of the main topics for which it's responsible; strategic planning, operational planning, and budgeting, the budgeting process.

If we, what's left actually before turning to the next slide, let me just say the next step is quite obviously sharing the results of that SWOT analysis with the RALOs and community. Some of that will be done here in Cartagena on Thursday by the Work Team. Then obviously interpreting the results and seeing the direction that it points us, the Work Team in from there.

Going to the next slide – the specific accomplishments of Work Team C – we've listed a series of important planning meetings in which Work Team C has been fundamental in, in both initiating and in offering input regarding these processes for which it's responsible. And as I also mentioned, well actually let me just mention that there are two very specific aspects of each one of each of these recommendations.

Under recommendation five there is an aspect regarding staff support levels and it should be noted that ALAC did request increase to staff support for fiscal year 11. Also under

recommendation six, the last bullet point regarding meeting accommodations, there's been significant progress on that with the ALAC Chair discussing the problem and reaching some agreements with various ICANN groups; constituency travel obviously. And of course the travel support guidelines that most of you are familiar with and the report is that the situation has been improving in recent meetings.

Let me go to the next slide – the overview of Work Team D.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Just before you do, Seth, if I may intervene. Just so remembering that this is a transcribed and recorded and interpreted meeting, I don't want something that is a piece of minor errata to go on the permanent record and be taken down and held against us at a later date. More to point, I want to be able to take something and hold it against others when it suits me later. We did not in fact request increased staffing in the fiscal year 2010 and '11, we requested the return to our existing staffing level. We are yet to even get back to what we were before we had Nick move on and that is a big difference. So it's not that we are not perhaps potentially not getting increased staff support, we haven't even got back to what was considered before our basics. So that just needs to go on the record. Now you can go to D.

Seth Greene:

Thank you Cheryl. A much better point than the one I made. Apologies for that absolutely. Alright on the overview for Work Team D, and again, you'll be hearing from the co-Chairs in just a moment, but on the overview to Work Team D slide, number eight

you see that the ALAC policy advice development work team is responsible for three recommendations and actually for the first two as you see the strengthening of ALAC/AT-Large policy device mechanisms and the creation of, or evaluation of the mechanism for requesting an extended public comment period to 45 days; that work is virtually completed by the Work Team.

There is, to actually to get things implemented, there is certainly work by other groups that needs to be done as listed there. ALAC endorsement, community review, and then ALAC endorsement, etc, but the actual Work Teams work, they're happy to report is done.

Regarding recommendation twelve – consumer input into the decisions and policy advice, the Work Team is I think, the work is in progress the Work Team is reporting and the next step is that there is a review going on of the consumer outreach documents that currently exist and they're being updated and consolidated to make more useful.

Finally, the specific accomplishments on the next slide of Work Team D, as you see are listed there. What I would simply like to point out overall, rather than recommendation by recommendation, is that the Work Team has developed a rather exhaustive new ALAC/At-Large PAD flow chart, which is going to be seen in Cartagena, perhaps even today. And this includes mechanisms for increasing accessibility which there's a lot of concern about before the public comment period. As well as actually increasing the

predictability of what steps are going to occur all along the process of the PAD and specifically the public comment period. And that's in the form of a number of flow charts actually that as I mentioned you'll be seeing.

Regarding consumer input, the input by consumer representatives, I would just like to point out a couple of things under that bullet point and that is that the, as has been mentioned before, the beginners guides are going to begin coming out very soon and in fact, it was an At-Large document that began that process, the beginners guide to gTLDs was initially an At-Large product. So that's a very, very good sign regarding this front.

I think with that I can move to the last slide. And Cheryl if you would kindly turn it over to the Work Team co-Chairs whom are listed on this last slide. Each one does have a few comments to make and I think that's everything. We'll have time hopefully we'll have time for questions to them as well. That's everything, Cheryl, for now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Great. Okay, thank you very much, Seth. When we see it out like that in a albeit brief, but nevertheless comprehensive, review of what we've done I think most of the Work Teams will go wow we've actually done a whole lot; looks good when it's put down like that. Thank you very much, Seth' I must say it's made me smile and I suspect several of the leaders around the table are smiling as well, so thanks for that.

Now Work Team A, have we heard enough from you boys already, I think we have, but I'll allow you to disagree with me.

Seth Greene: Well if you want to hear, I mean if we have time perhaps we could go through this one slide where we have the thinking of how to change the bylaws, perhaps we could go to that slide.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Use your microphone please.

Carlos Aguirre: Can I make a question in relation with this presentation?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: To the general presentation or to Work Team As?

Carlos Aguirre: The general presentation.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please go ahead, Seth's still with us.

Carlos Aguirre: Okay. At the beginning of the presentation the presenter talked about to get outside partners in relation with the education. My question is why not to try to inside partners? For example, ALSs, for example ALAC members, ALAC members academical ALAC members for example, another cheaper than outside partners.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well Seth, I'm not sure that that's a question that's necessarily for you to answer or whether it's for the Work Team Chairs to answer. Perhaps there's an indication that there was a sub-contractual plan to outside partners which was not the intention of the Work Team, Carlos if I can jump in just from my touching base with most of

them as I have been able to do. As I understand it, they felt that there was a great deal of reward to build partnerships with existing expertise in the area like the Diplofoundation. So it's more of a complementary rather than a passing on of roles. So it would be a mechanism of empowering our own education and outreach structure and not necessarily trying to reinvent material, which is already in many cases developed by our own people. When we identify who is involved in these organizations such as Diplo, we find not only do we have many of our people out there doing teaching and developing the courses, but of course many of the graduates are coming and sitting at our table and I'll just direct you immediately to your right hand there; because we have Cintra directly because of that. So I don't believe it was the intention to be, thank you Wolf, wave that and I'll now kick it to you.

Wolf Ludwig:

Just anybody curious on what is Diplofoundation, internet government, learning capacity building program is; this is a booklet for it. I can pass it and I would be pleased to get it back over the next couple of days.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Have you got your name firmly written in indelible ink in the front of it? Or in fact along the line of all the pages on the edge and that way it can never be white out. Fouad, go ahead.

Fouad Bajwa:

Just to add to Wolf's comment, the book is freely available online; everyone can download and read it; and in many languages. It's translated into many languages.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. Carlos does this meet your questions answer well, more to answer?

Carlos Aguirre: Yes, thank you Cheryl, but I recognize the material that Wolf presented and I know when I read the book it's very interesting, but not all cases presented by the book. For example, are in the same connection. I don't know if you understand. Diplofoundation has very special view about internet governments; maybe there are others.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Annalisa if you don't want to field than I'm happy to do so but I don't think, I think Diplo was given as an example, not the example. Okay? Good. Have we got the necessary slides because I'm filibustering about as far as I can filibust here? I'm about to have to get up and do a song and dance routine while we get the slides. There we go, we've got the slides up. Well timed. Whew.

Seth Greene: Okay, so basically we tried to work into this suggested bylaw changes the ideas of the ALAC Review Working Group. I hope you can see, we can make it larger on the screen, but basically to say first that the ALAC is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual internet users whose views and concerns it captures, aggregates and articulates in order to offer a representative input into ICANN's processes. Now this idea of ALAC capturing and articulating the views of its 2 billion constituency, I think that comes quite strongly in the report. And I think that somehow it would be good to include in the bylaws.

Then B is basically enlargement of the present point A of the bylaws which is about the role of ALAC. And now here instead of just saying that ALAC provides advice, we incorporated four points that the final report mentioned. That is to say advice on policy, input into operations and then accountability mechanisms and outreach.

Then C – we come to this problem of ALAC advice and how it is treated. That is to say, on issues that clearly affect individual users or have implications for them, ALACs advice should be sought and considered by relevant SOs or the Board. The ALAC may also put such issues to the SOs or the Board directly either by way of comment or prior advice or by way of specifically recommending action on new policy development. Now this text is pretty much taken from the GAC provisions, but of course instead when the GAC advice is sought specifically on question which affect public policy. Here we say that on issues that clearly affect individual users. This sort of obligation would exist for the SOs and the Board to ask for our advice.

And then lastly, the difficult issue on what happens when the advice is given. If the ALACs advice is not followed in a development of the policy, a response should be sent to the ALAC with an explanation or an explanation should be provided in the policy document or in the minutes of the discussion. This is again, a little bit the same that happens with the GAC. This is quite a big change actually to the present bylaws and this I must stress that this is just the first attempt at formulating these things and I would

very much welcome a discussion and comments in of course coming to the final formulation. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you. We are going to have opportunity to workshop this on Thursday. So what I would like to do, I mean these are significant issues, we will also be, the Work Team is going to meet with some ICANN legal staff while we're here because it is in fact, whilst it's ALACs role to put forward some proposed text for consideration, it's Legal's job to actually write bylaws. Just as I may not be at that particular meeting, depending on other demands, one edit I would like to insure goes in is I think we certainly do not wish to lose or devalue section G of the bylaw four.

So that's, I draw your attention to 4G where it states the following after talking about the RALOS in geographic regions and how the status of such a RALO is based on what criteria they will be established on. In that sentence it says the following, and I'd really like it printed on t-shirts and coffee mugs and taken out by the regional leadership and give to all the ALSs – “each RALO shall serve as the main forum and coordination point for public input to ICANN.” Now that's what the bylaw is saying now and if we're going to empower RALOs they way they should be we need to make sure that that doesn't get lost and we don't have that baby go out with the bath water.

So if you can insure that it is not seen as a replacement of that text. I just don't want ICANN Legal to think oh well that's all ALAC

now, what's happening in section G. We just need to be aware of that relationship between 4G and the proposed text.

So thinking caps on. Thank you very much. Can we move to B briefly? Who've I got here from B? Annalisa, are you ready to roll and have you got your slides queued?

Annalisa Roger: Yes, the slides were here earlier. So I guess somebody's going to pull them up?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We need to get them back. There, no – yes – maybe?

Annalisa Roger: Is somebody over there? Is Matthias here in the room? Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is this one of those sort of ICANN promises?

Annalisa Roger: There we go. Thank you. Okay, so I think Seth did a good job covering pretty much what my presentation was going to start with so I can rip through this really quickly. Working Team B is responsible recommendations three, four, seven, and nine. And I would like to thank the Working Team B members for their inspiration and dedication to the project and also I'd like to list them because I sort of want to put a face on Working Team B since we are looking for new members, new ideas, and maybe if we put a face on Working Team B people will know who we are and come and feel free to talk to us about the work that we're doing.

So from AFRALO we have Yaovi, Baudoin, [Mowahtes] and Michelle. APRALO we have Fouad and Cheryl. From EURALO we have Sebastien and Wolf. LACRALO we have Carlos, Antonio, and Dev. And from NORALO we have Gordon, Gareth, Darlene, and myself.

So recommendations three, four, seven, and nine are specifically designed for ALS participation. And the ALS, RALO/ALAC participation structure of AT-Large should remain in place for the present. Recommendation four is education and engaging the ALSs as an immediate priority where compliance is a longer term goal.

Recommendation seven is specifically collaborative tools and ALAAC is choosing its own communication collaborative tools. Seth discussed some of what those tools were; Posterous and the confluence pages, I'm going to get to that in a second.

Recommendation number nine is ICANN should strengthen its translation and interpretation processes which I think is underway, I think we're working on that.

Next slide please. Okay, so for accomplishments, one of the first accomplishments is that we have established our regional liaisons. So for each liaison somebody is actually specifically going to be bringing the information that we're working on in Working Team B out to the RALOs, but a big important part is getting the information from ALS members through the RALOs and back up

to us. So we're sort of contact people but I'm sure that anybody in our group can participate in that way.

So obviously a big priority is the unimpeded flow of information between ALS through RALO through ALAC structure and that's vital for the success of education engagement and outreach as well as recruitment. And these speak to specific tasks in number four. That's an immediate priority. And let's see, I think I've covered that.

Okay, comparison page of RALO participation has been completed. And that's a list that is available which shows all the membership rules for each of the RALOs and you can see them all at once which is interesting and helpful. Also the migration to confluence and our recommendation regarding the translation and interpretation processes. And we've also set a technology review schedule. We agreed under recommendation seven that it does make sense to review available technologies on a set 18 months schedule because that's direct tools to help ALSs communicate and bring information back up.

So on the next slide, the last slide some of these accomplishments are also it's kind of tricky because some of them are accomplishments, but they're long term goals so we're still moving forward and they should be looked at as moving forward also. So we've got Posterous which Dev may want to say a couple of words on.

just put up for Team B just duplicate in your minds to all the Teams, everyone of the Teams needs some fresh blood, new energy, some thinking minds.

Ladies and gentleman, we did start some ten minutes later into the session so we're going to stop ten minutes later into the next session. And the next session rather importantly is our luncheon and it is a working luncheon. So teams C & D are going to have to do their thing, albeit in an expedited manner, because you do all have Thursday to do your main presentations, once we get back to this table with your lunch requirements. So I'm going to ask you to do the following because your salads are getting warm and your sandwiches are getting something else, if you go out that room/door at the end, sorry for those of you who are listening remotely but just try and imagine this, there is a door at the end of the room and I'm asking people to leave. There are barriers to stop anyone else getting to our food, go, go quickly, get what you want, get as much as want, come back, sit down and we shall start again.

No dallying, no leaving, I've got the fence electrified, come back in this other door. Okay?

Heidi Ullrich:

And also the drinks and the dessert are going to be brought into the main room so that drinks and dessert can be got afterwards, but don't leave the room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay, so that means we're locking the doors and drinks and desserts will be brought to you. So we've actually provided you

both lavatory facilities and watering requirements don't complain; we're treating you well. Go, get, come back, eat, we work again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ladies and Gentlemen, recognizing that we don't have interpretation running at the moment, but recognizing also that we do have very limited time and mainly because I want to be an incredible nuisance to the two co-Chairs of Work Team C, and I see then both with delightful food in front of them so I'm going to ask them to speak now. Okay, we are doing, you're going and ready? Are we on record? We're ok, as long as we're live to air. Okay. We're ready to roll, fantastic.

So at this point in time as people in the future are listening to the mp3s of this tape and you hear the clanking of glasses and the crunching of crockery and flatware meeting knife, it is in fact a working lunch. And the background noises do not mean we are meeting in a cafeteria, we've actually brought our excellent food, prepared here locally at the conference center, back to our desks and we're going to slave away and listen to the presentation from Work Team C. So I believe Tijani, you're beginning this. Go ahead, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes, thank you. We have interpretation? Thank you. So Work Team C will respond to the request of Cheryl to be very short and very brief. I will just tell you that this working team is dealing with the strategic planning, the operational planning, and the budget preparation. Since I was travelling last weeks and I didn't

attend the last teleconference because the connection was very bad, I will let Olivier, who is the co-Chair, present you the report.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Tijani and I might add also another stimulus to the fact that it will be very short and that my food is getting cold, so it will be short. The working teams work has actually been described very well by Seth a little bit earlier. There are three different points that we had to look in two different recommendations – five and six. Specifically, as Tijani said, the strategic planning, the operational planning and the financial planning and how we can interface this because as with any dance it takes two to tango. And we actually, whilst not indulging with tango, with the rest of ICANN and with the other committees have actually got to interface with both the financial planning process in ICANN and the strategic process in ICANN.

So we had a couple of briefings which took place online from the strategic planning briefing and the financial planning briefing. Those came rather late because as some of you might know, and in fact some of you will learn later on perhaps today or later on in the week, there are new teams in place at ICANN for these new processes and so things are changing. And whilst we might have been frustrated in the past regarding finance or any of our input being taken into account in the strategic input, and strategic planning, it seems like things are changing.

So part of the work that Work Team C was doing was to actually improve our own processes so as to interface with what's going on

out there and this work is certainly in process and well underway. You will be able to judge for yourself whether the current improvements that ICANN is looking at on their side will interface well with what we want.

Apart from this we worked on a SWOT – strength, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats – the whole, well all the members in the Working Group actually had access to a confluence Wiki and added their points on there. We are going to actually go through this and work on this in a meeting that is going to take place on Monday, I believe, between 12 and, well between lunchtime 12 and 1 pm. And that's taking place in Comiseo 2AB. I'm telling you the room because we actually welcome more members to join us in that team. We'll be looking through the SWOT and we'll be also trying to see if we can perhaps build on that SWOT and then use it in responding to some of the questions which were asked, some of the tasks which were assigned under the recommendation five and recommendation six of the At-Large improvements.

With regards to a SWOT there is also a treasure hunt going on at ICANN, I'm not quite sure whether you're aware of it. There is an elusive SWOT somewhere which has appeared in the strategic planning, you will see it on one of the slides. We are looking for it. If you find it anywhere in the building then please, please, please come to either Tijani or I and we'll be absolutely very grateful. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Go ahead, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Last word, I want only to say that we started with what was done by the standing committee on finance and budget. So we made use of this work that was done by this committee.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you and the concept of the little lost SWOT analysis hiding under desks and behind coffee cups and in folders saying NO-NO, I'm not to be found, NO-NO tickled my fancy. Have I given enough time for what must be known is going to be Work Team D up next? Are we ready for Work Team D? Do we have any slides to queue? Queue slides. And seeing as Rudy, is Rudy on leave, last time I heard he was in transit, but he may not be in transit. Ok, unfortunately Rudy cannot be with us, so Dev it's all yours.

Dev Teelucksingh: Thank you Chair, and good afternoon everyone. Well At-Large improvements Work Team D which was in charge of looking at implementing recommendations eight, twelve, and thirteen – recommendation eight speaks to the public comment period remaining 30 days except in special circumstances, in which ALAC can then request an extension to 45 days. Recommendation twelve talks about ICAN to develop a mechanism to allow the voice of bodies recognized as representing consumer interest to be heard at critical points in the decisions and to provide input into policy processes.

And recommendation thirteen, since providing policy advice is part of ALACs purpose and well ALAC should them strive to

provide policy advice on any issues that affect individual internet users and it goes into recommendations well what should be strengthened for the policies that ALAC for developing and providing policy advice.

Jumping to the next slide, to the team. Well the Work Team we have representation from all the regions quite fortunately. From AFRALO we have Dave Kissoondoyal, from APRALO Cheryl Langdon-Orr, EURALO Rudy Vasnick, from LACRALO we have myself Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Antonio Bodino Gomez, and Carlos Aguirre. And from NORALO Beau Brendler and Chris Gundelman.

So regarding the overview of Work Team Ds work, specifically to recommendations 13.1 and 13 1 1, when it came to looking at reviewing the At-Large's policy advice development process, we decided to come up with a flow chart and we've come up with a fairly detailed flow chart I think that at least breaks down the steps by which how ALAC treats a policy that once it's available for comment, how do we respond and what are the exact steps that are taken until either the policy is ALAC has finished making comments or ALAC has decided not to submit comments and what steps should happen there.

With regards to recommendation eight, this regarding developing a process, this also leads to recommendation weight developing a process for requesting a 15 day extension and the steps for that has also been put down on a flow chart. Also with regards to

recommendation 8.3.1, and 8.3.1.1, and 8.4 we've also come up with a proposal to try and figure out a way of how to, the process by which we can somehow keep track of policies. That before they come out we are made aware of these policies beforehand and try to, and then have a review system in place so that ALAC or At-Large can intervene and ask questions as to whether we can maybe have a policy briefing or seek clarification from the SO or ICANN regarding this policy.

And regards to recommendation twelve regarding consumer outreach, we have started to create a consolidated consumer outreach document and now we're putting together an outline of related materials needed for the consumer and At-Large research outreach and inreach I should say as well. regards to the future working plans, well a review of the flowcharts, and I welcome comments from everyone on it, and refining those flowcharts to the document At-Large policy advice development process because I think at the end of it all the diagrams and so forth will really help in educating AT-Large structures in how this RALO, ALS/RALO/At-Large/ALAC works.

Also we'll be looking at recommendation 13.2, strengthening the policy development process between the SOs and the ACs, for requesting and considering ALACs input. And continuing work on recommendations twelve on the consumer outreach and putting together the educational materials needed and links to educational materials needed for the consumer and At-Large outreach.

And well, these are all very important items and it would be good to get more and more input. And I think even if, I'm speaking for volunteers not just from the room, but for those listening in or who may be listening into this presentation afterwards. I think it's good if you have ALSs that are not even aware because sometimes they may see things that we take for granted that maybe seem obvious to us, but to an ALS looking from the outside they don't understand it. So I would encourage anyone who's interested in even learning to join the Work Team. That's it, thanks very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Dev. And I must say that closing point you made is a very important one that all the work teams are looking for more people to become involved. You do not have to be a member of the ALAC, in fact, I prefer you not to be a member of the ALAC. We need some ALAC on there, but really you'll note the leaders are from the regions, there's a good reason for that. Because this staff has to be owned very much by At-Large and so the more we can engage the ALSs and the more that we can engage the regions in this process the better.

Obviously ALAC has a vested interest in its outcome because it's designing our future, but there is no priority or now criteria that if you're an established At-Large structure, or an individual member of At-Large, than please pick a Work Team and join. There's plenty of work to go around and the fresh view, and the multilingual and multicultural sense is very, very important. We

will bend over backwards and make whatever we can happen to happen to facilitate you.

Now occasionally, as Tijani and particularly Fouad have found, Mother Nature has played in role in connectivity and things and it's another reason why we need a critical mass of people in each of these work teams. These are not work teams that can rely on three or four people only because it's quite possible that two will be travelling and two will be underneath a flood or a famine or a pile of snow that we can hardly see the house through.

Are there any questions for Work Teams C and D? Yes, go ahead Beau.

Beau Brendler:

I have a question that was in part alluded to earlier which is, there was discussion of a gTLD document that had its origins in the ALAC and maybe offline we could talk about that because if it's the document I think it was I don't think it was very highly regarded when it came out. So just want to make sure that you know. And also I wanted to apologize to Work Team D because I didn't get a chance to help them as much so I will try to do it while I'm here, I've actually been in rather bad health the last three months, so. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

We appreciate the difficulties you've been under Beau, and any contribution you can continue to make is greatly appreciated. I think the genesis of the document we're referring to is in fact out of the same stable. It is the original documentation, yes it wasn't

particularly well received by parts of the community, it wasn't wholesale rejection at all. But it was heavily edited and changed and is it possible for us, Heidi to, when are we going to be seeing this because it would be interesting to see the changes.

Heidi Ullrich:

Yes, this is Heidi. It is expected to have the PDF version later today or first thing tomorrow and just to reiterate what Cheryl said, the version that you will see has been heavily, not only heavily edited, but also quite a bit updated as well. Sebastien's contributed some very useful comments, so I hope that you will find that more useful. And again, just to reiterate what Scott said earlier, this will be the first of a series of beginner's guides, the topics of which were chosen by ALAC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

So Beau does that...?

Beau Brendler:

Yeah, I mean since it's coming out in a PDF today does that mean it's final and done and over with?

Heidi Ullrich:

That's a good question. I can ask Scott about that.

Beau Brendler:

Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Any other questions for A, B, C, or D? We can put them all on the hot seat. If not, then what we will now move to is what we were hoping to do during the working lunch. Now let me just mention to you I'm about to disappear and go to ATRT duties. I had planned to be with most of you because I assume most of you will

be going to the fellowship cocktails later today, which I think are held perhaps in this region here, they're certainly not far from where we are.

Unfortunately I'm now going to have to be at a meeting at the Hilton and so I've got a meeting that starts at 5:30 at the Hilton and another meeting that starts at 7 at the Hilton, which really doesn't mean I can get back to fellowship. So please if you would accept my apologies and pass that on to the fellows. I look forward to seeing them on Tuesday morning. I would like to have met them today, but I so far cloning, they just haven't made it legal, human cloning is still an issue and I can only be in one place at a time.

Sebastien Bachollet I have asked to join us back into the room and do a little, help us go through do a little getting to know you exercise. Some of you have been around in the wonderful world of ALAC for some time and you might remember some interesting times when, for example, we put large sheet of paper on the ground and then we folded in half and we all stood on this piece of paper, and then we folded in half again and we all tried to stand on the sheet of paper, and then we folded it in half again and it was getting very friendly at this point in time. That is not the type of getting to know you exercise that we're planning on running here today, to the relief of those of us who are claustrophobic or have personal issues with spaces.

But it is in principle, it's psychologically what I'd like to think of you thinking of yourselves doing. We occasionally have very

small and very intense times together, here is one of those examples, but we actually know very little about each other. And when we have new At-Large advisory committee members joining us, when we have members of our community who simply haven't been as closely and regularly exposed to us ALAC people up until now it might be worthwhile learning a little bit about each other as humans, and then of course in terms of our principles and policies and our core values. So as I'm going to leave you shortly, let me begin.

I'd like to share something about myself that I doubt many of you know; some of you may know, but some of you may not. I read trashy teen vampire novels for fun. I thoroughly enjoy *Twilight*. I watch *Vampire Diaries*. There you are, I've said it. You know more about me now than many other people do. Can I encourage you, it's not all I do for fun I'll hasten you and certainly not all I read, but can I encourage you to think about what I just did. I just shared something about myself. In some of our getting to know you exercises early on I for example learned that both Sebastien and I are all into scuba diving. Great we had something we could talk about; something we definitely would not argue over, which was good to find at the time I've got to tell you.

C'mon boys it was fun, and so if you can think about doing that sort of thing. Expose a little bit of you that is taken down, will be recorded, will go into three languages, so do be careful what you say. Just something that exposes a little bit of you to the rest of the group. And if you let them in and they let you in you'll actually be

in a better position to build a team and that, ladies and gentlemen, is what you are, one of the most important teams that this organization has. Thank you, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you very much. And thank you for offering me to share this part of the meeting today as it will be my last week meeting as an ALAC member and there will be other moments I guess to talk about that. But I think it's an interesting exercise, my just concern is that we don't, we just have half an hour because Avery is coming in half an hour for that and we will have to stick in this timeframe. It was not just because she did not want to say much more about her that Cheryl takes a very short story, it's because of time. And may I ask if somebody wants to follow the example of our Chair and give something, and it could be done in French, Spanish or English of course, no problem? Okay, Carlo, please.

Carlos Aguirre:

Well, I'm going to give you something or tell you something, I'm going to tell you something that is so intimate, so private to me, and this going to be useful just to begin to classify me or in a way have a witness you know. I like you should know a very hot swimming bath. In Brazil they call it soonga, it's like underwear, very small, very sexy and hot as well. And the topic, the issue is that I don't have much to hide in there you know. So well, thank you.

Male:

Thank you Carlos, very good, way to go!

Carlos Aguirre:

Thank you.

Male 2: Now I just wanted to say that there are things that sometimes like Cheryl was saying, I love playing rugby you know. And after many years for not playing I'm back and this is one of my greatest passions and reading about political philosophy. So I really enjoy this. Well let's talk about that during this week because you know that the number of the Board is fifteen, that one plays rugby in the position fifteen said that it's something that I also like and enjoy. I played rugby for some years now. Well, we're going to discuss about it.

Fátima Cambronero: Hello, I'm Fátima Cambronero. I'm from Cordoba, Argentina, and this is my first meeting as a fellowship in ICANN. And I'm not hiding, I have no hidden secrets so far, but if they come up in the upcoming meetings I will disclose it, but not necessarily must it be hidden.

Sebastien Bachollet: Probably you have things you really love or are fond of or things that you would like to share with us. It doesn't have to be dark as Carlos, just you could just mention some other things, interesting things to share with all of us.

Carlos Aguirre: We belong to the same organization, sorry, I just gave you the deepest fact of my own and now you're just making fun of me, c'mon, give me a break.

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay, Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I love swimming, that is the best sport. And so I really love kids, I have four and six grandchildren.

Sebastien Bachollet: Tijani, big family, thank you! And still he had the time to come with us and help us to define the politics. Thank you very much Tijani.

Female: ...something to keep me warm at night although some will probably find me eaten by my cats at some point.

Sebastien Bachollet: And you live in the country where it's freezing sometimes and it's, you need cats to be warm. I understand that. Yeah Heidi, you can, you must, you are welcome. Go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, just with Tijani and his family, I'm very happy to say that I'm going to start our own family. I'm four months pregnant so. Yay!! So just to announce that, I'm thrilled, my husband and I are thrilled. I will be with you in San Francisco, but I will not be with you in Asia-Pacific.

Evan Leibovitch: This was a form of outreach we hadn't planned on.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much Heidi, and congratulations, yes. That's very nice. Beau.

Beau Brendler: I just wanted to tell everybody that I am in fact three months pregnant...no, I actually already have two children. I have two children already. I have two really nerdy hobbies, among many

others. One is I'm a film buff, but of the worst films ever made. So I collect like terrible Amazon, cannibal films and Korean monster movies and all kinds of things like that. My other nerdy hobby is I collect stamps, but they're worth a lot of money.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you Beau. Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Thank you. My very first activity in political activism involved taking money from the Richard Nixon election campaign. Sorry. From the Richard Nixon election campaign. I was, I took money from them. I was a high school student in Miami Beach High School and there was a rally that was being done for Richard Nixon at the time and so I was walking past and there were people that were unloading these signs that were meant to look like they were hand scrolled, you know, "Seniors for Nixon" and "Jews for Nixon" and "Hispanics for Nixon," and if you looked closely at them they were all machine printed. But they're unloading this out of the truck and they were having difficulties so they gave me \$10 and I helped them unload it, and later on I attended the rally, got a chance to shake Nixon's hand before being knocked to the floor by Secret Service. And so yes, that was my entry and that probably explains my current political views.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Sebastien. Before I tell you something personal I'd just like to make an announcement because I think this might concern some people here, I got a message from Janis Karklins

which says those people who haven't yet received the per diems will receive them actually in this minute on the first floor. So I really help this would not disturb this very good session, but I think for some people it's quite important to receive the per diem so I just wanted to, because we just found out, Wolf did not get that message, I got the message so I think there is a problem.

Sebastien Bachollet: If it's from Janis Karklins it's maybe for the fellowship program and not overall.

Sandra Hoferichter: But I'm included and I'm not fellowship. I don't know. Okay, so it was just an announcement and now something about myself. I like to tell you that I'm snowboarding, but I like to move to the more comfortable she's now with my five year old daughter which means she will learn and I will shift to ski and I hope I will be successful and be with you in San Francisco without broken legs.

Sebastien Bachollet: We hope so too. Thank you. Andres.

Andres Piazza: All my passions, intellectual passion, I am quite sick about sports. I get up early or late or at whatever time to watch a match. Football, basketball, tennis, I don't know also rugby and other sports, especially when Argentina plays in a worldwide stage. And I also practice basketball for, well I quit basketball when I start eating so it was a quite, like a few years ago. But I still play puddle, which is some similar sport, similar like tennis and ping pong. And at the Hilton I saw a ping pong table and I will buy lunch or dinner to whoever could beat me in that table.

Sebastien Bachollet: Okay, thank you Andres. It's a deal. Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Every five or so years I like to do something different so I've started a project where I'm going to be a farmer. I am going to grow oil seeds. Most of you probably know of the castor bean, castor bean has one of the highest oil content of plants, better than soy. And it's used heavily as a bio-fuel, as an additive. So I've just started the project with a friend, older man who was my first boss, the first job I had, to grow 150 acres of about 40 something hectares of castor beans to produce seeds to be sold to a processor who will crush the beans and sell it to a Dutch combine in Amsterdam. And I hope to gain some carbon credits from that. And when carbon credits become tradable, I hope to be in the market to trade carbon credits.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you, Carlton. Our first green entrepreneur in this arena and I wish you very good luck because one of my best friends I was working with decided three years ago to become a fruit producer and he went back to South of France and he leave his previous life, except the family, and it was a big, big change. And he's very happy now and good luck. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm going to go for the two for one offer which is going to give you small insights and all job related. In the search of future occupation and so on I always try to go back to my first job, which to me was probably one of the most interesting ones I guess, which was a wind-surfing instructor when I was

about 16-17 years old. It was a while ago and back in those days the great trend was for these swimsuits for, well both men and women but mostly women, to be about postage stamp size and I thoroughly enjoyed the experience of going far into the sea and having to look at every little position and make sure we go in the right direction, I guess. We got lost a few times, but anyway it was the wind that changed direction I guess. That was one thing and I haven't been able to find the same job satisfaction in any other job ever since. And the other thing...

Sebastien Bachollet: Be sure that you will find it at the end of this week starting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The second one, I guess the experience that comes closest to enjoying that was actually a few years ago. Some of you might know that I owned a construction and refurbishment company in London during the property boom and I was sometimes quite hands on. My favorite tool, as one always has in this sort of business, was the angle grinder, which is a sort of machine with a big disc about 12-16 inches in size, and which when applied against a stone or against anything metallic creates huge amounts of sparks and really gets you noticed. And I absolutely enjoyed the experience, it's just power, raw power. Thank you.

Sebastien Bachollet: I hope that you will not make too much use of that in your future role with us here. Thank you. Sylvia.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: I can say that I am very passion in a double way just because I have two countries as my home countries: Argentina where I was

born and Brazil which is the place where I reside and I feel like my country home. And I have a fantastic place, a job with social inclusion, and we are about to create two telecenters in Sambas. And I have took it of two legged kids and four legged kids are the ones who can see here that they are like, my little kittens, my cats. Here, here can you look at here. So I have two countries, two kittens, two cats and two new center stations that we are building in Brazil, just that.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you, Sylvia. Annalisa, please.

Annalisa Roger:

Most people probably do know I'm from California, the west coast, but what may be interesting is that I was born in San Francisco in the middle of the 1960's and I lived at Haight an Ashbury. And I was right there in the middle of all of the wild movement at that time. So I think it's kind of fun to think that a lot of I guess who I am, which I've always grown up thinking I was pretty conservative, but a lot of who I am actually comes from the new thinking and the new ideas that may have happened back then. And our next ICANN meeting is in San Francisco and I'm sure a bunch of you guys are going to enjoy visiting San Francisco and seeing some of those neighborhoods that still have a lot of color. So that's something about me that I am actually sort of an off shoot of an interesting time on the west coast. So that's me.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you, Annalisa. Who's next? Didier?

Didier Kasole:

Just a familiar funny anecdote and personal anecdote, it's just a small anecdote. As I was saying, this is an anecdote about how electronics got into my life, how IT got into my life and it interacted with me. When I got married, about 20 years ago now, my wife complained because her husband, that is myself, had two wives; herself and my computer. And this lasted for a few years till the time when we saw the first trouble in [Canchasa] and things started to change; she is a lawyer. And today the computer got so much into her life that sometimes it is in her laugh when we are having visits at home and that's real hard. So my wife now has two men; her computer and myself. So now the roles have changed a little bit.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you, Didier. That's the liberation of the women really. They have, this is what they have attained. They've managed to adhere to a few of our customs and we ourselves actually have taken some of the bad customs that they had. It's a political issue really.

I'm coming from Morocco and since January where I've been chosen as a secretary in the same. I have three kids. In my workdays I run 1000 meters every day and as Didier said, I was one of the first internet users in Morocco. This made me become very interested in the issue. I am a math applied professor for three years now, but it doesn't really seem that you are so old, maybe I suppose you started when you were very young, you really don't look very old.

So let's see the last ones please? Erick.

Erick Iriarte:

I left my family, we all moved into a 10 meter trailer, a 30 foot trailer and spent the next five years living in camps in forested areas in North America. So I've seen more areas without broadband than I think ever believed existed. I have run a satellite relay from my camp for five years always keeping my machines in Maine, keeping in contact with them, through my satellite uplink. So I've just been like most of the people who have very poor connectivity for almost all of the last five years, six years. I've only actually been settled in one place now for a year and a half in Ithaca NY where my wife is going to law school.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you Erick. Hiro and than Fouad.

Hiro Hota:

Thank you. Can I make this statement in Finish? Anyway, alright Fins have lots of crazy habits like for instance sitting in a very hot sauna and then rolling in the snow afterwards, but I'm not much into that. My real passion is sailing, but sailing in Finland is like skiing Colombia; the seas are just very short. Thank you.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you Hiro. Fouad.

Fouad Bajwa:

Apart from being a computer geek, at some point in time, I was really bad in sports because I couldn't throw the ball or hit the ball when I was playing baseball, and then like in Pakistan we play cricket because I have weak wrists, but I ended up somehow dancing. And I've been dancing for the past like 25 years. And

this is a funny thing but one night I danced with 30 women from like 20 countries. And apart from that I used to have a reggae band. We launched our song and it actually crashed on the charts and then after two months it was to top of the charts for like 4 or 5 months.

Evan Leibovitch:

Just how big is the reggae scene in Pakistan?

Fouad Bajwa:

No, we were the only ones! And finally, last year I composed a song with a mainstream Pakistani singer. So it's part of his second debut album, oh sorry second album.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Great. Ok so the last ones. Who wants to take...? I will not oblige you if you don't want that, two or three or four of you. Yeah? I know, but if they don't want. Yeah but you will find another time, other situation, it happens that I was, I don't remember when it was on Friday evening I was for my first time I was in some ICANN Board activity and our Finish guy asked me where I learned Finish, but I can't say I speak Finish, I just know a few words and I can just show it nothing else. But they asked me how I learned that and after I explained them they said but we never knew that you were doing all that.

I learned Finish because when I was student I was in engineer school, dealing with wood, I am a wood engineer, I never do something except my training period. And my first training period was, usually the student of this small school in France decided to go to a sawmill in France and I decide that's not big enough, I will

go to biggest sawmill in Europe and I went to Finland. And I was with a team to take care of the quality control and they gave me the roller and they have to write.

And I have to learn how to count and I have to learn some other words and it's why I went to Finland for two months in LaPeranza and (inaudible 4:51:02) and a company called [Caucas]. And that was my first experience and I will stop that. But just to let you know I learned Spanish and I guess I can't say I speak Spanish, I can't say that I speak Finish because the next year I have to find a training period somewhere and so ok, you already do the biggest sawmill in Europe and you need to find something else and I decide to go to study the wood industry in the Peruvian forest.

And I gather money for that and I got one of my friends and went and spent two months in [Ikitos Calpine], a part of the rainforest in Peru, and it's how I start to learn Spanish. Then I went for three months at the University National de Mexico, but for three months and that was also the time I learned a bit more Spanish.

I would like to thank you for this time of sharing your personal important thing and I think it will be very useful and I hope that we will find other time to do that again in the future. And I want to give the floor to the next item and I guess it's a JAS group, report, discussion; who is sharing, Olivier? It's you? You are a member of the group and you chair twice, I give you the floor. Go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch:

Thanks, Sebastien. We're going to go now into this group, which is, it's been called the JAS, joint applicant support. Joint because this has been a collaboration between GNSO and ALAC based on a request to come up with way in which gTLD applicants in emerging economies might be able to catch a break and not have quite so many barriers to entry as exists currently. I've been co-Chairing this together with Avri, who has been doing the lion's share of the work in it, so I'll let Avri do most of the presentation.

I just also want to acknowledge people within this group from ALAC and At-Large that have been a major part of this. Tijani, Erick, Sebastien, Cheryl and Carlos have been very, very important parts of this and have basically been critical to what we've been doing. Our challenge now is getting ourselves heard, but I won't take anything away from what Avri has to say so go ahead.

Avri Doria:

Okay, thank you. Although I must admit sitting here I felt like a bit of a voyeur because listen to you all bare your souls about who you were and what your secrets were. And I figured hmm, how could I stop feeling like a voyeur unless I do the same myself? So I'm a very shy person. See! That's the sort of reaction I get. I'm a very shy person and if you ever see me in a party you'll see me hiding in the corner being very nervous.

But to try and get over my shyness, and by the way I was on the other coast during that whole, but anyway, and that was one of the secretes, but no. How I've dealt with it is by being a joiner. I join this, I join that, I joined GNSO I joined the NCEC, I joined ISOCK

Finland, I joined ISOCKNY, I get to be in ALAC, I get to be in GNSO; I'm a joiner. So that's really my secret is to try and get myself out of my shell I join stuff.

Slowly, sorry. Yeah I also speak too fast. Okay. So this is a group and there will be many people in this room that can give far more detail than A-I'm going to give, given the time that we've got and B-because they feel impassioned about some of the things that I'll just be glossing over. So that should hopefully come out in the discussion. Also one of the things I want to get to at the end is sort of some of the re-chartering issues because GNSO is in the process of re-chartering something that ALAC already has and I just wanted to make sure you knew about some of the issues that existed. And I also want to thank staff for the slides. After presenting it to GAC the other day someone came to me and said oh what great slides. And if you've even seen the slides I produce you would know, well there's two slides in here I produced and you'll see, but anyway.

So we've been working on this for a while. This really all started in March 10, 2009, I think, with a GAC letter to ICANN basically saying there's pricing issues here and something needs to be done about those pricing issues. There was a Board resolution and after that basically both the GNSO and ALAC had motions to create this joint Working Group which I personally think has been one of the very early and successful examples of a cross-community Working Group that is actually producing stuff. So as that chart shows we've gone through several things. We've put out a blog entry

which was sort of a request for service providers to basically sort of get a gauging on, registry service providers, on what kind of reception there was to the idea of people giving in kind help.

We supported a snapshot before the meeting in Brussels sort of saying this is the direction we're going in, got comments, dealt with those. Before the latest Board meetings we presented a draft of what was almost done. Then the Board resolution came out, which basically had three point on it and what I remember most about it is one – we need more specifics on some of the stuff you've been doing. Like how you do these criteria and how you set these things up and go ahead and keep working and in general that's what I took from it.

We've now published the milestone report which has the meat of it and then the addenda which has the various background reports, some of the intermediate stuff, the attendance and so on. One of the things though, and it's on this slide here, that reminding people in the gTLD policy as recommended by the GNSO that started the whole new gTLD process and this is guideline N. It says ICANN may put in place a fee reduction scheme for gTLD applicants from economies classified by the UN as least developed.

And that's a very important thing to remember when going back and saying well is this part of the policy recommendation for and basically going back and saying, remember, yes it was. Ok, so than the question became the group had to work on who should receive support. And this slide here, do not take it as a Ven

diagram, is basically what is primary, what is central, what is beyond – you need to start there, is there need to be a set of need criteria and someone needs to meet the need criteria. Now one of the things that came out...oh, and for those on the slides I think they're close, there may be some deviations between the two sets constantly editing it.

Now one of the things the Board came back to us and said need criteria is all well and good, but how do we figure out what those are. So when we talk about future work that needs to happen...why do I have this in my ear that's what's weird, I thought I was sounding very loud? So basically we said there has to be a need criteria that needs to be established, the Board has come back to us saying well give us a little bit more information on that. Once need criteria have been met then there's another set of conditions that, it's not that you have to meet all of them, it's a family of attributes that need to be met.

So it's supposed to be non-government organizations, civil society, not for profit organizations. However, if you look at the bullet at, I guess it's at 5 o'clock, it says local entrepreneurs in those markets where market constraints make normal business operations more difficult. The issue was when we presented one of the early works on this we had been very absolutist about no business need apply. The comment we got back from AFRALO was well wait just a second. In some developing economies, that's not a realistic criteria. And that sometimes it's 10 people that are trying to be entrepreneurial or something that should, so therefore there is that,

that exception is in, not exception, but criteria has been added, that the applicants be located in emerging economies. And we quite specifically went with economies and not necessarily developing countries because just for a sort of broader, more general definition.

Applicants in languages whose presence on the web is limited. So we're really having a strong focus toward the IDN, although it's saying languages, so it doesn't necessarily need to be IDN. And then community based applications such as cultural, linguistic, and ethnic. Now, one of the questions that we still have outstanding is indeed how do you determine that it's a community based etc and that's again part of the feedback we get from the Board is a little bit more specificity. And please shout at me if I speed up because it is my tendency, especially when I've only got short time.

So who should not...that's what I was just saying basically so thank you for shouting out at me. So who should not receive support? Specifically in this case we were looking in the first round to try and box it in somewhat so that it wasn't quite as broad and basically decided to exclude geographic names. And part of the rationale that comes out is we've got an immense number of people here coming to all these meetings for the last couple of years doing geographic names and there's a plethora of them and what we're kind of looking at is supporting those who aren't here. Who haven't been able to make that first step. The people for whom this set of criteria that now exists is a barrier. Geographic names, while there may be geographic names for whom it is a

barrier, for many it is not. So that one was excluded, purely governmental or para-state applicants.

Now, you'll find later that there's explication on this that sort of says just because somebody has some government support or something does not make them a governmental organization. But if all or a majority of one's funding and ones organizational structure is based on a governmental organization then it would be excluded. And then business models that fail to demonstrate sustainability. The notion that just because it's an applicant with need, just because it's an applicant from a region that doesn't necessarily do registries and registrars doesn't mean that it doesn't need to have a reasonable business model for its context, for its location, for its situation.

Those three had consensus. Then there was the dot brand TLDs where there was a difference of opinion, where there was a consensus of most of the people, the first three had full consensus, there was no disagreement in the group. The last one there was basically partial consensus and that sort of said that dot brands may come in in the future or could be...there was also a view that says but if a brand is from a developing country and it is a small thing and such, kind of like the same kind of logic one might use for the entrepreneurial than perhaps it should be, but as I say there isn't a full consensus on that one, but that is who should not but whether there's an exception or not, I don't know.

The kinds of support offered. The first one is the cost reduction support. There were certain costs, and I'm not going to go through the details of it because it can be lengthy, but there were certain kinds of costs that seemed patently obvious to people in this group did not, should not have to be paid by people in developing economies. For example, the cost of program development, the cost of ICANN developing a program that presents barriers to people from developing countries is not a cost that should be passed on to people from developing countries.

There were other sorts of fees and I do recommend, that's why we came out in many languages, I do recommend that people read it and look at them all. There was also a notion of staggered fees. The way the program is built now you pay your \$185, or if we're successful at getting things lowered you pay your \$100 and then maybe if you're not successful you get it back. What this group has suggested is that for those who meet the qualifying need and such that perhaps they can pay as they go. So if they've raised part of the money, the \$30000, and they have the ability to raise more based upon success that becomes possible.

We looked at sponsorship and funding, by the way I must say on the cost reduction support, that's one where we haven't seen great support from either the Board or the staff on that particular leg of this program; and so definitely looking for support. Support and funding – looking outside of ICANN, looking at funding organizations and such, is there any way that we can collaborate with other groups to get, and by the way please let me know on

time. I forgot to start my timer, so I don't know how I'm doing. It's tough when I have to both go quickly and speak slowly. Less than ten minutes? So I'll have to skip slides because I can't talk quickly through slides.

So modifications to the continued operation instrument obligation. It's currently listed as several years, people in the group said it should be shorter; 6 to 12 months maximum. Logistical support, translation and other forms of help on applications understanding. Technical support – now one of the things that's important to not, we did not suggest that they have lower technical requirements, we suggested that there be aid from other, for example my favorite example is the requirements that you have to have IPV6 connectivity. Well, there's a lot of people for whom that may be difficult so can we provide someone that builds an IPV4 to 6 tunnel for people so that they have the 6 connectivity or something without having to wait until its run to their country; that sort of idea.

And then one of the ones here that I won't get into because it's probably not necessary any more, but while vertical integration was still pegged at the there will be none to sort of allow for some exception, although this could still come in to bear, allow exception from whatever rules exists for these applicants to be able to combine the registry and registrar functions.

Guiding principles, quickly. Self financing responsibility – no more than half of the costs should be provided by any program.

People still have to come up with some part. A sunset period – any of the conditions that last beyond the application and go on need to cease within five years, or by five years. It was an open question. Transparency – basically if people are applying for the aid what is the criteria, who's applying, how's it dealt with?

Now, once we get into dealing making recommendations on financial need, obviously some of that information would not be quite as open.

Limited government support I already spoke about; that if there is some government support that's good as long as it isn't majority. And then an important one is if one of these is successful an expectation that they pay into some kind of fund so that in the future there is monies for others who have financial need. So if it really works for you, the sort of paying it forward types of notions.

So we basically finished the first work on our charter. We proposed a new Working Group charter, it had these elements on it. Most important, establish criteria for financial need, definition of mechanisms, establishing relationships, establishing framework for managing monies that come in from outside including auction, methods of coordinating assistance, etc. So basically putting together the structure and then also working with staff to look further into the 100,000 base application fee to see whether there's anything else that doesn't make sense when you're talking about a developing economy.

So in terms of the charter extension, ALAC has already approved our charter going forward and I'm very appreciative of that. We have, and it's sitting before the GNSO at the moment, one of the issues that the GNSO has been discussing is item C, which is establishing the framework including a possible recommendation for separate ICANN originated foundation for managing auction income beyond costs for future rounds in ongoing assistance. The possible edit has been presented which adds lots of weasel wording which adds lots of, of course we understand this is big issue, broader issue, etc sort of saying establish a framework for consideration by the chartering organizations, that's you, and the GNSO and the community At-Large that deals with methods whereby any monies raised for the purposes of support of new gTLD applicants.

Framework could include a possible recommendation for a separate ICANN originated foundation. As the recommendations made by the support for the JAS group also include a proposed use for surplus auction income beyond costs, future rounds and ongoing assistance. This framework could include a proposal for disposition of these funds, realizing however that the use of surplus auction funds is a wider community topic and may include other proposals for the use of such funds.

Now I'm hoping that surrounding that with all of that "maybe", "provisos", "could be", "community review" will be enough for the GNSO to accept it. There's a possibility that they won't and that C will be stricken from the GNSOs approved charter. At

which point the charter, well the charter's going to come back to you all anyway because they already did make one or two small changes which I thought were probably not problematic. For example, the GNSO is very concerned with the issue of delay. And even though we've said no it's a separate parallel process, don't worry about it, what happens if we don't succeed is not that you don't start the round it's that we don't have an aid program.

But they've added a line to it that sort of says in any event no delays of the new gTLD should result from the Working Groups work. And so that, so in any case the charter's already going to be coming back to ALAC with a couple of changes, but that is the one I mentioned about C is a major one that could still happen. I don't want to see C dropped. I'm arguing, well people have seen how I can argue...I'm arguing against dropping it, but I would prefer to see the rest of the charter approved then to see the rest of the charter blocked over C.

So at least that's my personal take on, I don't have a vote, but so that's where we're at on that one. And that's basically all I had to say. Other than one other thing, there is these other meetings, these are the list of meetings. It's especially important that as many people as possible come and attend the Thursday general meeting to speak up, to voice, we intend to have us talking as little as possible, no more than I just talked today hopefully. And spend the rest of that hour with people that are participating, participating. And there may be a Thursday Working Group meeting, but we haven't managed to get that scheduled yet. And

thank you for the time, I'm here to answer any questions until I'm not here anymore.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, floor is open. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I should know this answer, but I'm going to ask it anyway. On the first version of C it has an etc, etc in it, I presume that part has to be changed regardless.

Avri Doria: Right, yeah when I was looking at it I was sort of saying oops, we forgot to take the etc, etc out and yes what's in the current GNSO motion is etc, etc and that's also the one you all...

Alan Greenberg: And therefore probably in the one we approved.

Avri Doria: Yes, you approved the etc, etc and I feel bad about that.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I think we probably need to fix it at worst, at best or whatever, at worst.

Evan Leibovitch: I have Carlos then Tijani.

Carlos Aguirre: My personal opinion but could be to know what do you think about the statement of USA government about new gTLD program?

Avri Doria: Oh, you mean the letter? I don't know exactly how it feeds into this, I do believe that it's something that should be fairly easily answerable. I mean some of the stuff has already happened and

I'm really quite hopeful that the Board will look at it, will respond to it as any comment should be responded to, will basically not worry about its tone, will take its content and say study's been done.

In a couple places like the VI where they didn't do an adequate explanation of how they got from zero to four to unlimited, write an explanation, fulfill that, but basically explain what they've done, answer the questions and say thank you very much. What I don't expect will happen, and I'm reading tea leaves, is that they might not make the decision in Cartagena, but they might make the decision one of two meetings hence. But other than that, that's purely guess work, but I think that everything that's in there should be answerable and should be answered and they should be thanked and said and now we move on. But that's personal view and has nothing to do with the group.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, I have Tijani, I had a very quick comment and then Alan you've got the floor again.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

I will speak in English. So as a member of this Working Group I want to tell you how much Avri has put from her time and her energy for this Working Group. So I want to thank her today so that you know because really Avri was essential person in this Working Group. The second thing I want to say what Heidi didn't say is the decisions taken by the Board in their retreat in Norway concerning our work, concerning the work of this Working Group. So the most bad decision perhaps is that they decided that the

application cost would be the same for everyone and there will not be a reduction for the cost. And I think it was something that the group felt very disappointing. We are asking to give the criteria for the selection of the needy applicants, we will try to do so but I am afraid that we will be late for the launch of the new gTLD program unless the leader of the US Government will delay it a little bit. Otherwise, perhaps we will be late.

Avri Doria:

Can I respond quickly to that? One is I totally, first of all thank you, but I totally agree about how disappointing the Board saying, and I think that's one of the reasons why not only did we come out with the report, but we made sure that the report was translated into all six languages. The fact that I am going to the GAC and other people asking the GAC to say get behind this folks, you asked for it here it is now let's see some support. And I guess I'm also hoping from ALAC who represent an international grouping and you know GNSO ok non commercials are the minority, but you represent the community of people that will be from the developing economies, or many of them will be and so I encourage you guys to say stuff.

Evan Leibovitch:

I have a very quick answer to Carlos and then Alan and Sebastien and we'll wrap it up after that. Oh and ok, Olivier has the last work. My own answer to Carlos is on Tuesday when we're going to be talking about the statement on the applicant guidebook, I myself am going to raise the issue of the DOC letter, especially as it relates to what we intend to say about our feelings about ICANNs handling of the process. So I certainly hope that we're

going to give that document the proper airing. Ok I have Alan, Sebastien and Olivier, and that's it.

Alan Greenberg:

Two comments. One of them was already made. The NTIA letter may well give us an extra couple of months to do our work and that's probably good. In terms of the Board's decision to say all prices must be the same, I do not believe they focused explicitly on two of our recommendations and I think we need to reiterate them. Number one was the staged payments, which did not say anything about how much one pays, just the fact that it's not all due Day one and that's a very important one for the groups that we're looking at. And I believe we suggested using the same staging, the same steeping as they were talking about in refunds, so it's identical except for cash flow issues.

And number two, the issue about not requiring the \$25000 which is a repayment to reserve, which again does not impact the cost recovery of the ongoing process when the applications are processed. Both of those I believe were not focused on by the Board, to what extent they were presented I don't have a clue, but both of those I believe we can push forward on. The other ones on cost recovery are more questionable.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet:

Thank you. The discussion these last days about this types of program and the VI integration put me one question in my mind and it was a premonition mad by every also because you say with

the VI decision it's done, it's over. And I am not sure about that, not because of the VI, but because we or at least I imagine that we think something different that what's a VI today. The VI today from what I understood is you can be a registrar and invest in the registry, you are in registry you can invest in registrar. But what we were thinking about was the need the applicant to be their own registrar. That means that they will not need to pay to be a registrar. And that's something we need to explain in much more detail if it's our goal. And it is nothing, I will not say nothing, but it's not the same thing that the vertical integration question then I would like you just take that, you keep that in the work of your Working Group. Thank you.

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, Olivier, you have the last word.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Evan. I just wanted to congratulate Avri and the whole Working Group for having done such a great piece of work. It's again another consensus based, community based grass roots work that was done. And there's one thing that I'm really concerned about though which is that I keep on hearing from the GNSO and from various people at ICANN that any of the work which is not finished or which still requires further work should not delay the introduction of the new gTLD process. To me, and I am speaking personally, I feel that this is a bit of a shotgun tactic and I do wonder what if more work needs to be done and what if therefore the work will not be finished by the introduction of the new gTLD process. Does this group's work just get dropped altogether, what happens?

Avri Doria: It's a really good question. Certainly some of it would be obviated if the application procedure starts and we haven't finished, obviously that would make it difficult for some. Some of the other work may proceed. I think there's also now I'm an over-confident sort of person and always think we can finish stuff sooner than we can, but I do believe that we will not work through this stuff sequentially so that much of it will be done. As for delaying, that's an issue I leave to you all, I'm not getting into that one at the moment. Basically I see it as a race and I'm suggesting to the group that if it gets re-chartered, they rethink whether they've got the right Chairs for the next episode, but if they do, they've got to tell those folks to let's get the work done. And to basically, we didn't quite get it done as quickly as we hoped in the first, but close and just race for the clock. I can't say more than that other than yell try to do it.

Male: Thank you Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

[break]

Male 2: I think that this is a session that some of us have been waiting for ever since we saw the announcement of your appointment. No pressure at all. And I'll introduce to start, David Olive to do the next introduction and perhaps a bit of overall intro. Thank you.

David Olive:

Good day everyone. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is David Olive, I'm Vice President for Policy Support at ICANN and it's a pleasure to be with the At-Large community. I just wanted to briefly, since I am not the main event today, it's my colleague over here, I just wanted to quickly talk to you about what you all know, of course some of the policies that are being discussed here in Cartagena today and over the next several days. Obviously the discussion of the launch of the new gTLDs and INDs are topic one and two in many respects.

But there are other policy aspects that are going through the various groups, the SOs and the ACs, there'll be a session on the internal management of the technical evolution of WHOIS, looking at the WHOIS protocols as a way to improve that. There'll be further discussions on the amendments and how to change the RAA. And of course, there'll be further discussions on the recommendation six – the Cross Working Group that's looking at what was called morality and public order, among other ones that At-Large people have been actively involved with and are being looked at by various policy making groups here in Cartagena.

So with that, I just wanted to alert you to what you already know about these ongoing issues and to introduce the new member of the ICANN team, the Senior Director for Participation and Engagement, Filiz Yilmaz. Just a brief introduction, she was featured on our website, quite prominently and rightly so who comes from the RIP in Europe, the group that deals with the

addressing issues there and has been involved with ICANN for many years as well in connection with that regional group in Europe. So with that, we're very fortunate to have her and she has some wonderful ideas that she's willing to share with all of us and so without any further delay, Filiz, it's yours.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Thank you, David. I want to say hello myself as well. It's very, I'm very happy to be here and in my first ICANN meeting as staff, as ICANN staff. I've been with this group in another ICANN meeting, I was sitting there watching the discussions, so I know some of the faces, but it will be, it is great for me to be involved on that level now. And this is a very international group, I'm myself from Turkey, so I'm coming from a region where we find ourselves somewhere between Europe and Asia.

When people ask me do I feel European or Asian I really don't know whatever that means to be feeling for a particular region. But I think we are all here trying to work for the best benefit of the internet and more brains are better than just one single brain, so I think this group is a very great representation of today's internet ecosystem. So that's actually why I'm so deep inside glad to be involved with you guys. So after this each of us, can I go to my presentation now?

Okay, I can't see it. So the title is, that is attached to me, is Participation and Engagement and this has different levels obviously and sometimes when I tell about this to my ex-colleagues they don't understand what it entails. When I try to

describe it I think for this group it's not a necessity, but we already talked about internet ecosystem.

Three decades ago when internet started as a new technology for a few academicians and for a few homogenous; the group was quite small. And now, after three decades you see that it has grown so fast, not only in the tools it involves, not only the technology it brings to people's lives, but also the audience has grown. Nowadays, internet is a utility it's not a technology that is a little plaything for a selected group any more, but it is in our houses, in our households and we buy online stuff there, we buy plane tickets, and some of the businesses are not even taken seriously any more if they don't have a website. So today it is in our lives and this ecosystem is bringing obviously a larger audience together with it.

People are more involved, more and more involved with different profiles. It's not only ingenious educators that are talking about internet logistics nowadays, it's the end users, it is the, there is the regulators, there is the governments, there is the ISPs; so it became a truly a multi-stakeholder environment. And this is where ICANN's core becomes very important with the existence of you guys as well because this is truly the internet policy making environment with this multi-stakeholder profile and shape.

So within that environment obviously there comes the question of this community and keeping that community engaged into internet issues. This is where I feel I need to, I will be hopefully helpful and, but we all have a role in that. And the important thing is

keeping the ICANN community engaged and participated. The participation can be one thing and engagement another, that's why we have two words maybe. You can participate or just listen, or you can actively be engaged in a process where you put forward your ideas and try to make a difference in that system. So we are here to facilitate a meaningful participation if you would like to put these things under one term.

So obviously ICANN, as ICANN staff there is only one person who would look like would do all of these elements, but we do have a public participation committee. ICANN Board has committees, I believe you are aware of that, and six of these people at the moment are dealing with focusing basically on public participation. The current Chair is Jean-Jacques and then we have Thomas, Gonzalo, Vanda, Katim, and Kuo-Wei. And I believe there will be more interest coming from the new coming Board members in this committee soon.

This committee was chartered early in 2009, March 2009. And there basic focus is on assisting the Board on defining strategies and guidelines in regards to public participation and supervising the public participation program. Under these two points what I would like to talk about, about their past work and focus points a bit. The focus points, they had since their charter was approved is quite wide. One of them is meetings for the new decade. Now, they chose this obviously because ICANN communities being engaged through, via the meetings. That is one mechanism that this community is using very well, three times a year you come

together and you talk about issues. So it's very important to review the meetings. Not only logistically maybe also on the content wise. So they put up this in there, they put this in their agenda and they dealt with this quite in detail. I will share a few more detailed points about this in the rest of the slides, but I first I want to continue on this slide about the distant communication tools and system.

This second point is, was and still is, very specific focus point for them in regards to taking the participation beyond the borders of a physical ICANN meeting. It's very important to involve those people who are, for any reason, not present at the premises of a meeting. Now, you obviously is one group, you are obviously one group particularly have been using these tools very well so far. So you are very familiar with those. It's very important to involve people who would like to come, but maybe they are stuck due to the strikes in Madrid, right, at the moment what's happening, or the snowstorm in Europe, or they just didn't have the time or the resources to come over here. So there have been considerable amount of work in this direction and I will share those with you again in the further slides.

The other focus point they looked at is reviewable public participation processes. This is quite important, how the community is involved in decision making and looking at these holistically and seeing if there is anything further to be improved is a constant focus point for the PPC, for this committee. And creating a comprehensive stakeholder outreach and engagement

strategy is another one. Now, this becomes important when you talk about how to engage people and how to keep people engaged within the discussions. And there are different several ways of doing that. There has been discussions in the morning here in regards to when you were discussing with Mandy and Scott, those are part of this too. However, in terms of participation we all try to come up with some outreach techniques and this boils down under this umbrella.

So when you look at their past work, and this has been put up place obviously before I started, so I'm lucky in a way that I'm going to be working in a set up system now. Remote participation tools has been in place for the last two meetings. They started fully on since Nairobi, ICANN 2007, and due to the circumstances of that meeting at the time, actually they were utilized with a high volume. And what we have at the moment, we provide high and low bandwidth services. As you can imagine if you have a good connection and a good line, than you could do a video voice and chat, but if you have a restricted or a slow connection we don't want you to be cut at all, so we are just providing some, we are providing voice and chats so you can still follow without the media, which takes most of the bandwidth obviously. And so it is a modular set of systems which will hopefully be beneficial according to the circumstances of the user and they can choose in between what they can be using at the time according to their system.

The other work, like I mentioned already, is meetings. They focused a lot on this topic. As we have said meetings are the main tool at the moment. It's a very strong tool for the ICANN community to come together, interact with the ICANN staff, ICANN Board, and interact with each other. So this is a real community, talking, growing community, interacting with each other from all directions. So the main thing was to make sure that we are on the right track with these meetings and people are getting what they need out of these meetings. For this purpose, to understand if this happening or not, a survey was conducted by the recommendation of the committee, PPC, and this survey results have been now collected and there was a webinar about this and they are, they've been published out there.

The one very important thing coming out of the results and the consultation of this survey is that there is a highlighting topic there as hub city concept. So people are inclined to think maybe the hub city concept we're visiting the same location regularly may have some affect on some participants in terms of costs, in terms of airlines connections, in terms of visas – some people need visas each time to get to a different place – and this may be beneficial. So picking up on that, PPC at the moment is looking at if this can be explored further. There is no decision at all or recommendation, but they're looking at the details and they're studying it basically, they're evaluating the idea.

And for future work, while they're doing their current work which sits in their plate, they all keep thinking about the future work as

well. And one main point, as we mentioned, coming from their focus points, the first one, outreach strategies, they are looking at developing more specific outreach programs. And the ideas that are, that they are looking at are mostly focusing on for example the young people; reaching out to universities. The reason for that, the idea behind, is at the moment ICT policy is very popular among young people. And they are studying that with severity and they are very interested in internet policy making policies; one way or the other. So these people are going to be engaged somehow in the internet policy. The idea is basically going out there and introducing ICANN to these young people so that they will know about ICANN already and then they can maybe in two or three years time be participants of the ICANN community or take a seat here among you. So one of the ideas is to reach up them, looking at ways of this.

The other thing is technical internet communities where this is basically the RARs, this is my actually past as well, technical internet communities. These people have very common subjects with ICANN community. Say security, say privacy, data protection, they're also talking about these things; DNS net. And around these shared topics the idea is building bridges between internet communities and than making the ICANN community even stronger because now you are involving some people that are actually relating to your issues as well.

The other thing is cross-community collaboration in under involved communities. Basically, going out there and creating

platforms for people where they can discuss about their issues. I'll just give you an example as an idea, I mean this is not, this doesn't mean it's going to be done or it can be done or it will happen, but the idea is, one of the ideas, today there is the data protection issues coming up and some people are talking about security. So these people can be seen as approaching the similar issues from different directions and maybe at times having different interests, but that's what makes it an internet community, all of us. That's what it is being in an internet ecosystem. You will have those stakeholders with different issues. And the main thing is basically putting these people together so they have an environment to talk about these issues and finding a common ground. That makes internet so special I believe. And so again, this is the point where such effort can be put in place as future work, they're elaborating on that.

Improving public comment processes – this is coming from their focus point of holistic review as I mentioned at the beginning. There is already work being done about this and this is falling into public participations committees place or focus because obviously this is really how the community interacts with each other. Engaging newcomers – while we have, you're all very aware and I believe as I heard it there is already very good positive feedback about this. There's a fellowship program that has been in process for a while and it seems to be very successful and popular. One of the ideas is looking ways maybe enhancing this. Newcomers getting mentor steam, just another one where I don't know if you remember your first ICANN meeting, I do. And it was something.

There was a lot of abbreviations, there was a lot of things going on, I was catching up maybe one or two words for somewhere...yes, exactly going all around. And apart from that, socially as well you see all these people talking to each other and you are standing there on your own knowing nobody. It may be a little lonely and sad at times. And this is true for any other conference. I mean ICANN meetings are big, the issues are massive, there are several parallel sessions going on. There is a lot of catch on.

So what we want to do maybe is to engage together and put some effort on easing this process up for the newcomers. Because if you come to your first ICANN meeting and you are not leaving the meeting with satisfied, as satisfied as you are supposed to be and you haven't gotten enough information or you just missed out because you just didn't know or you weren't given the proper introduction at the beginning and it could have been much easier for you to grasp all that extra information if you had been given a small introduction, maybe that would be great for you. So it's an idea to get that some like over there and make sure that these people get what they need from the beginning. And this team, we're all open for suggestions. It can be even from you guys if you would like to contribute to that. We are thinking of the fellowship program attendees from previous years, because they know how it feels like, to help us out. So this is another thing that we are looking and public participation committee is also warm to the idea. So we will see how this goes.

More future work, this is a very active committee. Well I'm sure you all are engaged with some social media tools or network. We are talking the era for internet-related people and internet comes up with these fantastic tools and facilities to bring people together. And internet-related people, especially internet-related people are very fond of these social media tools or with technologies. So the idea is oh can we use these tools for the benefit of participation and engagement? So this is another thing, a question that the PPC has asked and we are looking into it.

And last, but not the least, their meetings for the next decade. This was already a focal point as you may remember, one of the points that you see most of the work so far. And it will keep on receiving more work because like I said, we have conducted a survey and the results are not very definitive to take one direction or another. It is highlighting certain topics like hub city, but it doesn't show that majority of the ICANN committee prefers this type of meetings or that number of ICANN meetings. So there is more to talk about there and this will be part of PPCs agenda, we believe, for a while now.

One last thing, this is the promotion slide. We do have a PPC public participation committee meeting update for the committee. They are going to meet publicly with the committee to explore on the issues that will be in their agenda. And that agenda contains hub city concept, remote participation and future tools, and public comment processes. So we will be delighted if you have time on

Thursday between 9:30 till 10:30 to come to that session and join the discussion.

One last thing, before I leave the microphone. There was the links for the webinar, thank you, it's on the screen.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. I don't know whether to be pleased or displeased with your presentation. You managed to cover, raise every single yourself that I was going to raise with you, so it takes all the fun out of it.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Oh sorry about that. I didn't mean to.

Alan Greenberg:

No, I think that's one of the things I, how I judge a good presentation is you managed to anticipate most of the issues and I thank you. Some of them are very encouraging. It's well understood that a lot of the things that we have been doing for, to encourage participation have not worked particularly well. the ATRT, the comments on the ATRT recommendations have closed and I was amazed that there were actually 17 comments, which is a huge number for most of our comment periods and a disappointingly low number based on how important the issue is. And so some of these processes are just not working, on the other hand we're seeing occasional things like the low bandwidth chat and low bandwidth facilities so that people can participate in these meetings at least a little bit without having huge bandwidth which I thought was, what had happened in Nairobi was the skies opening and we understood.

Without going into details at a previous meeting I was just at I had the opportunity, perhaps wrongly, to use the following expression: that is a classic example of ICANNs tunnel vision, only thinking of North America and Western Europe instead of the rest of the world. And the details don't really matter and whether I was fair or not perhaps it doesn't matter, but it's very typical, we have not considered the emerging economies of the world, the developing countries, and trying to make sure that they can participate when it's appropriate and when they want to. I find it very encouraging, so thank you.

Male:

I'm sure I'm not the only one with any comments, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi. Thanks, Filiz. I found a lot of what you said a little bit redundant with some of the other things we heard earlier today from Scott Pinzon, and this goes to a fundamental that I've had from the very first day I arrived in At-Large in ICANN. And that is, how does ICANN draw the line when somebody wants to get involved between public participation, getting involved through an ALS, if somebody wants to be involved with ICANN as a member of the public, there are multiple, confusing redundant ways in. How does ICANN identify that? How does ICANN tell, somebody or an organization that wants to get involved, be an ALS or submit a public comment, or do something this way? I've been stymied by the redundancy of two very well meaning departments essentially trying to do the same thing through totally different paths. And I've had people come to me and say I don't know how, how do you get in, what's the best way in? Do I just submit public

comments on things? Do I get involved in an ALS? Do I become an individual member of NORALO? How do I get involved, or do I join something through NCUC? So there's so many different ways is.

And part of the confusing way is for people that want to get involved figuring out where do they fit in, how do they fit in and how does ICANN make that demarcation of well if your interest is this than go here. If your interest is this go here. That's never been laid out and I don't know if anyone shares this frustration, but you're talking about what happens at your first ICANN meeting, my first ICANN meeting was how do you get there from here because there's 50 paths and you don't know which one to take.

Alan Greenberg:

I'll ask that question? Is that redundancy or flexibility? But nevertheless, one needs a roadmap. Filiz.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Well I'm inclined to have an answer in that direction as well. I hear you, what you're saying. For a lot of people it may be confusing. This is also the nature of the thing though. We are talking about very different subjects here. There are several different interests, we talked about the multi-stakeholder environment; so it is massive. So in some way s you can say yeah there is no one way, one path, but that is also good for people, like we're all humans and we like our different ways. So you are providing different ways as well to one person to go to the same endpoint maybe with several paths.

However, I think what is, whichever way or methodology we choose, one path or multiple paths, I think the key element here is communication. What you're saying is very important that people understand they have multiple paths and they may chose to follow one too. So in that regard, I hear and I sympathize with what you're saying. I think we have more work to do there in terms of communication and getting people the answers that they want to know.

Evan Leibovitch:

But specifically, the issue of how do you make that choice? Ok, there's a diversity of approaches, how does somebody who is foreign to the system, who is being introduced to ICANN, how do they know what choice to make? I understand diversity is a great thing, but informed decisions become an important part of that. How does somebody make an informed decision about which path they take and what can you do to help people make that informed decision?

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. Next we have Olivier. I'm sensitive to the fact that we're probably over time even though that we started late, so I'll ask for a little bit of guidance as to how long we want to go even though the whole day is likely pushed back because of this. But Olivier, you're up in any case.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Alan. First of all thanks very much for this presentation. In a way I kind of think that you're preaching to the converted already, which is something that's probably sort of easy for you because your audience is quite happy with what you're

saying, but sometimes might be also seen as a bit redundant use of your time where you could actually be preaching elsewhere. In fact, I would like to reiterate what Evan just said earlier. I sometimes look at ICANN like a restaurant. You go into the restaurant and all you want is to have a burger and then the waiter asks you whether you want it on a paper plate, a plastic plate, a ceramic plate, square plate, round plate, and whatever on a bowl and you're just thinking I just want a darn burger.

And in a way this is what's happening when you arrive at ICANN. You have so many different options, it's just too much. And one thing I'm a little concerned about is that the Board, whom we have been told is so busy with having to deal with so many things, has actually got a committee that spends its time trying to look at questions and trying to find responses and answers to questions which they have a complete constituency deal which is At-Large; this is our day job, well second job I would guess for some hopefully.

This is something that we've been doing for a long time and we've been trying to push this participation, get the information up. We're dealing here with grass roots based processes with the information going up the ladder and the Board is duplicating the work that we're doing. I just find it a bit bizarre and I, maybe you have an answer for that. Thank you.

Filiz Yilmaz:

Well again, redundancy or flexibility in the direction of perfection of getting things done, right I'm only a month and a half here and

I'm passing my observations towards to you in that regards. Having the Board committee dealing with this I think is an opportunity. It can be seen as an opportunity having a dedicated Board committee dealing with this, focusing on this. Apart from that, that committee is very open to receive community feedback. This is why they have a community update session on Thursday. This is an open invitation to this group, please do present there and discuss the issues.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

But you know that they ask themselves questions which are no-brainers. The idea of having meetings in hub cities around the world, well of course we're not going to have a meeting in the middle of nowhere. And I guess Cartagena is a lovely place and some of us have had trouble to get into here so you would think going to a hub city is probably something which takes about a minute to answer and we all say yes let's do it, I just wonder why it's still under consideration. This is the sort of thing, we're trying to split hair length wise or width wise whichever way it is.

Alan Greenberg:

I guess from my point of view, the Board committee has a far wider scope than what At-Large could be considered to do plus more authority to actually take action on it. And as your example says, if hub cities, if holding meetings only in hub cities was so obvious we'd be doing it already and clearly based on the number of people who haven't been able to get here we're not. So there are other considerations that are around. Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: I'm just thinking about so many people from At-Large had problems getting here I'll bet there's a lot of other people from other constituencies that did as well. So it's not just an At-Large thing.

Alan Greenberg: Andres.

Andres Aguirre: Yes. Well I think that maybe my statement wouldn't be like the majority of the cases, but just to raise a little perspective here. For me it was one of the easiest meetings to get to. And the greatest places also.

Alan Greenberg: Anyone else? Dev. I think we'll make this one the last one. Thank you.

Dev Teelucksingh: Alright. Thank you, Chair. Two points that kind of occurred to me as I was watching the presentation - One regarding the participation tools, you have the, I see you've catered for the low bandwidth and high bandwidth and part of me wonders what is better, is the packaging of it for offline use. By that I mean we have, we are capturing all this video streaming, transcripts and all of this stuff, but the problem is that for many, if for a person to actually go back on it they have to have high bandwidth to really take advantage of it. And I think sometimes it would be very useful if you were able to just simply download, have available on a, so you can get to a flash drive and give it to somebody, hey take a look at this, this is very interesting. I think that having some sort of offline access to all of these components would be fantastic.

Secondly, the second question is we have meetings all over the world and for I don't know, in terms of the outreach, we might as well be having it in a ship in the middle of the ocean because I mean I don't see there's really any interaction with the community here in any way, form, or fashion. Again, we might as well be having it in a ship in the middle of the ocean and everybody just sails up after.

Alan Greenberg:

I'm told there's one more question. Go ahead.

Female:

This is more comment. This is actually my first ICANN conference and it is a jump, but a lot of this information is actually tacit; it's in our heads, it's hard to conceptualize what ICANN is by a video or by reading a document. So I think maybe you need to look at maybe mentoring, shadowing maybe a Board member for a period of time or something like that. And I want to disagree with Dev because I don't think we value how powerful this interaction is. Even following things on the mailing list and that kind of thing it's only when you really connect with people that you understand the arguments behind it.

Alan Greenberg:

I'm told Erick has a question up, had his hand up, Brad does Didier have, I'm going to have to leave so I'm going to ask Olivier to turn this over. I'll also ask since I'm Chairing a meeting which is supposed to start in an hour from now and clearly won't, if you could let me know on Skype what the timing is looking like. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ok, I will. Thank you. Erick.

Erick Iriarte: Thank you Alan and Olivier. I'd like to suggest that you take a look at the FYI documents that were produced during the 1990s within the IATF where we were attempting to solve a very similar problem of informing people new to the process on how to be effective within the standard organization. There are quite a few that come from the user services area period, before the user services area was disestablished. So these are resources that you cannot simply pick up and use today, times have changed, but they attempt to address the audience that I think you're trying to address also and which ICANN does not yet have a record of creating communications for that appear to be effective. And these were effective in their time. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Next I believe is Fouad.

Fouad Bajwa: Thank you. Fouad Bajwa from Pakistan. I can definitely say I ended up in the ALAC because of the fellowship program. And one part of that was actually hanging around ALAC meetings when I was in the fellowship program. Unless, there was a feeling I had, which I've witnessed in many programs for developing countries, that the amount of time you're left on your own is like really important time which can be very productive. If the level of mentoring is added, in such a way that you have leaders from the various constituencies of advisories actually having the fellows coordinate with them. So this division you can already identify through the application process, the who's interested in what.

That's one thing. Like in my, I was early this morning I was like sharing, doing this cost presentation, I was sharing the fact that my bridge comes from the IGF, the Internet Governance Forum to ICANN, and my question was just one simple question. That this irritating question about ICANN within the IGF circles what is the real story about that? The (inaudible 6:07:55) evil and the necessary evil circle. But that's not the case for everyone.

In my two fellowships I've seen people who have really no idea about what they're doing here. And then you see a number of them just roaming about, not actually doing something, whereas I've always heard of doing lectures or interactions for the new fellows that in order to come over here you need an agenda. In order to build that agenda, there has to be certain information and knowledge available somewhere. And this fellowship segment is just one small segment, but there's a larger community out there which is yet to be engaged with ICANN, which becomes part of what we call our implicit and explicit key messaging strategy of the communication strategy.

And to add to that I think there's much more that we have to do. Ok this is one thing which I shared when we were implementing the confluence Wiki for At-Large. That it's not the technology, it's not actually the process that has to be mapped to technology, it's technology that has to be mapped to the process. So the social tools are there, but the way people use the social tools are not something that you can actually really maximize on or benefit

from. Because people, they're using those tools for personal communication and hanging on with their friends online and stuff in part of their life. Integrating ICANN into that is going to be a really hard concept. You see ICANN is not a friend of this community, ICANN is an organizational system and you can't just use those tools to hang onto it and just to share.

If you go on Facebook you'll find actually various constituencies and organizations on Facebook already. At-Large has a significant presence on Facebook. And similarly then the RALOs also have it over there, but then you have to see how many people communicate in what ways. I think the amount of engagement we have with ALAC is almost, I think totally with the teleconferences and the emailing list and that's how we're communicating, so we're not actually using social tools, but we're using Skype extensively.

And there are certain things that we've identified in our ALS survey which also give you very good insight. I don't know if you've been through the analysis summarize, I think Dev can give you a copy of that, we also have it on our Wiki, on the confluence. And that gives you very good analysis of something that we've already done. Something that Olivier was also mentioning, that there's so much stuff that we've done which can be used for you to use in the standard program. So I think this mentorship activity has to be at least structured with the involvement of the groups you want in there. If you think that there are people who can be joining

in ALAC, then you have to have ALAC people mentoring them. So it has to be very focused now. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Fouad. Do you wish to reply to that or, we don't really have time for any more questions if there is...okay, one more Annalisa, please.

Annalisa Roger: Yeah, this was actually just a really short question. You mentioned that the meeting tomorrow, there's a meeting for interaction for communication, but I couldn't hear if it was Tuesday or Thursday and exactly what time that was because I am interested and I'm looking at the schedule and I couldn't recognize it.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thursday, 9:30 to 10:30.

Annalisa Roger: 9:30 to 10:30, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Annalisa. Any more questions I guess that perhaps could anyone get in touch with you or...?

Filiz Yilmaz: Of course, by all means. I will be here the whole week and yeah you can write to me Filiz.Yilmaz@ICANN.org. I'm all at your disposal. I'm here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you very much, Filiz Yilmaz. Thank you very much, David Olive. And I'm afraid that we're going to have to just continue very quickly to the next point, which is, on the

agenda the ALS survey Working Group updates. Wolf, I believe is going to be dealing with this part. Wolf, you were supposed to get 45 minutes, I'm afraid this is going to be cut short. Make it quick, thank you very much.

Wolf Ludwig:

Hello, thanks a lot. I was told I have to hurry up and to push you as quick as I can with the next round. As you may remember the ALS survey started some months ago and it took quite some effort, in particular, regional At-Large organizations to get our ALSs convinced to participate in this At-Large survey. As far as I can recall from EURALO at least, it took us several rounds to remind our members and to convince them about the necessity to participate in this At-Large survey.

Finally, At-Large Survey Working Group succeeded to make the first analysis of the results before the Brussels meeting last summer and we had first presentation of the preliminary results in Brussels already. And most of you who have been present in Brussels at least may recall that each RALO made its presentation on the preliminary results talking about very specific aspects of the outcomes RALO by RALO. At the Brussels meeting, the Working Group got the mandate where we know have to continue and to go into more details because it was a very complex survey. And this Working Group did a hard job continuing and to analyze the answers to the questions again and to come up besides analysis with concrete recommendations.

And that's exactly what the Working Group was doing over the last couple of weeks and now we have the results ready which will be presented by our colleague to my right side, Dev, and he in my eyes did a marvelous job putting all the elements together and showing up with a good report and now I give over to him for his presentation.

Dev Teelucksingh:

Thanks, Wolf. First of all is there any way to shrink the, well zoom out of the text so that we can see the entire page? Ok, excellent, thanks. Well I know you're kind of pressed for time, so I'm going to try not to, try to do it quickly, but comprehensively. If you look at what we have done was that we for every question we had an analysis and then we came up with recommendations. So the first wasn't really a question, it was rather a response to the survey. And given the fact that although we emailed 122 ALSs, in the end only 72 ALSs responded which is roughly 50% of the ALSs in At-Large. So I'm just going to go and go into the recommendations to speed up the time.

One of the things we have to look at is insuring that the contact information gotten in this survey is used to better communicate with At-Large structures. I think what happens also is that we need to also look at developing and structure question better because while some questions were answered, many were not, were misinterpreted and therefore not, or were left blank. So we have to structure the survey properly and also give it time to get properly translated. So I think it will improve the survey responses next time.

Do some sort of outreach, inreach I should say, for the ALSs. Promote it through the RALOs, through the mailing list and through the monthly teleconference calls. And well, don't overdo it. We don't want to have surveys like every three months or anything like that. Having one per calendar year is maybe, is probably more than enough. Next page.

Male:

Can you develop better product, the criteria regarding that the team doesn't consider the ALSs that didn't answer as inactive ALSs? Because I don't know, our RALO is also working with the criteria of how to consider an ALS inactive or active, so this discussion could be useful.

Dev Teelucksingh:

Sure. I mean I don't think that any of the survey team thinks that because the ALS didn't respond that they are somehow inactive. I think it's also a combination of things. One, they may be not participating, that is true. But two, they probably did not feel they have, the reason for actually wanting to fill out this survey, for the At-large summit, I think there was a high response rate to people responding to the survey because there was an incentive in that case, whereas this was not really, well incentive at least not explained properly to the At-Large structures. So I don't think it's because it was only roughly 50% of all the ALSs in At-Large that responded, I don't think it's a case that the other 50 are inactive or anything like that. I just think it all comes back down to inreach. And as we go through the survey questions I think you will see that need for inreach more and more.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: May I suggest that you let him continue his presentation and you forward you're questions at the end of the presentation, this is acceptable, Andres? Yeah? Okay, thanks a lot.

Dev Teelucksingh: Okay, so going to the question one which is regarding the names and contacts of ALS representatives. Now we asked the question for primary, secondary, and tertiary contact and while most, well practically everybody has a primary contact because we email the primary contact person, roughly there was about a third of ALSs did not have a secondary contact and about 75% of ALSs did not have a tertiary contact. Now, some may think well this is possible a bad thing, but I think it's a combination of the ALSs size and capacity to actually well, dedicate the time to actually follow all of the material in ICANN and in At-Large. And be able to comment on behalf of that At-Large structure.

And two other questions seemed to bore this out because question 9B, contact information of another person in your At-Large structure to be notified about ICANNs public comments – practically all the ALSs simply replied with the primary contact. So one of the recommendation is that well, we don't really want it to just be the primary contact alone, we want to get more people involved from the individual members in that At-Large structure.

So one of the recommendations was that given the wide scope of the ICANNs At-Large activities, ALSs should be encouraged to include more persons within the ALS to participate in the RALO and in At-Large. And the benefit will be that it allows at least the

primary ALS contact to share the workload, it's not just that person alone doing everything, which I think is near impossible to do. Next slide.

So question two – ALSs websites, about 20% of ALSs didn't have websites. So ultimately we think that, while it's not a guarantee that having a website means that you'd be interacting with your members and participating, it's important to have a website because it allows for people to discover, when they are doing searches online. So we recommend that ALSs should be encouraged to have their website. If they don't have the capability, capacity to do so then use the confluence Wiki, to offer them a webpage so that you know contact details, and the details about the ALS can be found by anybody doing a web search. Ok, next question.

Question three regarding the level of representation of At-Large structures – the majority identify themselves as national ALSs. So I think one of the difficulties of that came down to the definitions. People didn't understand what it meant by regional, state, or local so that's one thing we took from that. The other thing we took from it was also the many RALOs have countries and regions where ALSs are not present, but a nearby country or region has a national At-Large structure.

So we were thinking that well, the recommendations were future surveys should highlight this question a little bit better and give explanations when needed. Also because many ALSs left it blank

we should have some validation tool within the survey so you can't leave it blank when you're submitting this survey, you have to answer the question. Or at least seek, ask questions about the question. And RALOs can then look at ways to see if the ALSs in nearby countries can do some sort of outreach to those regions or countries that don't have ALSs. Next slide.

Question four: number of individual organizational members. Unfortunately this answer was a free form answer and the answers were literally all over the place. And it appeared a lot of the ALSs, especially the non English ones, misinterpreted it completely. They were answering like 40% of the country's population that has internet access. So obviously a misunderstanding of this question means that the answers to this survey question was flopped.

So we should of course, the next survey question should structure this a lot better. So asking specifically how many members and then probably asking how many organizational members and that will be easier to extract information for use in the next survey. Next slide.

Communication tools. Well email was the most popular tool, followed by Skype and blogs, Facebook and Twitter. Now RSS feeds was the lowest in usage as a communications tool and I think potentially this is a problem because tracking changes to At-Large activities is to the At-Large Wiki is best done by RSS. So it's not clear whether that means that the ALSs are simply not even aware of the large activity that's done by At-Large and all the Working

Groups, ALAC and so forth. So what we have to do is look at an education campaign to educate ALSs to learn how to use RSS at least to track the changes to the confluence Wiki.

Also all of the persons answered they use Skype and they use Facebook or Twitter. They didn't actually provide the actual links or the user names. So it's not, so what has to happen is the RALOs have to, at least the RALOs have to get back to those ALSs, get the information like Skype user names, Twitter names, so that they can be consolidated and used by the RALO in some particular form of inreach or outreach given the prevalence of that communication tool by that, within the RALO. And again, since it was a free form question, structure the survey so that it's easier to extract the information easily in the next survey. Next slide, question six.

The majority do have regular meetings and in theory this should provide an opportunity for discussion dissemination of information about ICANN and At-Large. We didn't really have any particular recommendation on this question. Next question.

Question 6A – how often does the ALS meet? Most ALSs meet every two to three months. And a lot of the ALSs in the other categories mentioned a yearly meeting. So this is a difficulty here because if you consider, I mean those ALSs that meet every two or three months or once a year will be difficult to have a discussion dissemination of ICANN and At-Large related policy issues at such a special meeting because it's so infrequent. Because if you think about it, policies are 30 days for comments, so if they don't meet to discuss than it's kind of impossible for ALS to effectively

disseminate the information to its members and get a consensus feedback regarding a policy within the 30 days if they're only meeting two to three months or yearly.

So one of the two recommendations was that we really have to promote to the ALSs the availability of material about ICANN policies that can be used by ALSs to inform its members and based on its feedback look at what material is needed by an ALS. So yes, more feedback from the ALS is needed. And more critically, At-Large and RALOs should encourage ALSs to allow its members to directly subscribe to ICANN and get information directly, rather than just waiting on the potential primary ALS contact. And if they subscribe to using the various communication tools than the hope will be that this can give rise to possible informal deliberations of the policy issue and then can lead to input on ICANNs policy work.

Next question. 6B – types of meeting the ALS has with its members. Primarily face to face meetings followed by teleconferences. And the recommendation coming out of this is that the next survey should look at what ICANN material is in a form that allows the ALSs to be discussed and presented at ALSs, at their meetings in the first place. And allow the ALS and its members to learn about the issues on their own time, and be able to discuss, and hopefully again, give rise to better informed input. Next question.

Working languages – English, French, Spanish are the three top working languages of At-Large structures. And I mean it underscores the diversity of within regions, typically three or more languages are used by At-Large structures within a RALO. Given in order for the French and Spanish speaking ALSs to better participate in ICANN, we recommend that more content form ICANN specifically relating to those policies for content, educational material be available in Spanish and French. Next slide.

Question 8A – what issues? What the percentage shows that the key issues for ALSs vary from region to region, but practical all is using in all the regions have significant interest. So again, recommendations were that ALS representatives with particular interests be encouraged to join, should be encouraged by the RALOs to better participate in At-Large in the various Working Groups that are set up to look at these various issues on a regular basis. And allow them to subscribe to the email list, the Wiki pages for the Working Groups and so forth. And again, continue to insure that the material is in accessible form, not just putting a link to a policy, but wherever possible build up educational material to better explain what this issue is about and make that available always for all its ALSs and its members.

Question 9 – type of Working Group activity. Most ALSs expressed a clear preference for either type of Working Group activity, be it a standing Working Group focusing on a larger issue and for the possibility of ad hoc Working Groups to be created on

the specific issue when it arises. So again, recommendation – education. The RALO should incorporate the activities of the standing Working Groups in its inreach to ALSs and to inform ALSs when ad hoc Working Groups are formed. Next question.

Question 11 – scale of one to five, how well is At-Large integrated in overall ICANN policy structure? Well most ALSs are like in between, they view At-Large as not being an isolated constituency, but it's not very well integrated. And there is some discussion as to why that is and I think one of the next survey questions is to ask ALSs for reasons and examples of why they view the At-Large integration, and how they view At-Large integration sorry, in the overall ICANN policy structure. And again, having accessible material online to explain how At-Large is properly integrated for use by RALOs and ALSs and publicized properly. Next question.

Question 12 – scale of one to five, how was your At-Large structure integrated? 36% of ALSs responded feel that the ALSs are integrated and a vital part of ICANN, but 22% feel isolated and apart from ICANN, At-Large, and ALAC. And 32% further between, you know they're not completely isolated, but they're not well integrated. And again, it comes back down to the material availability online so one of the recommendations to increase awareness of the many activities of the ALAC and RALOs and so forth. We have to better collaborate and document the all this activities for ALSs not directly involved in the activities to be able to find and review. And this will then increase the possibility for ALSs to participate.

Another recommendation is that RALOs and ICANN, well it comes back to that same thing with participation and earlier this morning with the global partnerships. You know ICANN typically participates in a lot of ICT and IG events in all the regions, but there's really no coordination with the At-Large structures. And sometimes At-Large structures literally find out after they've, left if ever at all, that ICANN reps were present at an IG event or in their country. So I think RALOs and ICANN should better coordinate these activities to say that an ALS can even attempt to meet informally with ICANN representative when present in their country. And therefore I think that ALS, once the ALS is aware of this, they'll feel less isolated. Next question.

Important limitations to ALS participation. Well I think only a very small number of ALSs feel that there is no important limitations to participation. The key limitations, time commitments by the At-Large structure, policy documents are too technical and require too much time to read, and there's not enough knowledgeable members in the At-Large structure. Again, the ALSs and At-Large and ICANN has to coordinate efforts to better make available more accessible material explaining all the backgrounds behind all of the At-Large policy issues and ICANN policy issues so that ALSs can better educate themselves at their own pace.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Wolf, I'm really sorry. I'm going to have to cut you off we are way over time and this is cutting into our coffee time and I see

several people who are in requirement of coffee. We still have another subject before that. So Wolf, can you just quickly?

Wolf Ludwig:

Yeah, as we are already over time let me suggest that we open up the discussion not now; there will be another opportunity at the secretariats meeting on Thursday. So everybody who is interested in asking more questions on the outcome of this analysis and recommendation is welcome to join us in the secretariats meeting on Thursday. What exactly time is it? I remember something, I've seen something. 12:30? Okay, 12:30 on Thursday.

Everybody who's interested to continue this discussion from now is welcome to join us and I think there are some important aspects in it and it needs to be further discussed like inreach, outreach, etc. But as Olivier said we don't have the time right now otherwise you would have to forget about your coffee break and this will not be in the interest of others again. Therefore we close down. I thank you a lot for your presentation and please to see you on Thursday in the secretariats meeting. Thanks a lot.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Wolf. Just one more thing; the presentation is available in the USB sticks which has been given to you. I'm also told by Matthias that it has been just uploaded just now on the corresponding final survey report page. So you can click away and get it from there. We're going to move quickly. First, thank very much Dev for this presentation. Really, really exciting stuff, thank you. And we'll move quickly onto the next part or the last hurdle before we all get some fine Colombian coffee and beautiful cakes

and cookies which is to actually get the volunteers to volunteer further and go out there and act as spies for At-Large. And to basically report on all of what's happening in ICANN. So we have a schedule which is currently on the screen and what I would suggest is we spend a few minutes to actually start through it and get some volunteers for each one of those sessions.

Now let's start, I don't actually have the session in front of me, I have to read it from the screen, it hasn't uploaded to my machine yet. The first one is starting, well Saturday I think is already passed so it's going to be difficult to send someone there. If we can move onto perhaps Monday might be a good idea. Oh yes, but we started with, if I recall last year we did start with a few people volunteering to lead the thing, but yes it will be on the wall afterwards.

Or maybe before leaving perhaps we could all actually pass by that sheet and if you show your thumb as having been going through that sheet and put your name on there, you're allowed out of the room. Perhaps that would be faster. Anyone happy with that? I see nods around the room. Ok. Well that makes it certainly very short, but beware we're watching you. Thank you very much and have a good coffee break.

Male:

And please those who volunteer to police the ATRT comment, comment to the ATRT, please after you take your cup of coffee come here and we finish the job. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And just one more thing also to add. Of course once you've been to that meeting, you have to report on it. And there is a webpage for that in the confluence Wiki. I think Matthias has the actual location of the page, or is it on there. Okay, perfect - At-Large Cartagena meeting reports, strangely enough it's actually named with the actual purpose of what it's there for. So you can find it and you can type in your reports on there. And Heidi, you want to add something?

Heidi Ullrich: Yes, just if I could quickly add to please do add your report prior to Friday's session where Cheryl give her Chair's report. This information, that link will be given to the Board and the world. So if there are no reports on that it shows negatively on the At-Large community. So please just if it's just a brief report, it would be greatly appreciated.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You think when you're here you're working hard; well this is your opportunity to show others that you are working hard. Thank you.

[break]

Alan Greenberg: Okay, if we can call the meeting to order. We have Kurt Pritz here and Carole Cornell to talk about the ICANN Strategic Plan. This is a session that builds upon a number of community calls that have already been made. Kurt says he has some slides that he would like to present quickly and then open the floor to feedback and just discussion. And Heidi said that you have received a copy of a document on the Plan and it looks like that. It's in your book

with nice colored charts to make it easy for all of us to read. And I turn the floor over to Kurt. Carole? Kurt.

Kurt Pritz:

Hello everyone. Thank you for having me talk about ICANN Strategic Plan. I was lucky enough to have a teleconference with many of you on previous occasions, one with the Council, the At-Large Council, and second with LACRALO and EURALO. So we hope what we're presenting here reflects that we took into account your comments during the previous meeting. To the extent they haven't, please flag them again, and we'd like you to review the materials presented and I'll present some of the changes that have been made and you can review them and then we can have questions and answers, so pretty straightforward.

For those of you on the phone, what we've handed out here is a hard copy of ICANN Strategic Plan and, of course, that plan is posted. And, Heidi, is there a way to get... Does everybody have the link to where the Strategic Plan is posted that... Yes, so we'll put up the link if you don't have ICANN Strategic Plan at the ready, but there was an announcement for it sometime during the past month, so, you can always go to the ICANN webpage and look for the announcements on the right-hand side of the webpage and find it there.

Alan Greenberg:

Sorry, Kurt, I'm sorry to interrupt. Can you speak clearly in the microphone cause apparently they do have problems with the sound, especially for remote users. Thank you. Sorry.

Kurt Pritz:

Oh, no, thanks for the advice. There. So, we're going to go through the slides so who's the driver here? Heidi, are you driving or Matthias? So the first slide is really our agenda and, boy, I should get on the... What? Yeah, I know I was going to get on the Wiki too so I can read the comments cause I can't really see them, but...

So I'm briefly going to describe ICANN's planning cycle as I did last time, but it's refined a little bit based on comment from our Board. We've also, in meeting with the community members, including yourselves, we've not only changed the substance of the plan, but we're also changing some of the goals for the plan - that is, what the plan should include. And so this will require some additional amendment to the plan. So I wanted to show you what the new plan goals were to test your agreement and to see if you had any ideas for how the plan could be improved in a general way.

\

Then the next topic of discussion will be where the plan has changed from last year in summary form, and then there's also been many changes to the plan already based on community input, so I wanted to highlight those. And then, you know, the steps we're going to go through to get Board approval, so that's the agenda.

The next slide shows the ICANN planning cycle which has recently been revamped to a certain extent. Our formal planning cycle had two semi-circles – six months of strategic planning and

six months of operating planning and budgeting. And what we've learned is – not so much with strategic planning, but with operating planning – there really needs to be more time for discussion with the community that specific budget requests – and let's not call them budget requests, let's call them outcome requests or requests for help to accomplish something. Those sorts of requests, for ICANN to process them and plan for them, really takes longer than a six-month budgeting planning cycle, so you have probably had telephone calls and meetings here about the operating and budgeting plan which is earlier in our fiscal year than is usual.

And the purpose for that is to get that whole process started sooner. So this is meant, then, to demonstrate that the planning cycle is really built into three – a strategic plan and then planning to develop an operating budget framework, and then a final budgeting plan so it's meant to provide the community with more input into the budget, which is really where you get your resources, not in the strategic plan. But the strategic plan is very interesting for other aspects, you know – what is the direction of ICANN, and that's why we're seeking your input.

If you can, take a look at the strategic plan. I really want to point out a couple things. So the strategic plan's not up, so you've got to look at your handout or on your computer. And the third page of the plan is what I would call the one-page version of the plan – lists in very short form ICANN strategic objectives across its four main mission statement pillars. And I think we're pretty much familiar with them – insuring DNS stability; promoting

competition and choice; excellence in ICANN operations, including the IANA function and a healthy internet ecosystem. That last one really goes to an effective policy-making process through a multi-stakeholder internationally based model.

So those are the strategic objectives and we really – that’s not the right slide. Just go back to wherever we were. There you go. That was a mystery slide.

So then if you are to turn the page on the strategic plan, we get to where the prose is and the first heading is DNS Stability and Security. And all I want to point out here is that the underlined sections, the strategic objectives really are in the third sets of paragraphs where it says Strategic Objectives. And all the underlined prose that you see in the plan are changes based on community comment to date. So we had... ICANN staff had written a proposed version of a Plan and that language has been amended or sharpened or added, and so the underlined sections of each section of the plan that follow are really the additions due to community-based input. So I just want to show you that just from a form standpoint in order to demonstrate that already there have been substantial changes to the plan.

So, what are those? Let’s go to the next slide. So, how do we want to take this plan and even make it better? So, how do we want to make it better? So, we’re seeking to reorganize the objectives. If you look at the strategic plan, some aspects of it are really broad to improve or insure DNS uptime and ICANN doesn’t

control the DNS; we have our own limited areas of control. But we've got some more specific objectives. So we have some more specific objectives where we do have very specific control like increased contractual compliance.

So the strategic plan is a mixture of those lofty goals where ICANN has some influence, but not control in other areas where we have control. So we're going to seek to reorganize all the bullets in the plan to distinguish areas where ICANN has control versus influence - the current version of the plan kind of comingles them - and then be very clear about our levels of engagement.

So sometimes we have a contract with an entity actually effect a change and sometimes we just have what I would call the bully pulpit or a platform from which to speak and encourage change. So we're going to reorganize the plan in those regards and then we're going to include some more measurable objectives, some more clear definition of desired outcomes.

One example might be DNSsec where we do have a stated goal of the number of TLDs that will sign their zone by the end of some time period, so we're going to aspire to be more clear about the desired outcomes and establish a method for evaluating those outcomes. So when you're thinking about your comments to the plan, either now or in written form later, please think about these objectives cause we're looking to change the plan in these ways.

So how has the plan changed in recent history? Well, since last fiscal year ICANN and its community actually got some things done, and so there's changes to the plan in that regard. So, for example - and we've talked about these things on our last call - but our last plan focused on signing the roots on, well it's signed so now we're going to focus on DNSsec adoption by TLDs as I said. And the last plan we proposed that a DNScert, which is an emergency response team that ICANN might coordinate, was proposed as one of the solutions to enhance DNS security. Clearly the community has said we don't know if that's one of the solutions or not, you just need to support a broad community discussion on DNS stability, DNScert might be one of those solutions. So you see a change in the plan that way.

And with regard to consumer choice and enhanced competition, last year's plan focused on the delegation of IDNs; this year's plan, now that IDNs are being delegated focuses on making IDNs work better in all situations. So implementation of the protocol down through the application layer and the like. There's more discussion this year about protection of registrants through RAA amendments, GTLD registrar accreditation amendments and registrants write charter, and also focuses on communication of all these things to users so that, you know, the global community is aware of them. For example, the new GTLD Program has attached to it a global communications plan.

Other updates to the plan under the pillar of core operations and making ICANN internal operations excellent. You know, the

updates to the plan this year is ICANN has instituted a number of, I'll just call them self-help mechanisms, you know, internal operational excellence initiatives – (1) targeted specifically at IANA and then an organizational effectiveness initiative to provide for continual improvement across the company. And then there's a new focus on finally implementing and launching IANA automation.

And then with regard to the healthy internet ecosystem, including our policy development support, there's an initiative for the GNSO to improve its policy development process. ICANN seeks to increase participation and engagement with especially the technical community. So the ITF - the root servers – practically engage with them and start a better collaboration. And also with forums where internet discussions take place, such as the IGF and the OECD.

And then, again, to improve communications and accessibility, one of those will be through reorganization of the ICANN website. So, you'll see that effort is ongoing and any input you have into how to improve the website – cause everybody has an idea, right? We all do although we all agree it's hard to get around - ICANN will be looking for suggestions there.

So what's changed in response to the community input on the plan? Well, regarding stability and security, there were very many specific suggestions and really using - and I just described some – but really using our stakeholder relationships. Particularly with the technical community where we don't really do a good job of

liaising with, again, the ITF and the root server operators to accomplish these things here. So, remember, we're trying to make the plan more specific and more objective and therefore, deliver plans for stable L-root operations – you know, ICANN operates the L-root – the publish business continuity planning, so you might have seen some of that in line with the new GTLD process and transition of registrars to facilitate the adoption of IPV6 and DNSsec. We talked about that and work with the community and internet security. So these were all pretty much word changes to the prose of the plan and insure that those specific objectives were put in there.

And then with regard to consumer choice and enhancing competition, you know, a key change was increasing registry registrar regional diversity so, especially with the IDN program being implemented and the potential implementation of new GTLDs that the goals of those programs are to increase regional participation in becoming a registree, becoming a registrar, or being able to take advantage of the new services and opportunities offered by new GTLDs and registrars in people's own area.

And then something we used to do that we're putting back is partnering with ISOC and others to provide training for those who want it – new CCTLD operators or new GTLD operators.

And then finally, the last set of changes we have to the plan to do with core operations. So focus on the IANA contract renewal – I think everyone knows that ICANN performs the IANA contract

through a contract with the U.S. Government. And that that contract is up for renewal next year, and we plan to get a contract renewal next year and we plan to get a contract renewal and continue performing those operations in an excellent manner.

There's a specific request to model our operational excellence operations after EFQM which – is that European? I think so, right? – which is – you know, there's an American version of it that I'm familiar with, a continuous improvement – but model our efforts after that. If you know Deming – is it Edward Deming?

What's Deming's... What? No, no. That's okay. We want to enhance measurements so make things more objective; we want to improve the PDP process from a staff support point and then – boy, this is a recurring theme, but – strengthen our strategic relationships with the technical community.

And then with regard to policy development support in the multi-stakeholder model, also known as the internet ecosystem, we want to maintain DNS uptime and maintain the existence of a single operable internet, one of those things where we don't have control, but we might have influence.

But we do have control over enhancing the multi-stakeholder bottom-up model and working towards increasing participation through groups such as this one.

Improving the website – but you don’t just improve the website as the end, right? It’s a means to an end and so we want to enhance informational tools and content.

And then, finally, increase our participation and collaboration in all these forms that discuss internet governance, and to a certain extent, ICANN’s existence as a model is tied to those discussions.

So we’re going to come back to these slides in a minute. I just want to take one minute and say, “So what’s the path home from here?”

We’re going to continue having these consultations. I’ll tell you, they’ve been really good and you know, you sit in a room with a bunch of people and write the plan and stare at it for days and then you take it out and get a fresh set of eyes on it and it’s really helpful. Finish these consultations, we’ll repost the plan for public comment and submit it to the Board for approval in the next Board Meeting or the meeting thereafter that. While we’re not looking to markedly change the plan; we do not want to short cut the community consultation process.

So that’s kind of the end of my presentation and I guess I went on too long, but what we could do is go back to a couple slides ago and talk about update – yeah, keep going, go forward; no, you’re going the wrong way now. Yeah, one more. There you go. It’s over on the left. Yeah. Thank you.

So I'll take comments. I would take comments first on either the gestalt of the whole plan or, specifically on items concerning DNS stability and security or competition and choice.

Male: A quick question. Kurt,, you had a reference to a PDP improvement. Is that the ongoing GNSO team or something else?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, that's it. Paul?

Paul Twomey: I think it may have been on a previous slide, but there was a mention in this presentation about – I forget the exact terms, but responsibility versus influence, in other words, what I can actually do versus what it can use its bully pulpit to do or whatever. Can you give us a stronger... Can you give us a clearer interpretation for the user community as to what ICANN is actually able to do in light of some questions that the At-Large has been getting from the user community that they don't believe ICANN believes that it has authority to enforce contracts.

Kurt Pritz: Hi, Paul. How are you doing?

Paul Twomey: Hi, Kurt. I didn't mean to be... I was having a thought there. I forgot to be nice. Sorry.

Kurt Pritz: I'm good at that. So I think there's three ways ICANN works. In some instances it has control – and I think it does have control where it has agreements, or where it does have authority to perform the IANA function, or where it does work with the

community to develop policy and then implement that policy. So, ICANN, either the Board or an advisory committee or a supporting organization, can initiate a PDP and affect change that way. So in those areas, I think ICANN has a significant amount of control.

There are other areas where ICANN does not have control, but has significant influence, so I think that CCTLDs and GTLDs that adopt or assign their zone, I think ICANN has a lot of influential power there. They can... if a CCTLD needs help to, you know, technical help or something like that, to get the zone signed we can provide that. We can bring influence to bear to help convince TLDs to sign their zone; we could amend the registry agreement in the case of a GTLD, so those are instances where we have sort of a medium amount, you know, we can really affect change even though we don't have authority; we can take responsibility.

And then there's areas where we have less... no control and less influence. So, for example, a goal in Lester's plan is 100 DNS uptime. While the DNS can be broadly interpreted, ICANN has little control over that. But we can promote security and stability; we can do training, we can do some other things. So I would grade those as the three types of control and influence that ICANN has and the plan – what that bullet says – the plan should make that clear. So that's kind of the answer to the first part of your question.

The answer to the second part – I want to understand more about ICANN. ICANN clearly thinks it can enforce its agreements, so

I'd want to have a continued discussion or get a response question from you if you want to do that, if you have a specific instance in mind.

Paul Twomey:

Yeah, maybe I can send you an email or something with specific names, but there have been repeated examples. And this may have something to do with the fact that there's apparently three job vacancies in the Compliance Department at the moment. There seem to be numerous examples of registrars behaving and acting in what appears to be non-compliance with the RAA and ICANN not doing anything about it. I can give you some actual names, but I'll just email them or something.

Kurt Pritz:

Yeah, and I think the really interesting discussion is about why the authority is in the contract and what ICANN can do. And so I understand that there's three positions open and ICANN is not only planning to fill those positions, it's planning to implement new GTLDs and staff a Compliance Department that's adequate for that and there's a plan for that. But if you look at statistics, you know the number of registrar de-accreditations are non-renewals, the amount of enforcement notices sent out or the amount of breach notices sent out, it's always on the increase. Anybody else? I can't believe there aren't any. Erick?

Erick Iriarte:

Hi, Kurt. This is my first time on this side of the pond. I'm pleased to see the DNScert taken off the list and want to commend the effort of funding work with network resource start up center in ISOC in the basic registry operations class and the advanced

registry operations classes that have been held in Guatemala recently and Mali recently, and I assume will continue for the foreseeable future, as competency is developed in operators regionally which are outside of North American and Europe.

So I really commend that as a good choice of resource allocation that moves skills to the periphery rather than the DNScert proposal which moves skills to the center, possibly without any real use.

I'm puzzled by the references made to increase the involvement of the technical community because in 2002 we had a functioning protocol supporting organization that was in November or December of that year ceased to exist. And we have a current review of the tech liaison function which the initial report was fairly critical of its continued existence and proposed, among several proposals, ending the TLD as an entity which provides non-voting seats from the technical community on the Board and, of course, the previous PSO put voting seats on the Board and there is a significant difference institutionally between voting seats and non-voting seats, between veto power and persuasive power.

So I'm curious how this is going to work out that we will have increased relations with the – you mentioned the IETF – but presumably with the broad envelopes that we used to call the PSO of technical organizations, including the IETF and possibly the W3C and possibly others. That's really all the comments I had. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

So I think... So the objective to increase our effective interaction with a technical community, and specifically the IETF and root server operators, came out of, actually, two events, two or three. One is having to do with IDNs, the IDNA protocol and how staff worked with the IETF on that and then with the variant IDN discussion, IDN variant management discussion, where the IETF has said, "We're not really considering any issues with variance cause you haven't given us a problem." And so our Board has recognized that as really staff not effectively participating in the IETF and raising issues there in the form of solvable problems.

And so I think ICANN is getting better; we have Joe Adley now, who works in that realm. But there's a couple instances where solutions could be developed faster if staff reached out and did a better job.

The other instance had to do with the root server operations and root scaling where ICANN is churning away making new GTLD plans and, while that information is available for the root server operators so they can anticipate it, there was no real interaction between the two groups so they could plan for the timing, the number of delegations, the delegation rate. So a briefing was given to our sec but really that's not complete and really there needs to be more of a cooperative relationship.

So the goals there... half of your comment, I think, the goals and the plan sprung from those two events where Board members and other say, "Get off your butt and go interact." And what you're

describing – the report that recommends that that Board liaison role be abolished, I think that came from something else and I'm not up on that so I don't really know all the reasoning, but there had to be some recognition that what we're trying to achieve with the TLD role wasn't really working bearing fruit, so go find something else to do; just don't eliminate something and say, "Well, we give up."

So I don't know what the future of that recommendation is, but I think it too comes from the report anyway saying it wasn't an effective tool for accomplishing the sorts of things that you're talking about accomplish, so go find another way.

Alan Greenberg:

Dev, go ahead.

Dev Teelucksingh:

Thank you, Chair. I noticed in the presentation, I see that the word translations was included in the revised draft strategic plan after the consultations. Care to expand on what that is regarding translations?

Kurt Pritz:

So, no. We wanted to flag that and the way it's put in the plan now is make translations more effective. Theoretically that could be more or less, right? So I think what we're talking about is making that the input we're looking for and how we want to modify the plan from here is making that more of a measurable objective. So what could be some goals? And I'd really like to tie it to something other than a number or frequency, but what's our goal? Because, you know, there's translations and they cost money so we

want to really do them in a way that gives us the most good. So is there a way to formulate an objective that really could be increasing the investment on translation, but also making that investment as effective as it can be?

It's not easy or else we would have wrote it more better. But if you can give some thought to how that objective could be rewritten so it's measurable and comes to improvement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Hong?

Xue Hong: Thank you, El. I hope you don't mind if I ask a very specific question. We all agree these ICANN public meetings are very important for the community building, for the healthy ecosystem and for policy making and discussions. Otherwise, ICANN won't have these meetings in different regions. I'm not sure whether you talked about this issue with my colleague in European-RALO, but as you may have (inaudible 0:43:19) that there will be an ICANN meeting in June 2011 in Asia Pacific region. So my question is that, when you make strategic plans for an ICANN meeting in certain region whether you think about to facilitate the regional need such as regional and large organizations need to have the (inaudible 0:43:42) events by using the (inaudible 0:43:47) of ICANN (inaudible 0:43:49). The same since we only have six months to go for this one in Asia, I'm quite keen to hear from you about any planning or strategic thinking about this because the European colleague has raised the issue that's 18 months out of the time because there would be a European ICANN meeting in 2012

and they raised this issue already. I guess we are running out of time.

Kurt Pritz:

So there's two aspects to that. One is the strategic aspect – what are we trying to accomplish with that meeting. And I think that's pretty easy to write down. There are a lot of benefits that would accrue from having such a meeting. So in the plan, if we want to regularly build on existing ICANN meetings in order to have other At-Large meetings, we want to build that into our strategy so it regularly and normally becomes part of the operating plan so it's sort of not a last minute thing cause it's a strategic objective.

So I can say, you know, now we're starting – I don't know if you met with Kevin and Carmen Juan yet – Wednesday you're going to talk about budgeting, so you're going to talk about with them – what's the next fiscal year? 2011? 12, holy smokes! So the 2011-2012 operating plan, you know, you're going to want to discuss making sure that you've got your input. You're going to have specific opportunity to input into that plan for 2011-2012 which leaves us with – what are we going to do in six months, right? What? You're shaking your head. So I can't speak to what's in the ICANN budget or what's planned for that meeting in Asia. Does ALAC have a specific or the At-Large have a specific plan for that?

Xue Hong:

At-Large has a strategic plan. But issue is that issue be planned into ICANN's overall picture. And now is very much ad hoc so what I'm thinking is that it should be more strategically planned.

Kurt Pritz: I agree. That's right. So we want to build that into the strategic plan so normally it becomes part of the operating plan cycle. So we want to write an objective into the strategic plan for that.

Alan Greenberg: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. If I may add, Work Team C in the At-Large improvements is actually looking at this and looking at closer cooperation between ICANN strategic plan and also the ALAC strategic plan. That's one of the reasons actually why Kurt was very kind to actually give us a presentation as well.

I do have one question for Kurt. The presentation you have here is different from the one you did earlier and I wondered whether we would be able to have a copy of that as well please. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg:: Anything else? Nine more minutes. We could finish early. Fern, I think you need to be complimented if no one is irate and wants to yell and scream at you.

Kurt Pritz: Well, let's see if we take the input from you and get it into the plan and then we'll test whether I get yelled at and screamed. I think the input is good and actually, you know, especially with regard to a translation objective and with regard to writing an objective for At-Large meeting planning as part of the annual planning cycle would be good if you could suggest how to write that.

Alan Greenberg:

Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Alan. Just one question and I might have missed this slide. With regards to Outreach, whether At-Large is part of the core strategy of ICANN for Outreach. Is that now linked into the plan?

Kurt Pritz:

So here's what it says now that was added. It says, "Starting with the new Board seat representing the At-Large community, we will also work to formalize input from the At-Large community into Board discussions." That was the comment about the GAC, the comparison with the GAC.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Is there a time scale for this? Have you put a road map on that or is this the next three years?

Kurt Pritz:

Well, Carole's going to write that down but that's exactly how we want to try to make these objectives more measurable – by putting some time scale on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay. Excellent. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg:

Thank you. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch :

Just one comment and it's a positive and it's a note of thanks for having put in the registrants' rights charter into the community work section. Does this mean that there will actually be some resources available to help make that happen?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, I think there are policy development support resources already helping on this. I think what the addition of this will accomplish at the end – what goes in here filters down and gets into everybody’s work goals so we can hold up a banner at the end of the year and say success. So by formally including it here, what that will mean is there will be certain staff members at ICANN and that will be their work goal to establish that.

Anyone else? Last call. So I just want to thank everybody. Thank you guys, Olivier and Alan and everybody who contributed, everybody who takes time to read the plan. Everybody in this community works very hard; staff people work really hard to write things. The community works hard to read things and provide input and provide their own writings and want to make sure the iteration continues so the documents continue to improve. So, anyway, thanks for your efforts in the past and in advance for the future.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you for joining us. Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you very much, Kurt. Just a comment. For those of you who would like to add your comments following today for the At-Large contribution to the strategic plan, there is a link to our workspace on that. It’s up in the connect chat, so please do take a look at that. There are two comments there already, but we definitely need to hear from you. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. While we're setting up and doing the dancing chairs routine, or is it, no, missing chairs, dancing chairs, whichever one, musical chairs routine without the music, our next two visitors are Carole Cornell, who's going to remain with us, but also Roman Pelikh, who is the Senior Director of IT Services, and they are both going to speak to us about the Confluence Wiki Review, that fantastic system which we seem to be the guinea pigs for, so let's find out some more about this.

Whilst we're setting up the technology, may I just remind everyone that on the list which is currently on the wall for us to be able to sign up to go and see and report on meetings taking place outside of At-Large, there are other days than Monday. I've seen a lot of people very eager to go places on Monday, but then from Tuesday onwards, it's a little bit empty. I'm sure it will fill itself up as time goes. But that will remain on the wall during the whole week, so we can fill it up as time goes on.

And Heidi has raised a threat which is otherwise. She will fill it up for everyone. We will be allocated. Think of the worst of those sessions and their being allocated to you. You might want to avoid that.

Right, okay, well, before we actually start in and give this over to Carole and Roman, how many people in the room have actually used the Confluence Wiki so far? If you can raise your hand, please. So, we've even got people using it right now, so we've got

about half of the room who has, a bit more than half. So, and all the staff has, so that's great. That's good news.

Heidi Ullrich: Could I ask those... I'm really interested in this. Those that are not using it on a regular basis, why is that? Just before we get started. Is it because you're just not familiar with it or just don't have the time yet? Andreas, I see you didn't raise your hand. Sylvia, go ahead.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: I tried to use it but I have a little problems to access. But I tried to do this, to use this, I think, twice or more than twice.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, so Sylvia has an access problem. Those that are not using it, is it also due to access? Okay, so Darlene, also access, you're not logging in.

Darlene Thompson: Access, yeah. It's not letting me in but also it's just, as you said, lack of being used to using it.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, it is really quite easy. I'm really surprised at how quickly we got it. If we can do it, you can do it, definitely. But we will sort this out. Roman, are you able to give log-in details; not now, but after this meeting?

Roman Pelikh: Yeah, correct. We'll address some of those issues. We will be able to address those issues definitely after the meeting we have a couple sessions. During this meeting open hours where we can definitely handle that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Andreas, do you have a question?

Andreas Schreiner: No, no, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond : Okay.

Andreas Schreiner: It was about the dot conic and other stuff, but not Wiki so I won't do it. I won't say it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If we have time, perhaps we'll sort of get to it afterwards, but we'll see. Whilst Annalisa goes to the mic, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch : I just wanted to make the point as somebody who uses it heavily now and absolutely hated it a couple of years ago, I will simply say that Wiki is a certain way of doing computing that certain people gravitate to, but not everybody is very comfortable with it. It requires a certain kind of mindset, you know, and shared editing that certain people are comfortable with it. Some people are much more comfortable with it, with the concept of, "Well, I'll edit this document and you edit it and then you send it back to me and then I'll edit it and then I'll send it back to you."

Although it sounds really cumbersome and for somebody who likes the Wiki, it sounds absolutely inefficient. But for some people it's simply a more comfortable way of working, and I don't think it's a matter of good or bad or otherwise. It's simply that I

think some people are far less comfortable with using a Wiki than with other ways of doing this kind of thing.

Roman Pelikh: Yes, so I'll address that in the (inaudible 0:58:16) as well. Part of it, we try to encourage that; it's not the only option. It's a option that we would like to make available and for the sake of the information being available centrally to everyone. Whatever the final documents are, we would like them to be on the Wiki for the broader community to consume. So that's the goal. So we're going to start – Carole is going to do some background...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sir, we had one more question from Annalisa.

Annalisa Roger: I remember getting a lit bit of training on the Wiki in Brussels and when somebody walked over and put me right in there, I thought it was super easy and intuitive and it kind of looked like a Word document and I thought it was great. I've never been able to find that place by myself. It's like a door that is – I don't know where it is, but if I could be in the room, I'm not scared of it; I think it's great. I just can't find that door. I don't know what the answer is. I bookmark things, I don't know.

And the other thing is I do notice that I'm trying hard to participate in the ALAC thing, but there's a lot of documents and cross-references and things and there's different programs being used – Google Docs or Wiki Pages or old Wiki things. And there's all these log-ins that stop you along the way, and for somebody like me who's not focusing on the technical – although I can handle that stuff – I'm actually focusing on the ideas and the content or

what I want to do or say. There's all these roadblocks and then I kind of run out of time so I sort of disappear a lot. And I don't know if other people have that, but I can't really follow through unless there's just a smooth, easy transition where it just works. So it'd be nice to have maybe a menu that just had all the stuff and there's one place I can go and I can find all the missing info.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, it's in the chat room right now. Again, we've set this up – the At-Large Wiki app – so you do not need a log-in to actually access it. Everyone should be able to access...

Annalisa Roger: There's just one link that's somewhere?

Heidi Ullrich: Click on the one that's in the At-Large chat room now. And again, you don't need to log-in to read them, but let's go ahead and begin.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And one more question – Andreas?

Andreas Schreiner: I was going to say the same because before Heidi pointed it was in the chat room, someone who is participating remotely sent me a Skype, "Do you have the address or the URL of the Wiki?" And I couldn't find it and I searched in Google and it's not even... I searched ICANN At-Large Wiki, and it's not even in the top 10 results; so it was like quite useful to get the others quickly from the chat room, but for someone who is not so involved or who doesn't have that in emails or whatever, could be like, a little hard to catch up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Is the social text Wiki on there? Because if it is, if it does come up, because if it is, then perhaps that would be a good idea to have on the first page of the Social Text Wiki where everything has moved to. Just say, “This has now moved to community.icann.org.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay. Very good idea, Olivier. We can do that...

Andreas Schreiner: No, it’s not even the... Sorry.

Heidi Ullrich: As well as we’ll make it prevalent on our At-Large website too. Perhaps that was a mistake.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, alright, one last one from Erick.

Erick Iriarte: Thank you, Olivier. Three years ago I joined the company as its CTO and encountered the mantra, “Put it on the Wiki.” That was a real shock for me and I’ve been working with texts and a variety of editors for a long time. So the comments that were made just recently by another speaker about some users have a preference for document exchange as opposed to a shared workspace, realistically we have to grasp that users have different modes of interactions, and some will adopt the Wiki model without much resistance.

Others will find that the creation of name spaces in Wiki is antithetical to their preference or their history of using time as an organizing principle, which is basically how blogging works. So anyone who blogs lives on time; anyone who does Wiki lives on key words, so I don’t think one size is going to fit all. And the

disparity of mechanisms that are used and the necessity of linking them together, which is the point which was just recently made, is one that we have to address.

Putting things on the Social Text on the outgoing – that’s an excellent idea. But I think it would also be useful to have Mail a Clue, so if you don’t know, send email to this address and you will get back a canned answer which contains the links to the clue that you actually do need. And so if you don’t have it on your device, if you don’t have it on your machine, if you don’t have it printed in front of you, you can at least mail to Send Me a Clue - and that’s at your end, of course - and you generate the automatic balance with a canned response. Thank you.

Roman Pelikh:

Sure, this is one of the things we can definitely take into consideration and working with Heidi essentially insure that the accessibility and easy access to the content is definitely available. So let me jump into the PowerPoint and we’ll go through it, it won’t take too much time because I like this discussion and I want to get that feedback because that’s what will help us to make the tool useable for different groups and different styles. And we understand that it’s not a silver bullet that will cover every single possible use and people will adopt the tool however they feel more comfortable.

The reason why we’re trying to set up some structure behind it is that there’s some organization that, if you come to look for information, you’re able to find it, you know where to look, you

have an idea where. It will take time but it will essentially give you an ability through the time to be able to navigate through the data and the content fairly easy. There is ability to search the data, there is ability to do key words, there's ability to structure the data in a folder format, as most of the people for the last 10 years are used to on their machine. So there's different ways of organizing the data and getting access to the data and through the training and the help, we'll try to insure that you guys have access that is needed for you to get to it.

Carole will start with the things we're going to cover today really quickly, and then we'll open the discussion back up. We'll go through some of the review. So we're going to start off with some of the background information, how this project started and where we are at right now and we'll go to discussion after that.

Carole Cornell:

Just a quick reminder kind of where are we today. We started this and announced that we were going to start moving from Social Text to Confluence back pretty much in Brussels is when we did that in terms of timing, and we also explained that we had hoped that we would do this implementation and that the At-Large group would be the first ones to take all of their content and move it from the Social Text Wiki to this new Wiki to help make it a better tool for everybody. So that tells you we've been at it now probably five months overall. And I want to say thank you for being so patient in letting us switch it over.

We've learned a lot of things in the process, but obviously there's been some learning curve on everybody's part and we just wanted to say thank you for doing that. One of the things that I would also say is we're not done yet and it's really important to know we will continue to work with everyone's request to try to make this a very good tool for everyone as a good resource for you, not just now, but as you go forward in the future. So it is a tool everyone will use.

One of the advantages was, as Roman and you guys have talked about, this whole ability to search for information; the fact that it has a few extra features from Social Text; it does have permissions, which is sometimes and a good and a bad, but it does allow you to have a private workspace if you need it, as well as distribute everything, depending on your needs, so you can customize to meet everyone's needs. It does from an operating perspective cost less to use this particular Wiki than what we had before, so we're spending less on the actual hardware, but there's still some enhancements we want too, so we hope that's a good cross-balance in terms of costs in operating.

And then the other is it does allow you to be able to put different documents, different types of material out there; whereas before you had limited capability on the other Wiki. So the reason I mention those is this is, I know, a little bit difficult, but I think the benefits, as we continue to progress, you'll find that it's a better tool for everyone going forward. So that is what I'll say.

The other part is you have, actually, and we'll talk about some of the progress made, which I'm going to pass over to Roman so we can hit some of the highlights of the progress we've actually done so far, but, as I said, and I'd like to reiterate – thank you for being patient while we switch it over, but there is still more work to be done. So we'd like to hear your input as we go. And I'll pass this now over back to Roman. Thank you.

Roman Pelikh:

So where do we stand today? We've done a lot of work of gathering the content that was essentially in the Social Text. It was somewhat disorganized in the flat system. We went through a number of workspaces; we did a lot of consolidation and cleanup; we migrated all the data and re-linked it to where possible, either back to Social Text – because some of the other work groups are still utilizing the Social Text. As you guys are aware, you are one of the first ones to be migrated and transitioned.

So what has been completed? All the data has been migrated; the workspaces for all the working groups as they've been identified have been created; there have been created the gateway pages which, once you're on the Wiki, enables you to get to things faster, especially to the things that you are working on now. And that area will be updated constantly so you don't have to search through the things to what are the current areas that you're working on.

We did some cleanup on the color designations where each of the RALO groups have their workspaces designated to them so you

can easily identify which workspace you're in. We moved our access feed from the At-Large website which essentially brings all the ICANN news directly on that Wiki as well, so you don't have to go to two different places to search for the data.

So in a couple minutes I'll kind of do a quick run-through of what the workspaces look like and I'll jump into that right now. So, hopefully, you guys can see.

The website is community@icann.org. It's open to everyone – let me see if I can zoom out a little bit. So At-Large community has a specific tab so the website is community@icann.org. There is a number of workspaces that are located; they're all listed here. The main workspace is ALAC and that's essentially what your gateway is going to be. Through this gateway you will be able to access – apologies. I'm running not on my machine so... So this is the gateway I was talking about. This is a quick link set to some of the At-Large, some of the things you guys are working on. For example, the first link is At-Large improvement workspace.

I know it's hard to read on the projector so I'll read it out loud: At-Large Accountability and Transparency Review Team. So those are the things that are the key areas that you can get access to. We'll insure that you guys get to this real quickly; we'll publish this on the existing At-Large workspace. Heidi will make sure we email that again over to the mailing list to insure that everybody has access and are able to bookmark this.

So on the bottom left you essentially have the structure of all of the content that has been migrated into the... from the Social Text it has been reorganized and restructured. All the links have been, as far as we can go through, fixed. If you find anything, please feel free to send an email to Heidi or reach out to us for us to correct it. It's fairly easy to do. Because of the amount of the content, we are not always able to find every single piece. So the news from the ICANN website are right here; this is access to the calendar which gives you an ability to look at the events coming up and that's essentially your main interface.

As you get a little bit more familiar, there's a toolbar at the top where you're able to navigate through different pages. You're able to browse through different pages; there's tools available to add attachments. As you get more familiar with it and have an ability to not only consume the content, but also be able to add and... So at the corner top there is a search tool if you're looking for something and can't find where it is, where it's located, use the search functionality. It will get you to the area where you need to go.

So I already mentioned some of the open issues that we have. We still have some broken links. We did due diligence with a limited number of staff that we have go through and fix all of them. As I said, if you find anything, please feel free to let us know and we'll help fix it or we'll teach you how to fix it. This is your workspace. You need to feel comfortable using it and we're here to help you doing that.

So there is over 1,500 documents on the entire workspace, across all the workspaces. Each document can maintain between five and 10 links so you can imagine the scale of the number of links that are available in there.

During the migration, we did the best effort we could with the resources we have to insure that all the links are fixed. We utilized the automated tools to find them and we fixed everything we found. Some of the issues in links could be caused because of the access control, because the new tool provides an ability to restrict certain areas and we are actually, in the last couple weeks, been in the process of assigning user name and permissions and the right access. The access to certain pages might have been restricted unintended, so we're happy to definitely fix that.

So moving on, a couple things that we've heard through Heidi of what you guys are looking for – one of the areas where you guys were looking to create spaces for the regional bases and essentially establishing the workspaces for the each individual regions. For each At-Large structure, I'm sorry.

I wanted to have a little bit more discussion on what the requirements what you guys want to accomplish with that. It will be extensive. From my understanding, it's over 120, 129 At-Large structures, and creating that many workspaces adds into the content and becomes less searchable and it doesn't address that issue of where do I go and find the content. So I wanted to kind of sense the idea of what you are trying to accomplish. Maybe we can

discuss how we can factor that into some of the existing workspaces we have or organize it in a little bit more consolidated way other than creating 129 workspaces and just let it be stand free in the community.

Also, is there anything else you guys are looking for that we haven't thought of or we haven't talked about? There is a number of capabilities available within the system. I understand it's a learning curve both for you and for us and you give us a challenge; we'll try to make sure we'll look into what a solution might be.

Darlene Thompson: I was just curious if this will be available in other languages at some point?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Darlene, you will be hit on the head in one moment. You may speak.

Darlene Thompson: Translation – other languages will there be?

Roman Pelikh: The Wiki does support other languages, and we probably would want to understand how would you want structure it, so the content is somewhat organized that you don't have Spanish in between English and the pages are somewhat in the same language. So the language segregation should be done. We are open to that because the Wiki does support it. There's some challenges on the right-to-left scripts, but there's ways around it.

Darlene Thompson: But it's not in the immediate future?

Heidi Ullrich: Darlene, just to follow up, are you referring to in the near term, basically French and Spanish editions or are you talking...

Darlene Thompson: Absolutely. We wouldn't need right-to-left. We just need right now French and Spanish.

Roman Pelikh: Yeah, so it's a Latin-based script that has no...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sorry, first question was for [Georgia] and then Erick afterwards. [Sedecka].

[Sedecka]: I wanted to make a comment. I'm going to speak in Spanish, I apologize. I would like to reflect on my experience with the Wiki. Particularly my work is I am a web developer and I find it very difficult to interact with this and what I wonder is, well, we have created a 2.0 webpage with a possibility to create internet communities and generate collaborative document development within the parties, and I was thinking that maybe it would be a little simpler for all of us, even for the end user, even though we are working on this and probably in a short time we will be able to use this and to take advantage of this, very probably the user who's not used to these, when we are not there to help the user, that user will be outside of it. That's why my question is what is the possibility to migrate in the future to extend the webpage so that we can have an interaction in between all of us? Thank you.

Roman Pelikh:

Let me address this. Part of the challenge is that this gives you a framework... the Wiki gives you a framework to do both. As a developer, you actually will be able to do a lot more than a typical user that is capable of doing more documents or what not. The beauty of this framework is it gives accessibility for people who don't have the technical background. It gives them ability to edit the documents in the rich text format and for the developer, it gives them the ability to do editing in the Wiki mark-up language, which also supports a number of macros, including the HTML macro that you'll be able to essentially embed other pages and use iFrames and embed other things.

One of the things we have, as a more technical person, I would encourage you – we're going to have two sessions for the remaining of the week. I believe I have the dates on a slide; we'll get back to it. It's actually on the next slide. It's on Tuesday and Thursday, and I encourage you to come over and I can share some of the things we've done with the Wiki where it requires a little bit more technical skills. But it also still gave an ability for some of the basic users to be able to contribute and interact with the content easier than as a developer using some of the developmentals. Hopefully that answers your question.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Erick, you have the floor.

Erick Iriarte:

Thank you, Olivier. I believe I heard a misunderstanding between two persons – one speaking possibly to the localization of the application, and the other one speaking to the character set in

which the content might be organized I don't think those are actually the same issue since I was hoping that you understood each other. It appears to me, looking at the application that there are localizations already into French, German and Spanish. I believe that takes care of the interest that was expressed.

I'm interested in the support for disconnected operations. I'll just give you a laundry list if I might. How to import from Media Wiki, would it be able to generate PDFs, docs, and HTML, which I believe it supports all three as generated output, but I wanted to stick that in. The Jira ticketing system is also from the same vendor, and I've used both its Wiki product and its tracking product and there might some use for using Jira as well for ticketing within the ALAC that is for task management. Although Track is another alternative and it's also free.

But I'm really curious about the scaling limitations that you hinted at; that is, creating 100 and some odd workspaces constituted some kind of a performance issue or caused you some concern as a system operator. So at your leisure, any of those things. Thank you.

Roman Pelikh:

Sure. So to address the basic things – yeah, you can create a content in the HTML; you can export the content in both XML, HTML and PDF. Import is available; there is a universal import functionality. It's not going to be available to the end users, but if there is a content, the universal import is what we use to migrate all the Social Text content.

The use of Jira is definitely something that we use internally for a number of other things within the organization, including the bot tracking for some of our internal development. It's a new requirement and we'll be glad to look into it. It does have a fairly good integration with the Wiki and ability to present some of the tasks and assignments and everything else.

To address the scalability of the workspaces, the challenge we've seen with the Social Text is a notion of a space bot. A lot of content, a lot of workspaces that nobody owns, nobody knows where the content is and that's the concern. It's not the underlying system capability or the scalability issue, per se, which is we can scale the application putting on the number of multiple servers. I don't see that as an issue. There's ways to deal with that. Currently just for some of the technical folks, it's actually running in the virtual machine. We can add more resources; we can scale that from the physical hardware, if required. So it's not a scalability of application; it becomes a usability problem where you have an unorganized closet without knowing where things are.

Erick Iriarte:

If I may, I think that phenomenon is actually quite common to all the Wiki models is that there's abandoned pages, forgotten information and orphan pages. But I'm still asking about the disconnected operation, because without the ability to do disconnected operation, we're telling the users who are in low-band width locations, which is how I spent most of the last five years, that they are SOL and that email really is the best way that they have of communicating meaningfully with other persons. So,

if we can do stand-alone operations, and I'm downloading it to this machine right now, then if editing can be done on a disconnected platform and then imported through the universal import, then we have a mechanism for users to create content without actually being simultaneously connected to the servers down in Marina del Rey, which I think is not the general case for, I think, oh, I don't know, nine-tenths of the world's population.

Roman Pelikh:

Sure, let me address that then in two ways. So I'll address the disconnected operation. One of the features that consulates provide is ability to import more documents and create the pages right directly out of them. So that means that the pages can be essentially created out of the war documents that provides an ability for people to download this war document, do the editing and email it back and to have either support staff or somebody to essentially attach it back to the page, which will replace the war document and therefore, also create diversioning behind that. So that's one of the aspects.

The access to the pages that are not in the war document and actually created as a Wiki mark-up language or content, unfortunately, that content will have to be created online first in the way of exporting as a PDF, for example, which you can do, creating essentially a local copy of the entire content, whether it's a space, or a page or whatever the content might be. Based on that, you are able to access the information. You would still have to create the content in a war document or Open Office or one of the formats that Wiki can import.

Now on the low bandwidth connection, one of the features we actually installed on the Wiki is the mobile [FIMI], which allows you to access the Wiki on the mobile phones, PDAs, local devices. It still requires the data connection, it could be good reference, but it's not good for content editing; it's more for consuming the data rather than creating the data. Does that answer your question?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Roman, and thank you, Erick. I think Erick's questions and comments are another living example of the amount of knowledge there is in-house and At-Large. And I must say that although I'm a technologist, I was a little bit lost some of the way in there that definitely it's good to have local experts on this. Any other questions? Dev?

Dev Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair. Two questions, actually and probably a clarification. Regarding the ELS pages, I wasn't very concerned about from LACRALO's perspective, I wasn't very concerned to be afforded separate workspaces for the ELS to create like, entire content, it was more considered like a sort of like a directory of the ALSs, so have like a page for each one. So I was thinking it would be more of a, not workspaces, sub-pages, child pages, underneath ELSs and LACRALO, and then you have a page for every single ELS. So that everybody could see, it's like a territory.

Roman Pelikh: So the way we structure the main ALAC workspace, it essentially has all the structure and the directory where all the ALCs RALOs can be accessed. The reason why we created a separate workspace for the RALOs is because some of the editing rights can be easier

configured on the workspace basis rather than page restriction basis. So that was part of the reason. From the navigation perspective, it's not any different; you don't get the different user experience, you still are able to navigate as a link from one place to another.

It's a natural linking from one place to another so you don't have to go to the base works page. The benefit it provides you is one of them I mentioned – it gives you the ability to define a little better access controls; it gives you the ability to do favorite pages where if you're working 99% of the time with LACRALO, for example, you're able to access that space directly without having to go through the main ALAC workspace.

So those are some benefits and they could be viewed either way as a benefit or a downside. But those are the things we considered when we reorganized and restructured some of the content.

Dev Teelucksingh:

Second question and I guess perhaps I missed it when I was looking at something here. One of the peeves with the Confluence Wiki is the, well, what happens is that when you open links, it opens it in the same window and not in a new tab or separate window. And, you know, it gets tedious because, especially if you're following an agenda, you click forward and then you realize you've lost the agenda, you've got to click back. Is there a way to make it a default to have links open up a new tab or windows?

Roman Pelikh:

So the new tabs are not supported yet by the browser; it's actually browser-specific. The new windows we could go and re-write and add some Java script to force it into the new windows. I think it's more of a user preference of how they would like to work, yet I see where you're coming from. It might not be native, but 99% of the websites – that's how they work. You don't force the... it's not up to the developer, usually, to force somebody into a new window or a new tab; it's actually user controlled. If I want to open the content in a new tab, I can do that either through control button or through the Win Apple button on the Mac just to force whatever the link is, and to the new tab or window, however it wants.

So although the challenge we have is if we do all the links to open in new windows, somebody is not going to like that. On the other hand, somebody else likes that it opens in the same window. So we're kind of somewhat in the middle of it, so by default we would open up in the same window unless you guys have specific items that you would like us to make sure that specific items like agendas or external links, for example, back to some of the Social Text links, that they open externally. And we can undertake the effort to go through those and make sure that those open up in the new window. But any navigation within the Wiki, it makes sense, like any other website, to have internal navigation within the same window.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I'll just recognize myself.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, Cheryl, you cannot – oh, I could hit you now. You're close enough. Alright, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Roman, couple of points there. I missed the very beginning but you do remember meeting me in a bus one day? Okay, great. Just as long as we remember we know each other, that's fine. Were you saying there need to be global replacements and that can't just be done within our space on the Confluence Wiki, just so I understand what you're saying?

Roman Pelikh: So what I was saying is that the opening in the new tab is not supported by technology; the opening in a new window is. Because we have thousands and thousands of links, it's a lot of effort to go through and replace every single one. And a lot of that has to do with user preference. Not every user likes to open them...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I can speak on behalf of our community. User preference be bugged. Give me their names and I'll deal with them because we will be opening in new windows. Now if it can be a global replacement, that's obviously easier. If there's a huge technical impediment, then obviously we need to talk and we need to cherry pick what we want and we can give you those lists. But user preference, they don't have any; we do. And we're saying new window.

Roman Pelikh: Okay. So to address that, the challenge is there are thousands of links. It's a big effort to undertake to go in and replace every link.

Going forward, we can make a decision that going forward we'll start doing that to make sure your new agendas and whatever that is opens in a new window. There is a little bit of scripting required so it's not necessarily complicated; once you do it once or twice, you get the hang of it. There's going to be its own downsides to that, meaning that you'll have a window open on top of the window. It's not going to be a new tab of the same browser, so it will actually overlay. So you will have to switch between the windows.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

To shortcut on this because certainly the usability issues we have discussed at some length. One of the things that we can do to make the roll-out task easier is give you click odd logs on what bits we need to have in that capacity first. And it usually is agendas and things that link off agendas, and you actually find – particularly for those of us who are managing the meetings – but also for those of us who are trying to manage the chat spaces, the Adobe connect room and have up to seven or eight things open, and we're cross-referencing and referring, you see where we're coming from on this. There are some people who literally have two and three screens lined up to manage this.

Roman Pelikh:

I actually encourage you to look at our master control of what we do for the ICANN meetings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

So we can make it easier to make it happen and if we can then get it planned that in future these things go out. We don't want to

make your life misery, but at the moment, this is making ours one, so it's only fair.

Roman Pelikh: As I said, we're reasonable people and we want to make sure...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We don't have to be reasonable people. That's okay. We can work with unreasonable people; I it's not a problem.

Roman Pelikh: So we want to make sure we accommodate and you guys are doing volunteer work that we appreciate and the community At-Large appreciates. And I think to make your life easier, we'll definitely undertake that effort, but we want to make sure that it's reasonable within our resources that we have that we do that. So going forward, we can make sure that the specific items that we go through that will open in the same window.

What I was trying to refer, some of the internal links, like links from within the workspaces to each other or within the pages, it just doesn't make sense for some of those things to, every time you click, it opens in a new window.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll have to have a look onto the... I mean "we," the royal we, will have to have a look here at how we are setting up our agendas because we actually have a lot of things that click out of a page. It may be a matter of the way we work – which we're not going to change. So it might be that there's a normal expectation of how someone using a page in a Wiki world would like to run, and it

might be our idiosyncrasies and you might never see it in another part of ICANN, and that'll just be easy for you.

You did mention scripting, and I was desperately looking around for Fouad who obviously... Who I will deal with later. And if Fouad is here, and he will regret deeply that he is not because it's something I believe he has the skill set to be discussing, when you mentioned scripts, I was wondering, is it something that we can empower at least high-end users in our regions to be able to operate? For example, I know that Fouad is a fairly high power user – thank you for joining us, Fouad. We will still talk later. We will still have a little chat. But with the scripting – if it's something that if you have someone in a trusted level they can help people do, we can also work together on this.

Roman Pelikh:

It's your workspaces and you guys are welcome to do – we'll want to make sure that we have the right level of access to make sure that people have...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

You've got a project. You leave the room; you get a project. Now because you left the room, you've got three. Okay? I'll let you know later.

Male 3:

There's an important thing I was thinking, actually. There's a certain amount of information that still has to go in or has been imported, from one perspective you have all the information in the system, then it's much more easy to customize it to the user needs, right? So that's one area I'm waiting for, to get to that stage where

we can start that customization process. And I think what we did in the BCAC was a good example. Once the information was there, we could structure it into how we needed it. Okay, Roman had to be there to go to the extra mile to get that done, but still. I see that as a really high impact thing happening.

Roman Pelikh:

It's much easier once you have the content and you truly look at the content, organizing it in a meaningful way is much easier than doing that in the abstract. And I can tell you that from the experience that we went through is, although we did it on paper, from the paper to the end product, it doesn't look anything like it was originally on paper. We did changes and shuffles and restructuring, including a lot of re-work of some of the things that we made initial decisions on that we end up changing later on. And that's that nature of this process and it's a living and breathing thing.

Today's requirements might be the same as tomorrow's requirements and might not be the requirements that you need the day after tomorrow. And these are the things that will happen and from the technology perspective, we're there to support you guys, to help you guys achieve what you're looking for.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

That's greatly appreciated and I think one of the other things we're very pleased about is your choices in giving us this particular tool where we know there's plenty of those things we can develop. Quite literally, amongst the skill set out there we have people who

can develop this stuff. I'm not chairing, so you'd have to ask the Chair to recognize this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:: First we have Erick who's been patiently waiting. He does have a comment on the technology side.

Erick Iriarte: Thank you, Chair. Earlier I mentioned that I spent five years living disconnected behind a trailer of cranking around a Visa and keeping my technical operation in main running from wherever I was filed. What I didn't admit was a very high latency low bandwidth link which resembles a lot of the world. So, my comment is as follows. The restricted MS Word import/export with ICANN staff manual assistance to import, putting content, updating content on the ALAC Wiki, are unfortunate design choices.

The best answer would be if content is created on any of Media Wiki blah, blah, blah, Wiki Confluence, and that an export from that can be imported to the ALAC Wiki and is easily as editing the ALAC Wiki directly at the cost of being, of course, connected to the Marina del Rey server, which I've always found difficult when using a Visa at Link high latency low bandwidth, which is the common situation for rural North Americans, and for both rural and urban users, in most of the world outside of North America, Western Europe, Korea, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. Thank you very much.

Roman Pelikh:

Sure. Let me address that. Are there capabilities for importing and can we look at something specifically to address that? Of course we can. It's the end of the day, it's ability to import the text and create that into the page. As an example, one of the underlying efforts within the organization that we have, specifically on the Wiki, not only for the community, but also for internal, is the ability to create the pages through your email. And that's not something that is supported right out of the box, but there are some APIs available that... there are certain plug-ins that have been written to facilitate some of that, and those are the areas that we already know and we're looking at to address some of our other areas; things like public comments, for example, that we have for the rest of the organization.

So, as a larger strategy, we're looking at, and I know Kurt mentioned, redesigning the website. The community interaction, overall, is a goal, is a strategic goal. We want to incorporate the ability of the community to generate the content, to work on the content directly. Not necessarily that it has to go from one place to another to rely on somebody else to insure that the content gets somewhere. It's ability for the community to go in and work efficiently and be able to populate that content. And we recognize, unlike a lot of other organizations do, depend on high availability band with good connectivity, we know we have people in Africa working on the cell phones. We have staff that we are supporting ceding that issue.

Remember, we're also running the staff Wiki. We're using exactly the same technology. One of the things... The reason why we're working the same technology, we're hitting the same exact issues you guys hit as a community. So we are encouraged, even ourselves from internal operations, to solve those issues because we have staff that is not capable to be effective in what they do if they don't have access to the information in the same way.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right now the queue is Darlene, Sergio and then Fouad. So, Darlene first.

Darlene Thompson: Just really quick – Cheryl, on what you were saying about opening in a new window or opening in a new tab. I've been playing with them and I've just been right-clicking on them saying “open new tab” or “open new window” and no problem at all. So it's already there if you choose to use it.

Roman Pelikh: Right. And that's one of the things I mentioned that is a user preference with any work. You can always do that and some of it is just a training issue. You can right-click and click on the new link or you can hold the Control Key...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Our iPad users are having problems; our mobile users are having problems. It's not quite as simple as right clicking, so... But yeah. Anyone who wants to do tabs still can, yeah.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Just a question. This... under what language has the Wiki been made? What is the language? Do you have program in language? It's a Java, yeah, Java.

Roman Pelikh: There's [audio break] available; there's a plug-in development kit available for the consulates. It not only covers the consulates but also covers GRSO. The plug-ins could be developed at the cross... It's the same platform to develop the plug-ins for both GR for example and for Confluence. Atlassian is the company that makes the tools. They have a wide variety of other tools for software developers and that's how they essentially started. It was tools for software developers and they kind of moved into the Wiki because that's what the developer's been accustomed to.

Fouad Bajwa: Just a few comments in support of the Wiki, as well as to add to what Roman is saying. I've already said that I come from Pakistan and Pakistan really hasn't had such a good bandwidth. And we're working on Confluence like four years ago. So that was a time and we were working in the complex environment, and there were really low bandwidth, No. 1 thing.

No. 2 thing – Confluence and as you mentioned it, it's an Australian company and it was developing the Confluence of Jira as part of an open-source support activity, while building up their own system and then actually delivering it to the community because that's how it got built in the first place. And if you look at the specs of how the open-source software is developed, you'll be

amazed that a great amount of developers of Confluence come from the door open world.

So the system has actually been somehow to a certain level optimized to actually work on low bandwidths because I've seen that in action; I've implemented that.

The third thing was how does this suit our environment? I was in a really bad internet bandwidth situation when the BCEC was working and we had that complex task of going through all the SOIs and then also scrolling the SOIs, and then with each question of the SOI that was scrolled, the page reloaded itself. So that all added up. And I did a calculation back then and I informed them this is the exact amount of time I'm going to take this week to complete this process; and we did it.

So I don't think... it's just like with any other technology. It's going to take time for people to adapt to it. I don't say that I'm okay myself with using an interface which I've made, but then my learning curve is like any other user that I have to learn how that environment is working. So this is an adaptable environment; it will take time, but I can assure you one thing – from my experience with its implementations and for non-profits, this is a very productive tool that we have and we will see its impact, say in one or two years.

It was a good choice that we went this way. And, yes, there are tons of opportunities for adding the ability to access it through

mobile phones and making it much lighter, but once we have to get the information and there we have to get the people who don't do it, and once that has been done, yes, there are ways to make it more lighter. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Fouad. Any other questions from anyone? We're reaching our ending time. I do have one question or one comment actually to make. I understand that some of the work that you're doing is actually looking for any of the orphan pages in the Confluence Wiki. There is one thing which I did notice. For some content which actually interfaces outside and back into the Confluence Wiki, such as for example, the At-Large Summit, it actually sends you over to the ALAC pages or the At-Large pages – www.atlarge.icann.org. But then it's impossible to go back to the conference because it actually points to ST.icann.org, so I'm not sure whether you've found a way to also update those links on the At-Large website, because I think that is required.

Roman Pelikh: Yeah, so to address that – the linking overall linking effort, is definitely not complete. As you understand, you're one of the first constituencies to move off from the Social Text. So what our plan is – to move the rest of the constituencies over first and then we hit all the websites... because we have to make an update on all the websites across the ICANN to make sure that they are referring back to appropriate Confluence pages.

So we need to make sure that the content is available 100%, all of the content is available on the Confluence because otherwise we're

going to be in the position where we're going to be updating a lot of content links that point into Confluence. But some of the links will still have to be pointing to Social Text because they refer to GNSO or any other areas.

So what we want to make sure we want move all the content, everything off from Social Text before we undertake the linking off of all the external websites. And then at a certain point, we'll essentially have a reference on the Social Text saying the Social Text have been discontinued and it will redirect people to the Confluence. So that's our game plan for that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Okay. Thank you very much, Roman. I gather if there are any more questions or any comments, is there any way for people here to be able to get in touch with you or what is the process?

Roman Pelikh:

During the week, we're going to have two more sessions; the schedule is outside. The schedule is actually on the slide right now. It's on Tuesday between 10 and 12. It's open hours, so you're welcome to come and ask questions. And it's right next door; it's behind this wall. So you can. Some of the more technical people – you're welcome to come and chat a little bit more in details. I actually encourage that and with anybody else who has a question or has a log-in problem, I'll be able to take that information and make sure we get back to you after the meeting with the proper access.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, thank you very much, Carole Cornell. Thank you very much, Roman Pelikh. I think it's been a very productive hour that we've spent with regards to the Wiki and to Confluence, and I hope that all the people who have not used it so far will, and if they need to get familiarity for it, they will come to those sessions which you just mentioned now.

You might hear some noise outside. In fact, it is the Fellowship Party which is just started which was supposed to be quite funny and quite enjoyable with drinks, etc. I guess that we should all be going there because this certainly is a fantastic reservoir of new faces whom we could actually bring into this room and give work to, which is something which means if you give it to someone else, you don't need to do it yourself. So go out there and befriend those people, hunt for them, should I say. Evan, you wanted to add something?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes. As of about 30 seconds ago, the drafting team has finished the draft ATRT response document and so please, as Cheryl had mentioned at the beginning of the day, please, everybody, wait for your email. It will come from Heidi to the announce list. Please look for it, go to it. I believe the latest draft will be draft No. 6 that has been gone over through everybody on the drafting team. Please look at it. It needs to go in before 8 a.m. tomorrow morning which means if you don't speak about it overnight, then nothing gets changed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just as an addendum on that, I've asked Kieran who has spent the evening, of course he's a ALS member, isn't he, he's San Francisco Bay At-Large structure, so Kieran said he spent the time -we were having a 90-minute session with the Board - making notes and wondered how it could be input to our ATRT processes. I said, "Well, as an ALS member, you send it to Heidi who will get it to the team who are drafting it overnight." So you will get some additional words of wisdom to at least work with if you want them, okay? I thought I'd capture what was going by at the time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Well, that's excellent news, Evan. Thanks very much for bringing that in. One last thing with regard to the Confluence Wiki. I did mention the beginning of the meeting that we were the guinea pigs and I realize that it's actually a good thing to be a guinea pig because what we'll end up with is being ahead of everyone else in knowing this, as usual.

So, well done, At-Large. I only have one more thing to do before we all go and get absolutely drunk at the party next door, is to actually thank the interpreters for their first day. It has been very hard for them – new terms, everything. Merci beaucoup. Gracias. And hopefully, they will not leave us before the end of the week. So be nice to them. Thank you very much and enjoy yourselves tonight. See you tomorrow morning. Bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]