

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. We have a double challenge. The first is it's the digestive period, so that's always quite difficult to concentrate after what I suppose was a very good lunch for you. And the second thing is that we are in competition with many other very interesting sessions. So, that's how it is, and we have to face the reality of public participation with, at least for the time being, a rather confidential attendance. This may change, of course.

Now, the first few elements I would like to give you about this meeting is that this is session in public of the Public Participation Committee here and I wanted to give you some indications of what is being done with this.

First of all, it is being recorded, mp3, and after that, with the recording, it will be scribed. Second, there is a constant audio streaming. And third, thanks to the arrangements made by the ICANN staff, this is being streamed continuously in French, Spanish, Korean, Chinese, and English. This, I think, has its importance, especially in terms of public participation, because we would like to encourage all those who are interest to come, and therefore, not to be limited or be less limited by the constraints of one language.

I like to start off these meetings, whether by telephone or live, as is the case today, by reminding us of one thing, which Peter Degate-Thrush, the Chairman of the Board, said right at the launch of this committee, that the purpose of public participation, of course, is to engage the wider public. And in a first stage, at least for those who are interested, it is to get to know the Internet system, and ICANN in particular, more thoroughly. But beyond that, when people become more familiar with this, I must underline that the purpose of public participation is indeed to engage those who are interested in taking part gradually in policy matters, which the contribution to the policy formation within ICANN. I think that's the very important thing.

I'd like to make another remark in this respect. This morning at this very table, there was a tremendously interesting, I found, presentation by the CEO, Rod Beckstrom, and he was assisted by two people. It was about the strategic plan of ICANN. And there, I think you found you had a very good demonstration of what public participation means, but also, can really bring to the functioning of ICANN. Because, there was a really lively discussion on very specific points, which were presented, and I think that was quite a success.

So, that's not the purpose of this meeting. We're talking about the methods of public participation, not the contents at this stage. But, I'd just like to establish in your mind the link between these methods of public participation on the one hand and on the other hand, the real ultimate objective, which is to contribute to the policy formation.

Now, I've been a bit long on this introduction, but I thought it had its importance. I'd like to ask Kieren to put up on the screen the last slide, which was the composition of the committee. Do we have that online yet? Good.

So, the following people have asked to be excused, Dennis Jennings, because he is taken up in another meeting as the Chair of a Review Working Group. So of course, he must be there. And, Mike Silber had another very important piece of work he had to finish. So with that, you have Nick Tomasso who is from the Supporting Staff. You have Thomas Narten, Thomas Roessler, Katim Touray, Kieren McCarthy, and myself, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

So, we'll start this meeting by showing you on the slides how we are structuring this meeting. One of my colleagues here just reminded me that we're in the business more of listening to you today than of speaking. So hopefully, we will not speak for one hour and then leave you only two minutes.

Actually, the whole scheme we've developed for this meeting with you is quite different in spirit and in fact. It's three large sections. One is the status updates, so that's just information towards you. The second part is used for discussion, and you can see on the slide what that contains. And finally, and I would like underline that we find this an important element, the last part is an informal chat with all of us – we will be somewhere around here – to relate with you informally in addition to what we expect to have as feedback from you during the session itself.

So, let's go to status updates now and essentially, two elements. One is document publication operational policy, and the other is language.

So, I'll take up the first subject, which is document publication operational policy. Just to point out, the elements you probably all know about because

this has been put online already for some time. First of all, 15 working-day deadline for documents and meeting agendas. By the way, what we're underlining here has already been approved and resolved by the Board, so it's no longer under discussion. It's already put into practice.

Guidelines on plain language, reduction in jargon and acronyms, translation, presentations. Staff report to analyze policy after each meeting. And also, some additions which were made following public comment period and online sessions. I'd like to underline that we had an online, open to the public, session a few weeks ago and I was chairing that session, so I was busy keeping note of everything and following track. But, those who were on the periphery told me that it was fairly successful. That's something we'd like to try again.

So, that was a very quick presentation on the status update, on publication policy. I don't suggest to open the floor directly now. I suggest that we have our presentations first, quickly, and then open the floor, because there may be relationships between various subjects as well.

So now, I'll pass the microphone to Katim Touray, a member of the Board from The Gambia who will be speaking to the language problem.

Katim Touray: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. Good afternoon everybody and good to have you here, especially given that you have so many other meetings to choose to attend, but you've decided to come here and we really want to say how much we appreciate that.

Regarding language, there are a number of issues here. One is that there's no provision in the document policy that we use and emphasize plain language in the documents. Of course, we all know that people have been complaining that ICANN documents can be a little bit intimidating, very filled up, very dry and full of jargon. So, the idea is to really encourage people to use more plain language.

There's also the provision that we translate a million documents into various other languages. The objective here is to at least get them in the languages of the United Nations System, the six languages. And, in that regard, we are happy to report that some serious progress has been made, significant progress. For instance, there's been 40.3 or a 40% increase in the number of

words that have been translated prior to Seoul compared to 70 something, about 2 million words have been translated to be precise.

And of course, we do not have an infinite bank of resources, so we always have to be careful about the use to which we pull the resources that we have to make sure that they're efficient and effective. And again, we're happy to report that there's a reduction in the overall cost of the translation effort. In fact, there has been a reduction from \$0.14 to \$0.12 in the cost per word between Sydney and Seoul. And I think that should be it for discussion, and I guess I'll put it back to Jean-Jacques.

Again, thank you very much.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Merci Katim.

Female: Thank you Katim. We are now going to move to the number of items that have been offered for discussion with you. But, I wanted to mention that we have a visitor here, Mrs. Rodriguez who is the manager in charge of language policies for ICANN within the ICANN staff.

As to our discussion, the first one is to do with international meetings, and I'm going to give the floor. So, would one of the members of this committee be ready to present this item or otherwise? So, I'm going to give the floor to Nick Tomasso who is the Director in charge of the meetings within the ICANN staff. Nick, you have the floor.

Nick Tomasso: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm going to be discussing a new strategy for ICANN meetings, and I'd really like to make this somewhat interactive as we go through it so that what would be most valuable to me is getting your input on some of the things that you see and hear as we go through it.

Earlier this year, we published the dates for ICANN meetings through 2011 through 2013. We spent a lot of time researching religious and geographic and country holidays, as well as other conferences to avoid any conflicts.

So, the question on the table right now and that we've been debating for quite some time in our own staff and with the PPC and others is what is the right number of ICANN meetings per year. There is a move to move from three to two traditional ICANN meetings, and then filling the void that that will leave

with additional conferences. It's been proposed twice in the past in 2006 by Susan Crawford and in 2008 by Paul Levins, and it has never moved past the debate in phase because of lack of consensus. But, we clearly feel it's time now to either move to a new model or really affirm that this is the right model to have moving forward through 2013.

One of the factors that need to be considered is what business takes place at ICANN meetings. The policy development work is of course extremely important; ICANN work that supports the community and the timing of that work, and ICANN community needs.

If we were to eliminate an ICANN meeting, the current thinking is we would eliminate the summer meeting, the one that happens in the middle of the year. And so, what you see here is a new schedule of events, and some of those meetings that I talked about earlier that will need to fill the void we already have the time set aside to run.

So, what additional conferences will we need, and here's where I would really like some input from you all to let us know what track we should follow. So obviously, in my mind, anyhow policy development meetings for the ccNSO, GNSO, ALAC, GAC, and any others that you can think of. Any comments on that? Please.

Nancy, can you get a handheld out there so we can pass it around?

Vanda Scartezini: Vanda from the ALAC. Well, we have been part for all those years and all these discussions; we start with four meetings. And certainly, for (unintelligible) is to March, but at the end from my point of view, three is the best solution we get. And I believe we should consider that appropriate.

Besides that, what we are saying for a long time is that we need to consider regional meetings for important issues, to debate policy issues with more cultural relations in facilities that become in this long, international where people mostly cannot really come, and country boots completely because of the language, because some of those are shy and have different cultures, and do not allow them to stand up and talk, and so on.

So, when you have those regionally, certainly, all those things is much more aggressive. It's very good to get people connected on the inside. So, we

should consider it, balance with spending money and so on. But, consider it at least to have some regional policy meetings related to ICANN. I believe that's very important.

Other institutions that we have some related with has those kinds of regional meetings, so we need to pay attention. To be international, we need to think regional to get to the international forum prepared to get the information that to get from the regional to the main groups.

Male: So, I have one comment and one question please. The comment is that the next bullet on this chart here does talk about regional outreach meetings, smaller in size in developing markets in native language, specifically focused on an issue that's important to the region. So, I think we agree and I certainly know that the members of the Public Participation Committee agree on that concept as well.

The second question I have for you though is when you talk about three meetings for ALAC to do policy development, does it need to be international public meetings or can it be two international public meetings and then some smaller policy development meeting for ALAC?

Vanda Scartezini: The idea of three in the end of the day was to make sure that we pay attention to the regions. That's because it's become important for the region to host those meetings.

Male: And, you may be very pleased with this statement. I have budget for two regional outreach meetings in the 2009-2010 budget, so it has been planned for.

Thank you.

Female: Thank you very much. I'm going to just, not for pleasure, to say to make a critique of what has already been decided. You presented by saying that documents had to be published two weeks in advance or 15 days in advance, and then they should be in various languages. I asked the question in a rather sudden manner during the opening ceremony by saying because there was a new book on the new gTLD in English only and they said, "No, they are coming in other languages," was the answer. And, they arrived today, but that's not two weeks before the meeting. So, what we have here is a gap

between languages and imbalance between languages, which is something important.

And the second point was that I was hoping that they will be also be printed in other languages in order to be handed out to the participants who read those languages during this meeting.

Now, going back to the question of, the one in front of me – sorry that I digressed – but, we've been discussing this for a long time as to whether we should reduce by one, the number of meetings. I want to remind you that when we went from four to three, immediately, another international organization decided to take that spot.

So, I worked in aviation and let's not let those landing slots be taken. So, we actually need to meet. Internet, that's great, and experience to meet and dialogue is excellent, but we need to meet face to face, and it won't be enough if we do it less than three times.

And lastly, I have a joke, so if we want to take out the meetings which are in winter, then there won't be any meetings, because there is always winter somewhere in the world.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Actually, I should have suggested that the presentations come first, otherwise, it will be split up. I'm sorry Michael, but of course, you'll have your chance to speak later.

So, let's go ahead. Nick, if you can continue your presentation.

Nick Tomasso: I will keep moving. Thank you. My apologies; you're right. Summer was the wrong time of year to state.

So, what other meetings will we need if we actually go from a three to two international public meetings schedule? What other meetings will we need? Meetings for the technical community as proposed by one of the Board members, Dennis Jennings. Joint meetings between interested parties. ICANN participating in other's conferences so we can get the ICANN word to them, and anything else you can think of.

We also have currently is a meeting bid process, which means that we publish a region of the world, and then we ask – I'm sorry, where are we.

We have a bid process that when we announce the geographic area that an event will be held in, we put an announcement for an expression of interest for those interested in hosting the meeting in their community. The question is does it continue to meet the ICANN community's requirements.

The ICANN facility requirements for instance for ICANN meetings has increased in the past year that I've been here, and it's likely to continue to grow with the advent of new IDNs and new gTLDs. There are many locations, especially in developing markets that do not meet all the criteria for hosting an ICANN meetings. There's much work on the part of all the people who submit bids. Only one can be accepted resulted in disappointment. The question I guess is who is disadvantaged if this bid process is eliminated.

The pros of the bid process is early buy-in from perspective hosts, as good geographic and Internet community support that's given in the way of ISPs, (unintelligible) etc., media in the area. What are the cons? And the biggest one is that times and locations that are proposed are not ideal in terms of facility security, air and ground travel.

Is there any value to a hub city concept? In other words, picking while maintaining geographic location. I see Avri serious nodding her head there. Maintaining a geographic location but selecting cities on a rotational basis that are easy to get to and where we can negotiate about the year contracts and actually realize some savings in the expansive ICANN meetings.

And of course, we would continue to hold ICANN meetings on a regular basis but less frequently in emerging markets so that we can continue the outreach program. And, the regional meetings also fall into that.

So, the next steps are research what all ICANN constituents – a thorough proposal to be developed by January of 2010, a public comment period where you all have the opportunity to provide your feedback to us on the direction we're moving in or proposing, and then implemented the resulting recommendation beginning in 2011.

Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Nick. So, we will not take the questions immediately. There are some other presentations arriving. So, I'll ask Thomas Narten to speak to the public comment process.

Thomas Narten: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I'll be fairly brief here. This is I guess an issue that I personally feel fairly passionate about. I think that obviously, the public comment process is very important to ICANN. That's how we sort of figure out what the community thinks and so forth, and then we iterate and go back to the public for more feedback and so forth. And, I think there is a number, sort of – I think there's a fairly broad agreement that it needs to be improved, in some ways, fairly significantly.

So, one of the things we've been working on is I know that Kieren has been trying out a couple of different versions of software for actually doing public comment that changes the way we've done things, and I'll defer to him if he wants to say a few things about the experience with that.

Kieren McCarthy: Thank you Thomas. So, one of the restrictions we have with the current public comment software that we use which is anyone that's used it before realizes that it's simply a stupid email system. You put an email in and it pops up on a list, and there's not very much more we can do with that.

So, experimented with two bits of software. One is called V Bulletin, which is an industry standard forum software and that enabled a whole range of interactions. And one was called Jive, which is very much more evolved, online collaboration software for two different comment periods.

And I wrote up some of the findings of that in some summary analyses of those public comment periods, but there are two things that I would mark out was that with those in place, no one used the traditional email system. We went through a lot of trouble to make sure the traditional email system worked with them and no one used it. So, I would count that as an indication that there was a fear that if we cut out the email system, no one would use or it or they would say this doesn't work. Actually, no one used it at all.

And there was many more comments than what we would normally expect, and there was much more interaction than we would normally expect. And there's various advantages that come with it. For example, we can gather

email addresses of people that interact with it, and then you can send people a notice saying this has got to close in a day. You can (**unintelligible**) saying the summary analyses is now posted. I keep people in touch with what's going on. And we could even put something on it which we could email them and say, "We know that you commented on this subject. There's another public comment period on a very similar subject coming up just to let you know." I think that sort of thing would enable a lot more interaction with the community, and I think that would be valuable.

So, I was very enthusiastic with the response from the community on these two bits of software and I'm going to suggest that we try it out with other public comment periods to see how it works.

Thanks Thomas.

Thomas:

Thank Kieran. So, the second point on the chart talks about the affirmation of commitments. There's one section in there that actually applies to this topic of public comment, and just quoting from the affirmation document. It states, "ICANN commits to adhere to transparent and accountable budgeting processes, fact-based policy development, cross-community deliberations, and responsive consultation procedures that provide..." and here's where it gets interesting – "...that provide detailed explanations of the basis for decisions including how comments have influenced the development of policy consideration."

And this is something I support. From my background in the IP for other places, I'm well aware that if people comment on something, if they get no feedback from it, it doesn't really instill much confidence and certainly doesn't make you want to do it again the next time around. So, that's an area that I think we're going to be doing some work on, or at least I hope so.

And, on the next chart, last point. This is sort of something that's been batted around a little bit. Should an AC or SO, should a formal response or formal comment, should it be given more weight than an individual response? And, I'm sure there's a range of views on this, and this is the kind of thing that we will be sort thinking through.

Thank you Jean-Jacques.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you very much Thomas and Kieran. Now, I'll ask Thomas Roessler to talk about the public forum.

Thomas Roessler: Thank you and I think I can be fairly brief. As you all know, the public forum is a bit of the nerve center of the ICANN meeting on Thursday morning. We will have four hours with specific time slots for the various topics. The agenda currently has the affirmation of commitments, the IDN ccTLD Fast Track, gTLD overarching issues, registry and registrar separation, and the document, deadline policies, and finally, 30 minutes of completely open mic time under general.

The format will be that the Board is going to be out on stage facing the microphone. Contributions at the microphone will be timed, so there will be a nice little timer on the screen. Also, we have again had a public question box that was open before the meeting and is now closed, and I will pass over to Kieran to tell us a little bit about what that has yielded in terms of results.

Thank you.

Kieran McCarthy: Thanks Thomas. I still haven't quite figured out why we got far fewer this meeting than we did the previous meeting. One of the first times that we opened it up, which was three meetings ago, we got something like 100 questions. But about – there were three people that sent in about 25 questions each, so I took the executive decisions that if someone stood up in an actual forum and asked 25 questions in a row, people would tell them to sit down. So, I changed the rules to you could only ask two questions each, which seemed fairer than one question.

And, we had around about 30 to 40 for the last meeting in Sydney. We only had seven this time, and I'm not entirely sure why, but they are not bad questions. We've been through the staff and the Board and got answers to them. We will make those answers available on Thursday and publish them on Thursday. And I think it's a very good process in the sense that it's exceptionally easy to ask a question and we do it in the five UN languages, and it provides people that won't be attending a very simple way to ask a question. So, I'm a fan of it and I don't know what the low figure of this particular meeting means. It maybe doesn't mean anything at all. But, I hope we continue with that question box and I'd be interested in your feedback. If you tell me that it's a waste of time, then we won't do it.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Thomas and Kieren. Now, I'll say just a few words about remote participation. This, we believe, is an essential part or so of service to the community. But of course, to engage people more into our work, we have to provide the proper means to make it possible without always having to travel.

So, I'll just go through the list very quickly. Expanded use of conferencing software, audio and video posted online, online consultation session by committee regarding, among others, the participation policy, and an experiment with more interactive comments software.

I won't go into the detail because what I suggest is that those who are interested will put questions, either now during the open session or perhaps by email to Kieren, and you can have much more complete answers.

Now, I think it's time now to declare the open session open, actually. That means, open to the floor. And, for the purpose of keeping it a fairly orderly discussion, I suggest that we take it more or less in the order we have presented to you. I remind you what that is. First, although this was only for your information – it was really not up for comment – but if you have a strong urge to come back to that, do so.

So, document publication operational policy, language – that was quite straightforward. As far as possible, I would encourage you to concentrate more on the next set of subjects, which are first, international meetings. You've already started on that. And, we owe Michael **Palage**, the first take on that. And then the public comment process, and then the public forum, and then finally, remote participation.

So, the floor is open. Who would like to start? I'd say Michael Palage first.

Michael Palage: Thank you. My comments with regard to the number of meetings, as a long-time ICANN participant, I actually was a survivor of the four meetings a year during the first two years of ICANN, which was a very tough time. So, I would be in favor of reducing the number of meetings.

I think though, we have to probably wait until we take care of IPv6, IDNs and the new gTLDs. Once those major tasks, I think, have been successfully

completed, moving to two meetings a year would probably be a good thing, and at least welcomed from this weary traveler.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Vanda, you put up your hand first.

Vanda Scartezini: Well, some comments. One that I appreciate the way that we have these opportunities, for instance, for when Rod put this (**unintelligible**), it will be easy for me to put the text in Portuguese so I could distribute the idea in my own language in the country and become the information really was disseminate along the many IP issues. So, I believe that all the facilities that we can have to get the information and make some of us interested in that, make the translation for their own language, and allow that for the others to use and to understand better, it would be welcome. I believe that's one point.

I have a lot of those, so I will get to the point.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: And Vanda, thank you for those remarks, but I'd like to remind us that as far as possible, we are taking first the question of meetings to try to concentrate on that, and then the other items I suggested. Would you please...

Male: I don't have anything to say about meetings. I'll defer to someone else.

Jean-Jacques: Right. If we could concentrate on meetings for the time being. Please give your name first for transcription purposes. Thank you.

Bertrand de La Chapelle (**unintelligible**): Bertrand (**unintelligible**)

Female Translator: And the French representative on the GAC, but I just wanted to remind Nick in particular that the GAC provided a very detailed document on October 15, 2008 regarding the meeting policy, the elements of which are still applicable regarding the frequency and the various challenges. But also, on the meeting policy is directly linked to the working method of the overall ICANN. So, it is the whole of the system that needs to be taken into account and it is a good thing that the Public Participation Committee should look into the subjects, because the meeting question is leading to the other issues.

Male: ...that GAC advice from October 2008 we should have in our pockets. But in any case, I think that yes, and share it. But, I think that we are addressing – I don't know it by heart, but I think we are addressing most, if not all of the questions. Perhaps not necessarily with the solutions you were thinking of, but we are addressing each of those questions, I think.

The next speaker please.

Jacob Malthouse: Hi. My name is Jacob Malthouse. I have been coming to the meetings for some time now, and I think one of the reasons that you could decrease the number or frequency of meetings is that you now have such a good online infrastructure that's projecting the meetings over the Internet. So, it's quite possible I've missed a couple, and as long as you have a decent Internet connection, you can stream in real time and see text that's coming out through the meetings and chat in the chat rooms, and really participate and engage through the Internet.

If you were going to reduce the number of meetings, I think keeping the geographic dispersion of meetings, so making sure that you are rotating through geographic regions would be important to maintain and sustain. And also, increasing the accessibility of people to get here and come in person, so the fellowship programs, these sorts of things. Increasing the level of accessibility but decreasing the frequency of the actual in-person meetings. You may actually find some ability to transfer resources into those other accessibility forum if you cut down. You'd have some cost savings if you cut down the number of meetings as well.

Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you very much for those remarks. Maybe Nick will have something to say, but I forgot to say earlier on to remind us that actually, there's a permanent tension between different purposes of ICANN international meetings. That's obvious. One of the constraints, and it's a very important one to have in mind, is that in between meetings, between these very large meetings, the staff has a huge amount of work to take on the advice, the comments, but also, preparing for the next stage, implementing all the decisions by the Board. So, it has been analyzed in a very detailed way, and that's one of the reasons for which – not the only one, but one of the

reasons for which it was felt that a large number of meetings per year was simply not in the interests of the most efficient ICANN.

So, with that, Nick, would you like to add something in response to that question?

Nick Tomasso: Just to say that I do appreciate that input. I do think that there would be economies if we reduce the number of large meetings and that the fellowship programs would likely increase for the other two, so that's a good point.

I know the ICANN technical team continues to research and develop new ways to provide ICANN meeting content via the Internet out to our constituencies around the world and we hope to continue to improve that process. You're correct in your observations that all of the text and all of the audio from each meeting now is streamed out to the Internet. There were very few exceptions to that today, which was not the case just one short year ago. The only exceptions are those meetings that are specifically asked to be private and not streamed out.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: I think Bertrand, you had another point.

Female Translator: Bertrand de La Chapelle, just to support what Sebastian was saying regarding the main goal of those meetings, the goal is for interaction between the actors but not with only within their groups, but between groups. So, the question is not only the number of meetings, but how they are organized or how meetings are managed within. And in order to – what's happening individually and what's happening between groups, and this distinction is still underestimated and it is mentioned under the affirmation of commitment, and it is mentioned as a special item.

Regarding remote participation, **RGF** is trying is testing, and is developing for **Shahmel Shake** after testing last year, so it's testing the idea of a regional hub so that local participants can look at the streaming and participate remotely. And so that local community, the idea here is that they should be able to meet say somewhere in Brazil if a Latin American cannot travel far. But all this streaming and all these sessions be available so that people can discuss locally. So, I think that's another avenue to explore.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. Perhaps, if you have a quick remark about hubs Vanda, you're welcome.

Vanda Scartezini: Yes. We have also the discussion about hubs. Looks interesting, but we lose the opportunity to circulate and once you have defined, in each region, one hub, if it's in Europe or something like that, nobody care. But if you go to South American, for instance, and you decide that will be some problem, you have a very arguable point among the other countries. Why always Brazil or something like that? So, the same thing in Africa.

So, I don't know how solve that. Certainly, the idea is very good because it's more easy to organize, and (unintelligible) every year, it's much more better and economic. But, I don't know how to solve these political issues.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Vanda. What we'll do is to take several questions or remarks, and then we'll try to answer by packets as it were. So Sebastian and then Avri.

Sebastian: Yes. Just to remind you of the time (unintelligible) was talking about, that we already – ICANN already have admitting and it was decided not to follow with that. It was in Los Angeles, Marina Del Ray.

Avri: Hi. Avri. I think what you do when you're defining hubs is you don't define a set of hubs. You define a set of criteria that make it a hub. So basically, this number of airlines from this number of other locations, and you come up with a formula. And then you find that you have several in each area, so it's not quite so limited as making a definitive there is only one per region.

Also, I would understand that almost any decision that had been made before could be made a new, so anything that has been decided previously can obviously...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Right. If I understand correctly, there are no people lining up to discuss meetings further so that we can carry on to another subject. But before that, of course, I would ask members of the committee first if they would like to comment on this. Otherwise, I would ask Nick to respond. Committee members, any remarks and general remarks?

Well, Nick, would you please take on all of these aspects?

Nick Tomasso: Tall order. The first question that was of particular interest to me was the concept of the interaction between groups that an ICANN affords. And in the thought process that we're going through today is we're trying to determine what is the interaction. Who needs to be with whom for what reason?

Bertrand de La Chapelle (Female Interpreter): The reply is exactly that. On each topic, there must be at least one opportunity for the whole of the community to interact. Otherwise, there won't be any interaction for the bottom-up.

Nick Tomasso: Understood. Thank you.

On the concept of hubs, Avri, yes, I agree with your assessment of how hubs would be identified. That sort of process would still afford us the opportunity for negotiations, specifically with hotel chains who operate in those larger cities, which typically of course, you know the brand names that are around.

Remote participation, we actually developed a model for remote participation, although it was not very expansive for this meeting, by recording – some recording and some live showing of the public forum, the Board meeting as well as a recorded opening ceremony. And, it was so limited in its concept that we've decided to abandoned it for this event. But, we are exploring the opportunity of those to produce the event, whether in part or in total, to remote locations so that people can congregate in one place and participate that way. So, it's a point well taken and a point we are giving considerable thought to.

Thank you.

And, I think I've answered all the questions. If I haven't, please put up your hand and let me know.

Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Now, I've asked my neighbor and friend, Katim, if he minded if we put, as the next topic to come up, the public comment process, and then the public forum before taking up the linguistic questions, because I think this is very important. We have to take this up. So, do you mind?

Are there any comments or questions about – this will be public comment process. So, please go ahead.

Brett Fausset: My name is Brett Fausset. I have actually three comments on this. One, I'd just like to let the Board members who are here know how important it is to replace Mr. McCarthy when he leaves. I'm sorry he's leaving, but that position was open. It's a bylaw-level position. It was open for about two years before we were fortunate enough to get him. I'd like that to be a high priority of ICANN to fill that position as soon as possible.

Male: I think that's very broadly understood, absolutely.

Brett Fausset: The second point, Thomas, you were talking about how to meet the obligations and the affirmation of commitments. ICANN has some history here. If you go back to the UDRP drafting process, that was very well done by ICANN. People submitted comments and when **Louis Tuton** who was putting the UDRP together, when he explained why he made the decisions he made in coming up with the final UDRP, he basically said, "Well, here, Brett said this. I didn't adopt it because X, Y, Z." And you could understand that your comments were heard. He actually didn't spend a lot of time on it, but he did say, "This is why I accepted it, this is why I rejected it," and I think ICANN can look to its how history for some way forward here.

Male: Yes, just responding briefly. I agree with you 100%. I think we know how to do this sort of stuff. It's not like it's rocket science. I mean, the IETF does this, sometimes not very well. The RR's do this, sometimes not very well. And, it's really about establishing a framework and making sure we actually do it and follow through in all cases. That's sort of my view.

Brett Fausset: Yes. We did it early in ICANN, so I think we got away from it. And my last point is on the public comment. We asked the GNSO Councilors and the Board members to put up statements of interest. This is who I am. This is where my monetary interests are. These are people who are paying my bills.

I would like ICANN to think about having a registered user so that before you go into the public comment forums and you post something that you say, "My name is Brett Fausset. I'm an attorney. I represent registrars, domain names registrants. I do this, X, Y, Z." So then, when you read my comment, at least, I may not be talking from that perspective, but at least you know where

my interests are. And I think we see the need for this, especially when there are big issues that affect a financial segment of the community and we have this astroturfing of comments come in. It would be really nice to understand who these people are and why they have come to ICANN to make a particular point.

Male: Yes. Just sort of off the top of my head, that's an interesting idea and I guess it would be, in some sense, like a standardized conflict of interest policy that applies not just to kind of a handful of people; it applies to everybody who participates.

Brett Fausset: Yes. I think just a standard form that before you're registered as a user on the ICANN public comment forum, there's a form you need to fill out. You can update it as you need to that basically just says this is who I am, this is sort of an authenticated user.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. A very interesting suggestion and we've taken note of it.

The next speaker, could you please identify yourself?

Paul Futi: Paul Futi and this is my third ICANN meeting. I don't know if there's something very important going on next door, but it's kind of ironic that the ICANN Board public participation committee is probably the least well attended that I've seen with only 20 people in right now.

I've been to three big ICANN meetings now. I've been to the one in New York. I remotely viewed the meeting in London. I think in Mexico, there were 1,200 people, Sydney, about 1,200 again, here's I'm guessing about 1,200. Would that be right?

In New York, there was less than 200 in a city of 15 million people. London, 150 according to the webcast. We're talking about a technology that hits some billion people almost. It's a technology that is based on communication. We're talking about probably the biggest news on the planet right now.

The IDNs were announced on Monday. CNN actually carried it on the news Monday night. How come the silence on what is going on here? I mean, how

is it possible? Again, Dot Asia is now owned by the World Media Group, which comprises of eight of the world's biggest newspaper companies. So, how come this isn't global news?

Male: Well, I mean, just sort of responding personally. I personally don't think that ICANN and what we're doing is the most important news in the world, and my personal view is that we actually over hype what we do a little bit too much. I mean, it's clear that IDNs, for example, so back here a lot we need to do, is very important. But, it is one small link in a very, very big chain.

People are using the Internet today in their native languages. With IDNs, once they're deployed and all the software works, they'll be able to do it a little bit easier and a little bit better. But, it's not like this is the most important thing that's going on.

If you want to see what's the most important thing, go to CNN or New York Times or some place and there's a lot of other things that people think are much more important than what ICANN is doing.

Paul Futi: People will think about...

(Crosstalk)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Excuse me. I would like to add a word saying that one could imagine that there's some sort of beauty contest. But actually, I think that people are more interested in policy, in the results of what we will decide or not decide on IDNs, on gTLDs, etc.

Public participation is simply a tool. It's perfectly all right with me if people are less interested in the tool, because they think that in spite of its shortcomings, the method more or less operates properly. It could be improved of course.

So, the other side of your question, Mr. Futi, is how come there's so few people in this room compared with the other rooms during this ICANN meeting. So, there is – and I don't want to avoid this question. You're quite right. There is an element of truth to this in that it's a programming challenge. Now, what Rod Beckstrom, our CEO pointed out at the beginning of this international meeting is that out of the 120, I think, sessions or meeting which

are going on, there are only six hours which do not enter into conflict with anything else. So, that's a very low number.

So, the real challenge for programming in ICANN is to either have less diversity, do not address all the concerns of all the members of the community, and go concentrate on only five or six topics. And then you'll have all the large crowds in the same place. Or, to do what we are trying to do, which is a very imperfect formula, granted, but I think that's the best we have achieved so far.

And, it's open and it's also on audio stream as I indicated before you arrived, which is being streamed in five languages. So, that's quite a progress also.

I'm afraid we won't be able to spend too much time on this because there are other important topics. I'm not pushing you away from the microphone, but would you have any other remark, observation on the public comment process actually, because we are in that segment?

Paul Futi: Well, it's not a public comment process unless the public knows that they have the ability to comment on something. And at the moment, 99.9% of the people I talk to have no idea what's going on. The Dot Com crash back in 2000, or whenever it was, it wiped \$5 trillion in value off the NASDAQ alone. What the new gTLDs will do the Dot Com, that is nothing in comparison.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you for your comment. Let's go to some other comment. In the meantime, Dennis Jennings has joined us. He's a member of the Public Participation Committee and I am very glad to welcome him back.

So please, Bertrand...

Bertrand de La Chapelle (Female Interpreter): There is a link between the use of the new electronic tools and I am very interested that this is being explored for the new tools, because as Ken was saying, the situation is that where more about consulting where somebody sends their comments in rather than interacting where there is dialog and there can be a reaction on other's comments. And, this is something that I've been pushing and I'm like a broken record on this topic. But, interacting between members of the communities needs to be developed most, and when I look at the difficulty or

the challenge with distribution lists where people sometimes jump from or react to somebody's comments...

So when on the mailing list, somebody reacts, responds, to what somebody else said, then there is sometimes, it generates a discussion thread. On comments, which are made on published documents, there is a series of individual comments and it is difficult to go and see somebody else's comment and possibly send something else in and refer to such and such. So, there is not the ideal thread, and this manner, I'd like to encourage the staff to explore, if possible, what Google is current doing, this Google Wave, whether it's usable for us.

Second point quickly regarding the meeting organization and this is to do with this contact: When organizing the sessions, something is missing is really the ability to insert within the program some workshops which would be generated more clearly by the community on a particular topic. Not that the community is saying that my little group meets in such and such room, but that one of the people being part with, as (**unintelligible**) say we would like to have a workshop on this and that topic. And, for example, interacting with the IGF or template that is being used (**unintelligible**) by making the distinction between those workshops that are being offered, that should enable us to make the work more clearly structured.

For example in Nairobi, we would have two big threads. One is institutional evaluation in the TLD. Perhaps we could use that as a thread for discussion.

Thank you for this comment.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: ...to indicate that it's 1540. We only have 20 minutes left and we have to keep about 10 minutes for the informal chat with you, not on this table but in the hall. So, I suggest that after Dennis's comments on this, we switch to the next topic, which is the public forum. Thanks.

Dennis Jennings: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I'd just like to pick up the second comment, Bertrand, that you made about the scheduling of the programming and the more formal workshops and the less formal workshops.

The complexity of what we're trying to do here at this meeting is beyond anything I have seen at ordinary conferences or thematic events or

programmed events, and I have run a number of these myself. Part time, I was the program committee chair for InterOp for four years, InterOp in Europe. So, I know quite a bit about program committees and organizing and so on.

But, this is one has so many different threads and so much demand on time, it really is very difficult. But some thoughts.

First of all, I think we need to engage, we collective need to engage the community earlier in the process of defining the various requirements for the meeting, and communicating to the GNSO, the GAC, all the stakeholders, that there are constraints and that we need to have this information fairly early in the process. And then, need collective to try and mediate the discussion to get an acceptable program.

The reason I wasn't here for most of this meeting is that I was chairing another meeting, and I didn't actually spot it until early this morning, even though I had looked at the schedule quite closely.

That way, we would be able to provide some pushback to the stakeholders so that some of the responsibility for sorting out the program rests with the community. I understand, for example, that there was a very important but late and urgent requirement for a law enforcement meeting on Monday, and it couldn't be accommodated, and some people said that's not really important enough. It can be Thursday. But, without knowing anything about the details, it does seem to me that that probably came later than was desired, and if it had been part of the developing of the program, that problem would not have arisen.

The second thought is that it might be useful to introduce the "birds of a feather" type session where there is time in the program for people to self-organize and have meetings of interest, rather than to have this chain meetings form early morning committee meeting to cocktail to dinner to bar, recognizing most of the work is done in the bar and then forgotten promptly by morning.

So, more space in the calendar and the program as well. So, those are just a couple of thoughts that I have.

The final and third thought is that I think whether it's structured or whether it's informal, we need to have more interaction between the stakeholders built into the program, more interaction time. And one of the things that I would like to see is that some of the questions that have come up in the public forum and will come up tomorrow – I have no doubt – that addressed to the Board should be addressed to the various SOs and ACs and resolved at that level rather than using the Board as a bully pulpit to shout at everybody else in the organization.

First of all, it's not very effective and it's not very responsive. And shouting at the Board may relieve some tension, but it doesn't get terribly much done. So, those are the thoughts that I have and I've been talking to Nick about how me might do that, and whether that's a practical way, because I haven't looked at the practicalities of building more stakeholder involvement, and commitment and responsibility into the programming.

Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Dennis. Now, we have to move on to the next subject, which is public forum. I'll only be able to allocate about three minutes for both the question and the response by Thomas Roessler. I'm sorry about this, but we either keep our timing in order to make the chat possible or we don't, and I suggest that we do.

So, are there any comments or questions about the public forum, which is as Thomas indicated earlier, tomorrow? And it's a very important, in our mind. For the Board, it's an essential component of any international ICANN meeting.

Paul Futi: The comments I have is that given the fact that there is a limited amount of time, there are many people here who will want to make a point to ask questions who do not have the luxury of sitting on Boards or Committees. And perhaps people who do sit Committees and do have the opportunity to speak be asked to respect the opportunity of other people who've come here without that voice so that the people who don't have a voice at least get a chance to say something.

(Unintelligible) in my point, I made a point about 99.9% of people I speak to, that's away from ICANN meetings. Basically, nobody that I speak to away from ICANN meetings has heard of this.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: We'll take all your comments and questions in a row, but please, now I must insist that it be very brief.

Male: One of the things that Rod Beckstrom has done in his meetings is to give priority to people who haven't spoken yet. I realize I'm here at the mic for a second time, but I think maybe having two microphones, one for people who've not spoken yet and another for people who are coming up to the podium to make their second point would be a great idea.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: One first point, timer very good. I am the first victim, but fine. The second thing to piggyback actually because it's connected with what Dennis was saying, two suggestions. Why not have a community-based program committee as the message you're sending is involve the community more. Why not set up a community-based program committee with the different actors to help sort out the structuring and the tracks.

And in the same vein, I very much appreciate the work that the Board Committee has done on this subject by identifying the topics. But, the limited time that is available for interaction would encourage us to us to whether it would be possible for the Board Committee to follow what Dennis was just saying to set up a community-wide group to further discuss those issues. Because, we have not extinguished the question.

And regarding the public forum, I fully agree that the questions should be sent back for the community to interact, but there is no framework at the moment for the whole community to interact on anything. That's the only point.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you very much for the comments. I think it's a point well taken that the public forum is an occasion for those who do not otherwise speak up within the ICANN structure to actually have time to spend and be heard by both the Board and the community overall.

To pick up on your point about putting questions back to the community as they come in to the Board, I think that's sounds like an excellent addition,

perhaps to the online question box. And, I see Kieren has his hand up, or is that...?

So please, go ahead.

Kieren McCarthy: I just want to take this opportunity to raise the most frequent bug bed I've had with the public forum is that the setup is designed to cause confrontation, and the whole setup of the room is wrong. You have a Board a long way back from the people. You have a microphone at the front with the audience behind them, and you're never going to get discussion ever with approach.

If you simply had people raising points and other people in the community saying, "Oh, I agree with that," or "I don't agree," then you get an actual discussion. I don't know why the – if you have the Board members in the room and maybe at the front or in a circular room or in a semi-circular room, then you achieve the same goal, but you don't have people talking at a lot of people on a stage, which has yet to ever work and never will work in terms of read discussion. It will always be aggressive and unnecessarily aggressive confrontationally.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: As I said, it's a very important topic, but for the time being Bertrand, we have not done what you have suggested to organize in another way more completely. So, we are constrained by this and I would suggest that Katim would take maybe one comment about the linguistic dimension now of ICANN. Anyone?

Otherwise, he had a comment to make more generally. So, you have a brief...

Male: (Unintelligible).

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, I know, but I don't see anyone queuing before the mic, so...

You do have one, so an incoming member of the Board of Directors of ICANN.

Gonzalo Navarro: Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in Spanish if I can.

(Female Interpreter): Many thanks. As you indicated, my name is Navarro. I have been appointed to the ICANN Board and I will be part of this Committee very soon.

The comment that I would like to make is that I would like to indicate that I am very happy to be making this comment in my own language, which is Spanish. This is the first time ever that I've been able to do this and I am really happy to be able to do this.

And in this regard, I would also like to indicate that I really appreciate the work that this committee is doing in expanding the work of ICANN in different languages and to this message, this medium. I will tell people who can speak Spanish who are listening to me through the different channels that we have created to this effect to participate in this community, which belongs to everybody and to which we are a part of. Many thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Muchas gracias Navarro. Katim, would you have any comments?

Katim Touray: Yes. Very briefly, I just would like to say thank you very much for your comment. And just to emphasize what you were saying, you might recall yesterday there was somebody who shouted out as Rod was trying to make a presentation that they draft Applicant Guidebook was only available in English, and promptly, it was responded to to the effect that, as a matter of fact by today it was going to be posted in almost all the – I believe it's already been posted.

So, I think we haven't got it where we need to be, it is not because of a lack of effort. It is not because of a lack of commitment by the community to ensure that we get there. I think the point is that we are making significant progress. And being perfectionists, we are not happy where we are, which is just well enough because that's what's in the end going to get us to make some progress.

So again, keep up the heat. Get involved and let's work together, and I'm sure we'll get to where we need to get to by and by. Again, thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: So, there are other topics, but we can take them up during our chat period, which is even shorter now, meaning remote participation and one other subject.

But before we end this meeting, it is my duty, my sad duty by my honor also to say a great and warm thank you to Kieren, because he's staying with us for some time yet and he will be attending other meetings. But, he has made known his intention of leaving ICANN to go on to other ventures, and I wanted to say on behalf of this committee how pleased we are with the work he did with us. The contribution he brought, I understand to the whole of ICANN, even before joining this committee as the so-called staff member or staff support member, and I must say that I was struck by several things personally.

One was his constant availability. And the second thing is his tremendous ability to relate technology with social requirements. I think that's really a tremendous strength, and whatever you undertake, Kieren, in your next ventures, this will be a very great asset for you, and you should keep it and cultivate that.

He was right on top of technology and he brought innovations into public participation in ICANN, various channels to allow people to react in a more convivial and direct way, and I think that was really a great contribution.

I would have liked to say something more complete, but time wise, we are a bit constrained, so Kieren, if you would accept this very short but very sincere manifestation of our appreciation for what you have done, and our very, very warm wishes for all the things you will undertake now.

You only mentioned that you had three or five books going, plus websites, plus, plus, plus, so if I could just advise you to perhaps slow down slightly in order to be able to achieve all of those and not only one of them, and then suddenly fall sick.

So, with our very, very best wishes, thank you so much Kieren.

Male:

Let me just say something very quickly. I really didn't mean to start a big thing here, but what I will say is that you haven't been here for a while. If you look at public participation in ICANN and what it was before Kieren started, and where it is today, I think we've really come a long way and Kieren deserves a lot of credit for that.

And the other thing is when I think of Kieren, one of the things that is always going to stick in my mind is I had this notion that it's really easy to come and whine and complain about how broken things are. It's a whole other matter to go and actually do something constructive, and he exemplifies that, because you could argue he was a bit of a complainer before he joined ICANN as a journalist, and then he came in and he tried to do something about it. And one of the things he has repeatedly done is to go after people that whine and complain and say, "Well, why don't you do something about it?" (Unintelligible) have you comments, and so on. So, thanks Kieren.

Roberto Gaetano: Good afternoon. We are already a bit late and I need to start, also because we have a hard deadline, because there's a session after our finishes. So, we have to finish promptly at 5:30.

So, what we are going to do is I'm going to ask Rob to make a short presentation, a short introduction. In the meantime, I hope that the Whois workshop is finished so we will have the best of the audience here, and then I will invite the chairs of the working teams to explain what they have done. And then we have ample time for questions and answers.

I'm going to hand over the microphone. I'm going to go off stage because I would like to see the show like everybody else.