EN

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Twenty minutes late already but we are going to be pushing through quite a few things. It's our first meeting of this Singapore Meeting. Welcome to everyone. I hope you've all traveled and managed to sleep during your travel, and you're all happy that you've got a full week of a lot of work coming up.

I think the first thing that we'll start with is a roll call, and so we'll have each one of us introduce ourselves, and we'll start from Beau on my left. Thank you very much, Beau? |
Beau Brendler:	Good morning. My name is Beau Brendler. I'm Chairman of the North American RALO.
Fatima Cambronero:	Good morning. My name is Fatima Cambronero from Argentina.
Natalia Enciso:	Good morning. My name is Natalia Enciso and I am from APADIT, Paraguay.
Tijani Ben Jemaa:	Tijani Ben Jemaa from Tunisia; AFRALO; ALAC.
Cintra Sooknanan:	Cintra Sooknanan from the Trinidad & Tobago Computer Society.

Sergio Salinas Porto:	Sergio Salinas Porto from Argentina. I represent the Latin American and the Caribbean region.
Andres Piazza:	Andres Piazza, LACRALO Chair for a little bit more.
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Trinidad & Tobago Computer Society and LACRALO Secretariat.
Darlene Thompson:	Darlene Thompson, North America Secretariat.
Alan Greenberg:	Alan Greenberg, incidentally from North America, and I'm the ALAC liaison to the GNSO.
Edmon Chung:	Edmon Chung, ISOC Hong Kong; APRALO.
Charles Mok:	Charles Mok, ISOC Hong Kong, also APRALO.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC Chair.

Yrjö Länispuro:	Good morning. Yrjö Länispuro, ISOC Finland and EURALO.
Mohamed El Bashir:	Mohamed El Bashir, ISOC Sudan; AFRALO.
Dave Kissoondoyal:	Dave Kissoondoyal, Mauritius; AFRALO, ALAC.
Oksana Prykhodko:	Oksana Prykhodko, Ukraine; EURALO.
Aziz Hilali:	Aziz Hilali from Morocco, ISOC Morocco. I am Secretariat of AFRALO.
Sandra Hoferichter:	Sandra Hoferichter, EURALO and Medienstadt Leipzig.
Wolf Ludwig:	Wolf Ludwig, EURALO.
Eric Brunner-Williams:	Eric Brunner-Williams, NARALO.
James Seng:	James Seng, ALAC, Asia, APRALO.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	He's actually all of the above for those who are a bit confused. He is ALAC, he is Asia and he is APRALO. He's a NomCom appointment to APRALO in the ALAC. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vice Chair of the ALAC and representing APRALO in the ALAC. Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	And we are missing someone who's standing right in the middle of the room, and I would ask for him to introduce himself please.
Evan Leibovitch:	Evan Leibovitch, cameraman and Vice-Chair.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	And we also have with us Matt Ashtiani, Gisella Gruber-White and Seth Greene who are going to be here with us all week and who are going to have the fun of trying to make sense of what's going on at any time because I will be turning to them if I do not know myself what's going on.
	I have to remind a couple of things to everyone here. First is that when you will speak, if I don't call your name out would you please be so kind as to say your name before you speak because the interpreters will have a hard time making sense of what's going on and especially if one listens to the meeting in Spanish or in French. Any other… Also, please yes, speak close to the microphone. It is difficult for people who listen to us remotely to

hear us if we speak far away, and it sometimes is extremely frustrating to listen remotely and not hear what's going on.

I see that Cheryl is waving her hand – would you like to add something to this please, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to remind those of us in the room that are in the Adobe Connect room to mute your speakers on the Adobe Connect interface please. If suddenly the voice starts looping back it becomes very problematic for those on remote participation. And also Olivier, if you might for the record, just tell everybody which channel each of the languages – and most excitingly Chinese – is on as well. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I would be saying that if I knew which channels were which. Perhaps Gisella?

Gisella Gruber-White: Channel 1, English; Channel 2, French; Channel 3, Spanish; Channel 4, Mandarin.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well thank you very much, and a big thanks to the Languages Team who has managed to have Chinese for all of

today and also for several of our sessions. So really a word of thanks for that.

And without further ado I think we'll start with our first session which is due to go on until 10:30 when we'll have our coffee break. Do we have to introduce anyone who is listening remotely as well? I know that there might be a couple of members who were not able to make it who might be listening remotely.

Gareth Sherman: Gareth Sherman.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Hello, Gareth. Thank you for joining us. I also notice Joly MacFie is here remotely but I haven't heard from you, Joly, yet. Okay, well I gather we shan't be listening any further for the time being.

Well, welcome to everyone who's joining us remotely, and so we'll start with the first point on the agenda which is the review of the At-Large Working Groups. Now, those working groups, if you turn over to the page, the webpage which deals specifically with them are numerous; in fact they have just been added on as time goes with some working groups having seen less life than a mortuary in quite a while.

So the idea that we are going to spend the next hour or so going through each one of these working groups that we have on this webpage, and if you look at the right screen you will see them and find out whether these working groups are still worth keeping,

whether they are not worth keeping; whether we have to revive them and who is in charge of reviving them and getting them working, because a working group has to work.

So the other thing, of course, if we have a working group that is not going to work anymore and that is obsolete then we'll obviously have to find a way to archive them or perhaps even to merge them with other working groups that we have. And so the suggestion is to go through each one of them in turn. We have time to discuss and I'm hoping that we will have some dialog and I'm not going to be the only person speaking about them.

The first working group on our list is the At-Large Engagement in ICANN. Alan, you put your hand up. Alan, please.

Alan Greenberg: I'd like to make a couple of general comments before we go on to the one-by-one. I guess I have more experience with working groups in this room than anyone else, at least ICANN working groups, and a couple of thoughts: if we want the concept of a standing working group – that is a group that is formed and ready to jump into action should something important come up in its domain – that's fine, but let's call it that. And you still have to review membership periodically to make sure they're still interested and the people are still alive and breathing, and still within our group.

If it's not called a standing working group but a working group, it needs to actually work and needs to have a motivation for being

there, so I think we need to differentiate between them. And if there's enough justification for forming a working group – and we shouldn't do it frivolously – cause it's an important subject that might become important for us sometime in the future, then we really need a rationale; I hate to use the word in this forum because of some past problems, but some level of "charter" so that we know what it's supposed to be doing, and semi-regular reporting as to what it is accomplishing and what the work products are.

Otherwise, I hate to say it but it becomes a joke and it's even more of a joke when we talk about it to other groups and they don't see any output coming from it. And just listing it on our list of working groups doesn't make it very impressive. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan. Next, Eric Brunner-Williams?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you very much, Olivier. While I was participating in the GNSO for the past I guess nine years the last two years, a significant portion of my time was spent on the issue of how GNSO Working Groups actually do work. And one of the areas where we sort of are walking without ground is that we don't actually have rules for or guides for those who are involved in working group activities. We can import wholesale the process and procedure of the GNSO but we should do so knowing what we're doing, or alternatively develop our own process and

procedure for working groups, whether they're standing – that is permanent – or of short duration.

But basically we do need to do some work before we have working groups, which is to figure out what the rules for working groups are. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric, and Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Forgetting Eric was in there I withdraw my comment about longevity but I support everything Eric said. Despite some of our problems with the GNSO recently, their working group rules and some of the other processes they have are as good a start as we're going to find and you would not believe the amount of effort that's gone into creating them, including with people from ALAC, by the way, and At-Large.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan. And I also take the opportunity to welcome Heidi who I understand is listening to us on the phone. Welcome, Heidi.

Heidi Ullrich: Thank you, everyone. This is Sophia.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	And of course Sophia is on the phone as well.
Heidi Ullrich:	I must admit she's not screaming but she's content at the moment.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	She's with At-Large; she would have to be content wouldn't she? Right.
Heidi Ullrich:	Okay, I'm going to go back on mute but welcome and I look forward to seeing you all in Dakar.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Heidi, and it's good to hear from you.
Heidi Ullrich:	Okay, you too, bye-bye. I'm listening and the sound is good, thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay thanks, right. So bearing in mind then the comments by Eric and Alan I think that we might need to do more work in the longer term perhaps than just spend our time today deciding on groups. I think the first step perhaps would be to decide on what groups we're keeping, what groups are obsolete, and then maybe start a

process whereas to see if we wish to have formal charters for these groups, rules of procedure, etc., etc.

The thing that I wish to avoid, though, is to spending as much time as the GNSO on process and diverting our attention too much from policy. I know that there's need for process of course at some point but perhaps if one of those groups could work on the process for all of the groups so that not all of the groups end up writing their own charters and end up writing their own procedures it would probably help. I gather they all work on the same sort of model.

Cheryl, you have your hand up. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I think with the huge amount of work that has gone into the draft guidelines, and they will soon be official guidelines from the GNSO world – and they are guidelines, they are designed specifically to pick and choose – ALAC and either its standing or its ad-hoc work groups would be well advised to simply affect whichever parts of those from that standardized document are useful for the task at hand.

The advantage to that not only saves us time and stops us from reinventing wheels; it allows those of us who cut our teeth in our At-Large and ALAC Work Groups to understand the processes, the mechanisms and the opportunities that such guidelines offer when we work in cross-community working groups or when we join

work groups representing us based on our region or our At-Large Structure, or just our personal opinion in either the ccNSO or the GNSO, because we have tried to make those rules very, very generic. So I would be suggesting that our business today would be far less worrying about the nuances of process and more about "Does this body need to be resuscitated or not?"

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and would you have a date at which those GNSO guidelines will be finalized? Or maybe Alan, would you be able to tell us when those GNSO guidelines for working groups will be finalized?

Alan Greenberg: I think they actually were but I won't swear to that. I thought they went in place at the last meeting or a couple of meetings… If not now, almost immediately and for all intents and purposes what you see in the documents right now is either close to what the final one will be or exactly.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan, and maybe we could have a first action item for staff, which is to check if those guidelines are finalized and to obtain a copy of those for future reference – guidelines for GNSO Working Groups, whether standing working groups, etc., etc. No need to reinvent the wheel in ALAC.

Right, and so now we'll move to the first working group if there's no other comment or question? And the first one is the At-Large Engagement in ICANN, and that was… So there is a webpage associated with this which shows a description of the Working Group and the members of the Working Group. And what I suggest is perhaps quickly reading through the description and then finding out from the members – and I see several of them are sitting around this table – what has been done recently and where should this working group go.

And I see Cheryl has put her hand up. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I may be saying this a number of times in this morning's session – "needs to be mercifully put to sleep." It has been superseded by the activities of the ALAC Improvements Work Groups that have relevant in this area. It is something that of course with the post-ALAC Review and indeed after the Summit has fulfilled its useful purpose; and should we in a, I hope, bright and rosy future for future summits, general assemblies and regional summits, we would simply need to form an ad-hoc working group to manage those processes. I think this is one that needs to be mercifully euthanized.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. And just for the record I'll just read the first very short paragraph of the description of the Working Group so that we know what we might be putting to sleep, and that is: "The

goal of this working group is to find ways to improve participation of individual internet users in ICANN's policy development process and follow up on their implementation. This working group is a continuation of the At-Large Summit Working Group on At-Large's engagement in ICANN which was established prior to the At-Large Summit in Mexico City in March, 2009."

So yes, it is rather old and I haven't personally seen much going on on that working group. Has there been a – and I'm turning to staff now – so is there any working list, mailing list associated with this group by any chance? There is. And I mean I'm subscribed to all the mailing lists; I haven't seen much traffic on this at all. Sandra, Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier. I think I was the last member who joined the Working Group this spring because I became an ALAC representative in December only. Since this time there is an existing mailing list but there was no traffic at all on this mailing list. And I've seen the last report is from March, 2010. I assume the time in 2010 was more or less used with these Improvement Work Teams A, B, C, D and took the energy or the traffic from several working groups.

And I think, especially looking at the first goal of this Working Group is to find ways to improve participation of individual internet users in ICANN's developing policy processes – I think the establishment of an ICANN Academy which is on the agenda

since December could fit perfectly in this Working Group, and it might be worth thinking about to keeping this Working Group, maybe to add new members.   Maybe old members are also interested in developing a process like this.

And I know when I look at the members… I'm not sure about the Latin American representatives but I know Siva, he was a participant in the European summer school. So he could actually be a very useful member and maybe the Latin American representatives could participate as well. Just my two thoughts.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra, for your point of view. May I ask Sergio Salinas.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'm Sergio Salinas for the record. I am taking what Sandra says, and there hasn't been a lot of movement on the list lately, and I believe that one of the issues that we will have to touch on very briefly is the issue of… I'm sorry, I'm going to speak in Spanish. So I will wait until all of you put your earphones on.

Are we set? Okay, so I'm starting again. So thank you for having given me the floor, Mr. Chairman. What Sandra says is real and what Cheryl said is real as well – there hasn't been a lot of movement on the list.   I believe that it is important to start discussing a few issues.   I have found some difficulties as a

member of the community to be able to participate in teleconferences when there is no interpretation, for example, and that is what drives me away or what discourages me to find other methods to start working.

But however it does not prevent me from working on this, and perhaps interpretation should be a part of the agenda because one of the issues we find is that if there are three people that speak Spanish – which is my language – and we are two representatives, two Spanish-speaking representatives, we will never, ever have interpretations on the working groups. So I think it is an issue we will have to discuss so that we can all incorporate more Spanish-speaking people in the users' organizations in my regions to this work.

That's all for my part. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Sergio. What I was hoping is that perhaps you could say a few words about the Working Group itself, whether you think it should be kept or whether you think it should be dispensed of.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Well, I'm sure we should keep it and we should deepen our work on it. I think what we would have said it was clear, but yes, this is what I mean.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sergio, it was just to be sure that I got the message. Next is Cheryl and then Tijani afterwards. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I have to absolutely disagree with both Sandra and Sergio. There is a great danger in repurposing existing work groups because there needs to be a clear charter and a clear end to what a work group does. You can stop this work group and immediately create something that is specifically purposed to look at the matters of the Academy, and there are already issues and work groups that are looking at the matters of translation – not the least of which is the ICANN-wide policy that will be coming out.

But it is fraught with danger to repurpose an existing work group. It gets very confusing for the archive and what tends to happen is when new people come in they look at what a work group has done before and they wonder whether or not their role in this is relevant. If you do a hard stop and a fresh start, it's clear. It allows you to charter the new work group to specifically meet the very particular needs that the Academy project would have; and certainly if that was to go ahead, that would be a very important and very active operational work group.

But please, from my relatively extensive experience, all work groups unless they are labeled "standing" work groups – and they are very few and far between – need to have a clear and defined

end. It may be in time or it may be in role completed, but this one, the role has been completed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Before I give the floor to others to speak I think that Sergio Salinas would like to answer.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think Cheryl is right in certain issues. This work group, perhaps what we should do here is to deepen the terms with which the group was created. If there is no activity since March, 2010, perhaps the members should review what was done, what should be done. I mean we're not really talking about generating new issues within the group but we should deepen the work we are doing in the group, and part of that perhaps would be – perhaps this isn't the right time to mention this – the issue of interpretation. But that was just as a matter of an example, that is all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sergio. And we have a queue at the moment with Tijani first, then Wolf, and then afterwards James. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you. Put on your headphones please. I think that the participation… (interpreter getting interference) I was saying that

the participation of internet users in the development of ICANN and policies is a question, an issue that concerns all RALOs. I cannot say that today we have, we still don't have a real participation of end users in the participation in ICAN policies. We don't think it's the ideal situation yet. This Working Group's job is to find a follow-up to what has been done to see how we can improve this participation. Much remains to be done. It is not over yet.

I agree with Cheryl – the objective must be clear, we cannot change objectives. We should change working groups, this is clear to me, but the objective has not been reached yet. And the RALO leaderships can contradict me – we all have the same problems, everybody is talking about it. We have to enforce this working group, it must be more active. I think that's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Tijani. Next we go to Wolf Ludwig.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks, Olivier. I do not like to contradict Sandra, my ALAC representative, but I fully agree with Cheryl on this point. I think a working group normally has a clear mandate and it has a timeline for a mandate, and should do a defined type of work. And a working group shouldn't be a purpose for itself, just to accommodate a group of people and it's not an instrument in my understanding of community building.

Therefore I think when a temporary working group was created for a particular purpose, we should stick to this purpose and we should see whether this was done or not done, and why it couldn't be done, etc., etc. And when there is a new project or a new necessity coming up then I think it makes much more sense to create a new working group with a precise mandate and with a precise timeline; otherwise, we will have a jungle of working groups and two years later nobody can remember what was the reason for creating a working group, etc.

And I think this is a very dangerous and not too transparent, and therefore I fully agree with Cheryl. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Wolf. And next on my list is James Seng.

[break in audio]

James Seng: …we should also consider shutting down the working group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, James. And next on my list I see Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter:	Thank you, Olivier. I think Cheryl and Wolf mentioned some important things and I tend to agree to create a new working group, but then I would ask all of us to avoid having two similar working groups on engagement and participation. We should then ask ourselves if this working group needs to be on again or if we just turn to a new working group.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Sandra, and if I may say at the moment we're looking at the current working groups. I don't think there is any plan to create any new ones today. The first thing we need to do is to clean what we have onscreen so far. Next on the list is Sergio, Sergio Salinas.
Sergio Salinas Porto:	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Sergio Salinas. I was right now listening first to Cheryl and then Wolf, and what caught my attention was the fact that they talked about something that's dangerous and they didn't refer to transparency. I perhaps am very naïve on this and I don't really understand, but I think it would be important to clarify what these two issues are, these two issues that you're referring to. That's all, thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Sergio, and I see that Cheryl would like to answer this. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Sergio, the transparency aspect is actually benefited by a hard stop and a proper archive where the work of the group that has existed is clear and available. So it actually is a very transparent thing in the closing down; the process for example that James mentioned means that these things are archived, they're placed, they're searchable and they can be used as a resource.

In terms of the danger, the danger is not only having our human bandwidth… If you look at who's in most of these work groups you have very few workers doing very many things, and the issues of volunteer exhaustion need to be considered – that is a considerable danger. But the issue of what we call mission creep, or where the purpose of something just tends to snake along and change and evolve… That is a very, very dangerous thing because what that tends to do is allow the whole community to believe that something is being dealt with because of what the name of the group is or what the original charter of the group is; and in fact that very important issue is not being dealt with by anyone.

So it is important that we have activities out of work groups that are measurable and achievable and simple enough – not too complex – that they can be met and done in a timely manner. There is also nothing wrong with suspending a work group for a period of time. So once we have well-purposed work groups we can do a lot with them. If we just like Phoenixes grow new purpose out of old ashes, it's actually less transparent rather than more transparent. I hope that helps.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I see approval from Sergio. This conversation on this first Working Group is certainly taking a lot more time than I thought it was going to take, but Evan in the meantime has been looking at the history of the Working Group itself and wanted to say just a couple of words, because we were trying to establish who was the previous Chair.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks, Olivier, this is Evan. I've actually gone back into some of the documentation from the Summit to try and determine who were the people involved in the original working group - going back to them might help kick start things. Excuse me.

Unfortunately, the Chair of that Working Group – Carlton Samuels – is a little bit late coming to this meeting and I would prefer not to shut this down until hearing from him about moving forward with it. Just for the record, the members of that Working Group at that Summit were Carlton, [Dravoslava Grev], Fatimata, [Howa], Vanda, and Yaovi. And so if you want to talk about that here then perhaps this is a good time to pick this up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I see Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just for the record, and I have reported this on a number of occasions, the Wiki record is disastrously inaccurate. As Chair of the ALAC I served on every single working group that the ALAC has – every single working group that the ALAC has. So I am not listed as a member, I was not only ex-officio but active in all of them. So it is very annoying, and this is where the transparency comes in, that we actually have an opportunity to tidy these things up because on closure we can do something like "Cheryl Langdon-Orr as Chair was…" And that just happens to be affecting me and my history, but it could be you and your history in a future sense. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, my apologies. That wasn't an exhaustive list of who was in that group. That was simply a list of the authors of the final report presented to the summit, and I'm going to post the actual link to that which lists those names.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: The list may be both out of date and not the actual membership at the end, but is illustrative of the fact that almost all those people

for all intents and purposes do not exist in our environment anymore.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm not telling that to Carlton.

Alan Greenberg: I said "almost."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan, and I think that because we're taking so much time and because the last known Chair of that Working Group is not with us here, what I would suggest perhaps is to kick this one into touch until… Well, should we give it three months or two months? One month? I see "No's" from Cheryl for each one of these suggestions. Fifteen days?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Unless the existing Chair of this Work Group is planning not to join us at the ICANN Meeting #41 I would suggest this could simply be dealt with later in another session. Perhaps we may even get him into the room before this discussion completes, but we cannot constantly say "We'll deal with this in another meeting."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Point taken, thank you very much, Cheryl. And so we will speak to the last known Chair of this group before the end of the ICANN 41 Meeting here in Singapore. And now let's move to the next one, which is the At-Large Naming Issues Task Force.

[break in audio]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: …and the other one being the Special Trademark Issues Task Force. This Working Group did include some members of the group that were not ALAC members or At-Large members a priori, but who were invited to work with us and to share their thoughts and work together so as to produce a united front against the evil intellectual property people out there. And we might have to strike that from the record, the word "evil" – the *nice* intellectual property people out there. Just a laugh.

Anyway, I'm not being serious on this am I? So yes, since we have gone a lot further done the road now and our relations with the intellectual property constituency is so great that we will have a breakfast and be sharing food with them. Perhaps this group is now obsolete. I notice quite a few people nodding their heads around the table, and so if no one objects perhaps this one can be retired?

Yes, a big yes. Now, the process for retiring it is probably going to have to be something like an archival process, and this is

something which I'll leave to staff to work out. Certainly it needs to be easily available and easily found and accessed, because the last thing we want to do in two or three ICANN meetings is to create a new Naming Issues Working Group. But I see Cheryl putting her hand up, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. We did want to avoid process but I want to just interject a tiny bit of process and a suggestion as to how this can be met. I would like to propose that as a member of the ExCom and one of your vice-chairs, Olivier, I only action item with a specific staff member; and my suggestion, subject of course to more senior staff disagreeing with me, would be that Matt and I work specifically on a set of standard operational procedures for what needs to happen with this because we are looking at other issues in terms of what's happened with material and archives from the SocialText Wiki as it comes across to Confluence.

So I think we do need to have a unified approach to this, so I'm happy to own that and I would put that to the table. If anyone objects to me owning how we wind these things up in terms of the archive, the descriptors, the way things are searchable, the macros so that we can link to the lists and things so it's an easily navigable process then indicate so now. If not then I think Matt and I will own it unless someone else wants to own it with me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Is there anyone objecting to this? I see everyone is in agreement. Okay, and so that would be valid for all of the working groups, all across. Thank you very much, Cheryl, and just one small bit of advice: some of these working groups include non-members as such. Perhaps one last email explaining what is going to take place, and certainly explaining that the mailing list is closed is also something that will help certainly for the record a few years down the line so that no one decides some need to most on the list again, thinking "Why did this die?" There's nothing worse than suddenly finding oblivion.

Anyway, so this second one is definitely going. The next one is the At-Large Registrant Rights and Responsibilities. This is a topic which of course is always very hot on the agenda, isn't it, the registrants, the users, the consumer rights and responsibilities. Is that correct? So the webpage here is rather short and is a huge membership base as well, with three members.

The description of the Working Group is "Thanks to the interest of a number of community members" – of which three are listed – "this Working Group is looking at the entire scope of the RAA, Registrar Accreditation Agreement, and recommend concrete steps that should be taken to the larger At-Large community. We hope you volunteer to join the debate."

And Beau has his hand up. Oh sorry, do you mind, Alan, if- Yes, Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler:	I think we should keep this one, maybe tweak the name or something to make it reflect more forward-looking notions, but there hasn't been much traffic but there is still discussion. So I think one of the challenges of this group may be to capture what is being said about the RAA. In other words, there's a lot of discussion going on about the possibility of future RAA amendments and such, but it's not taking place necessarily among the members of this group. So I do think we need to keep it.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Beau, and before Eric, the first person on the list is Alan Greenberg.
Alan Greenberg:	I guess I respectfully disagree, but not quite for the reason. I think what Beau is talking about is a valid requirement and something that we may want to convene but under a name that applies, says what it is doing. There is an effort which will very likely start sometime soon in direct response to both a recommendation that PEDNR will be making, and hopefully approved by the Board sometime this year; and the discussions that have been held between At-Large and registrars that we want an effort to look at education, which I think is the follow-on to a list of rights and responsibilities which already has been worked on.
	I think we're more likely to get good participants if when we charter this group we put out a new call for people and treat it as a brand new thing instead of trying to revive something which may

or may not have had a life before. I think there will be need of a second group looking at RAA changes, and again, I think that one should have a more appropriate name. And given that only two of the three people that are listed on that group are still around I don't think any of them will be offended if we do a name switch and a group switch to effect that. But I think we're likely to be more effective if we do a new call under an appropriate name than try to keep a group and maybe change its name.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan. And we have a queue in operation with Eric, Wolf and then Beau. So Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. I'm certain that a group is needed to address registrant issues, both those within the RAA and prospective as we look forward. I just don't know whether or not this Work Group or any other work group is the right bucket to put that in. So I just wanted to say that something needs to be done and I don't know where to put it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric, and next is Wolf Ludwig.

Wolf Ludwig: Wolf Ludwig for the record. I would like to argue in a similar direction because this is a long-lasting issue. It came up repeatedly

EN

before the Summit, during the Summit and I just want to refer to some similar initiatives in the context of the IGF's early discussions of the Internet Bill of Rights. And this continued afterwards; there is now a dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights and Principles which came up with ten punchy principles some weeks ago, and they will submit an extensive charter for the next IGF in Nairobi.

So my concern is I think we have to follow this up. We perhaps need a larger definition, what we understand on registrants' rights. It sounds very technical and the majority of the people won't understand the purpose behind it and the idea behind it, and I think if we make it more understandable or a bit more punchy in the direction that what we mean are the basic rights and principles we would like to promote; but not reinvent something completely from scratch. We can just look around and collect good initiatives and try to adapt them in an ICANN context. I think in this direction this Working Group, old or new, is still needed and useful. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Wolf. Next on my list is Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, it doesn't necessarily matter to me or hurt my feelings if this gets re-modulated or whatever. There's really three different, at least three different groups that you could create out of this, and from my experience it's been very frustrating to try to get members

of the community involved in this. We were sort of forced into a group to get involved in discussions about registrant rights and amendments to the RAA by the GNSO, and when we started bringing up things like registrants' rights or internet bills of rights or whatever the registrar community, from my recollection, looked at us as if we were from the moon and just didn't want to engage.

So there probably needs to be a technical group or a group that has a more technical mandate that's focused on the RAA; one that's more focused on, as Wolf says, a punchier thing that could bring more people under the tent and maybe harmonize with IGF and be outside the realm of just the accreditation contracts; and probably even a third. So I will volunteer here in Singapore if anybody wants to talk about it to come up with "Here's what we think needs to be done with this." So I'm happy to do that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Beau, and on my queue at the moment next is Cheryl, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Well, it shows on the screen as being you first. Okay, then Evan, Evan Leibovitch first.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi. As one of the other two of the two remaining people in that group that are on the list, I just want to add to what Beau was saying. We were both in the room at the same time. We were the only people involved in the registrant At-Large community in a room full of a bunch of people discussing the RAA, and we were

effectively pilloried by daring to suggest that there might be rights for registrants. Alan, you were there too.

But essentially what came out of that was two different issues, one of which was identifying what rights exist in existing documents, but the other one was being more assertive in trying to create something like a rights document that rather than being obscure and difficult and technical it would actually be written in plain language – easy for people to understand, and easy for ICANN to try and embed into its own operations – that would assert what registrants were entitled to.

And so one of these is an educational process that the registrars didn't have a problem with; the other, one I believe to me insultingly, called "aspirational rights," which was basically tossed off into Never-Never Land. This particular Working Group has seen its work evolve but it's actually gone in two different directions from what I can tell more recently, one of which has been into the consumer work and the consumer constituency work that Beau's been involved with, especially creating a new constituency in GNSO.

I can also say that it was one of the subjects brought up at the first meeting of the Future Challenges Working Group that was set up as a matter of ALAC and At-Large being proactive in asserting registrant rights that may not already be existing. And so the issue has not gone away. Whether or not it's functional within this Working Group though is open to challenge.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Evan, and next on the list is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I was going to propose, I still am going to propose what I think is a model for how we manage this. This is one of those where I think we do need a specific RAA in its technical terms – Wolf, I do recognize it's a little bit unfriendly and hard to sell – work group space because there is real nitty gritty contract-type issues that in the future we know we will have to deal with.

So this is not one that I'm asking to be euthanized. It probably needs to sit with a watching brief, but we do need and we've heard identified around the table, to have a clear nexus with what's happening in the GNSO community, with consumer interests more formally going in that line when – fingers crossed for the consumer constituency obviously there. But we also need to recognize that there is new work that is going to come out specifically for our attention as well as the larger internet ecosystem things which clearly we will want to have an activity in.

Now, the new work that will be probably coming out even at this meeting will be specific to the Board request on definitions and discussions on metric, on things like consumer trust and the measurement of consumer trust and things. So we have I think quite intelligently once created something called the ALAC

Consumer Commons space, which was designed to be open and inclusive and allow a sandbox for all sorts of things, including bills of rights out of the Summit discussions in Mexico to be worked on.

Please do not, unless you want to be as depressed as I am now looking at it, go to the link on the Confluence Wiki page because oh my, Matt, that's a disaster I didn't know about. But I do think we can use that Consumer Commons as the portal which we then link off the specific work group activities. So if you're interested in the more specific freedom issue, rights to speak, rights to have internet, things that'll go into the IGF world we have a place and space linked off it for that. If you're into the nuances of the contractual arrangements, etc., we have a space linked off for that, and we also have a space that acts as a clear coordination point between what happens in the GNSO and indeed the ccNSO on consumer and registrant matters.

So I'd like to say keep it but we need to probably relook at finding almost a portal model for the matters that are registrant and consumer or end-user based. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and next in the queue is Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: I've got to leave in a minute but this seems to be an appropriate time, because over the last few minutes we've brought up two

issues which I think are important if we're going to have any success in working groups; and one of them is, Evan alluded to it, that this group has had a number of different mandates – some self-imposed, some created for it – and changing what you're doing halfway along without actually formally making it clear is always going to be problematic. And I think we need to be really clear, and that goes back to clear charters and clear endpoints and not being afraid to dissolve a group and create a new one.

And the second is the absolute difficulty we have had in recruiting people to participate in these working groups. It is so easy to get everyone around the room saying "Yay! Yay! We really need this! This is an important issue!" and then you ask for who's going to actively participate, not just sign up on the mailing list, and nobody puts up their hand. And if we cannot fix that problem why bother going through all this work?

But I have the scars from PEDNR; Evan talked about them from this particular group and there are a number of other ones. If we can't get active participation – and yes, some of these things are technical. People are going to have to work to get up to speed and to understand the issues. Sorry, you signed up for this. If we can't get people to do this on a regular basis, both the people around this table and the other people in our RALOs then let's just admit defeat and go home. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much for these words of wisdom, Alan. Cheryl, you have your hand up in the Adobe Connect? It is supposed to be down? Thank you.

I think hearing the debate that is going on it appears that the At-Large Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities Group is something that needs to remain. I do have to remind everyone that we are here because we are here to defend the interests of the internet end user, and if we cannot do this Alan is absolutely right – we just have to pack our bags and go home, and perhaps first have a tour of Singapore, but the funding will probably not be arriving for the next meeting which is due to take place in Dakar. So I would imagine that we need to keep this absolutely but we do need to revive it.

I have personally written and sent a couple of questions to the discussion list and had absolutely no response whatsoever, although there is very important work coming up. There is actually a meeting that is going to take place here in Singapore specifically launching some work that was asked for by the Board on defining metrics, consumer metrics, etc., so we need to be more involved.

What I would like to perhaps have now is to have a Chair for this group, because I don't see any Chair, and as James said earlier "We need a champion" for each one of those groups. We need someone who is able to lead it and to rally support, and to then bring it forward to do some work and engage in the whole process.

And Beau, you see me looking in your direction. I'm really sorry. Perhaps the microphone is pointing to you.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I was worried that was just some sort of line of sight problem there. Yeah, that's fine, that's fine but I would like to just reiterate what's been said over and over again. The RAA is just not a topic that seems to attract any passion and it's difficult for me to understand that, and I've had this argument with people in the NCUC and CSG who don't want to get involved with it either very much. I mean this is the crux of where registrants… Well, this is really the legal binding material that can be used to influence the behavior of the registrar community, and why we're not more focused on it I don't understand.

But if we can move forward from that and get some people involved that would be great, so yeah, I agree. I will be Chairman.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Beau, and if I could just share my thoughts on the RAA – it's a highly technical document in nature and maybe many people feel totally put off by what's in there which sometimes is difficult for people to understand because there are a lot of legal matters related inside it. Beau?

Beau Brendler: Just to make this point very quickly – it wasn't until we were basically forced into the GNSO Work Group configuration on the

RAA that there was even a translation of the RAA done. We had to demand that ICANN Legal translate the document into something everybody could read in English, then we had to demand it be translated into French and Spanish. So it's heavy going.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And has this been done, Beau, so far?

Beau Brendler: In bits and pieces. Margie Milam has been working on it and she's been doing a relatively good job but I think it's a matter of resources. So can I point you right now to a version of the RAA that's written in comprehensible language? No.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Beau. And we do have Cintra and then we'll have Cheryl. Cintra Sooknanan.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Olivier. I just want to express my support for this working group and I would be happy to join both Evan and Beau. And if we choose to meet sometime soon we better start. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cintra, and I note for the record that both Evan and Beau have jumped from their seats and put their hands up in happiness – first success of the day. We have Cheryl in the queue and then afterwards we'll have Evan. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I would like to suggest that this particular work group and the nature of the work it needs to do is one that lends itself to be, as all our work groups are open, but informally if not formally a cross-community style of working group. And I wondered if whether we might ask the now-Chair to consider whether having a co-chair selected from someone in the friendly side of the GNSO community to this might be worthwhile exploring; just so we make sure there is a minimal risk of duplication of work or whatever.

I think perhaps we may find when we do the Consumer Trust Workshop that a natural fit might percolate to the top, but I think we might need to have a placeholder for a co-chair that brings in that GNSO-style of voice, because the RAA firmly belongs in their paddock. So I think I'd like to have someone who's got the ability, whether that's a role or a person I don't mind but it could be worthwhile. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and next in the queue is Evan Leibovitch.

EN

Evan Leibovitch:	I was just going to ask what role if any the Future Challenges Working Group is to have in this, and I mention this only because the idea of asserting rights for end users and registrants as a proactive activity was identified very early on as something that ICANN should be involved in. And in fact, the Working Group asserted that that is a priority, so I don't know to what effect that working group has in effect, or do we just instruct to that "Okay, there's already something done for that purpose"?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Evan. I think you might have meant that At-Large was involved in, rather than ICANN being involved in rights.
Evan Leibovitch:	So sorry. ICANN's not.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Eric Brunner-Williams.
Eric Brunner-Williams:	Thank you, Olivier. I used the Adobe Connect about five minutes ago to raise my hand and so that apparently is not being seen, or I have an independent view of the universe which says I'm in charge of it and it really isn't actually true except on my laptop.

About five minutes ago when Beau started speaking about the RAA I thought "Well, gosh, I've been doing this on the registrar side and on the registry side now for about nine years, so I guess I should stick up my hand and say 'Yes, I'm willing to be a [stucky] as well."

But I don't want us to go down the path of thinking that the GNSO is ICANN and that end users are registrants or registrants are end users, and that completes the universe of what end use means. So as important as the contracted parties' view of the world is and our view of the rights of the parties that enter into contracts with the contracted parties is for the benefit of those end users, that's not the whole story.

And we need to somehow – not necessarily in the RAA-centered group – deal with everything else which isn't necessarily registrants, isn't necessarily generic domain names. It might be addressing accessibility, it might be routing accessibility, it might be stability of the internet, etc., etc. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric, and I see applause and approval from several members around the table. Apologies for not having noticed you in the room. I am switching between screens so it is sometimes hard to see what's behind the other screen.

Just to suggest something, and I think we've heard quite wide approval to keep this group, though perhaps a wider consumer sandbox is something that is required, and this group would

certainly fall within a wider consumer sandbox – consumer and maybe even a "user" sandbox perhaps is the important word there. Certainly there is registrant, consumer, user – the user is all of that. And so I think, Beau, you'll have to push forward for that.

I wish to move forward with the groups but I hope that you have enough direction, Beau, to take this further, and hopefully you will be able to get more members here. I would suggest that perhaps you speak to people whilst they're here in Singapore around the table. It's an extremely important thing. Maybe in ICANN we're always being told "Well, this is not something that's important," but certainly in travelling internet governance forums outside of the ICANN space the first thing that I hear is that the end user is not having a very nice deal with what's being offered to it; and certainly there are concerns about that.

So I think it's something which definitely will improve not only the legitimacy of At-Large as a whole but also the legitimacy of ICANN as not being just a registrar/registry industry association, but a forum location in which everyone is listened to – multi-stakeholder. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier. I'm glad that we finally have at least one of the working groups moving forward, but with this I'm interested to go back to what we discussed early in the session. Do we want to sort of put back a formal charter and have it move forward that

way? We also talked about sort of using or adopting some of the GNSO Working Group guidelines.

I actually want to point out one more thing, which is that usually I think GNSO Working Groups are more ad-hoc based if you will, or sort of issues-based, and here we're really talking about a standing working group this set. So as we go through we need to put that in mind as well. Different issues might come and go on a particular issue, and we're talking about a set of standing At-Large Working Groups here. I see that further below there are ad-hoc working groups, so there might be some difference between the two, but in general it's two questions: one, do we sort of work on an actually more-formal charter; the other is the working style of a standing working group. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Edmon. So that's just an add-on to what was being said earlier, yes. Cheryl? Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Edmon, I think what you raise is very, very important, and I think those that we decide to continue either on life support or in fully fledged energetic mode do need to have some standardization looked at with their chartering and things. But I think we can probably capture that as a next step and work specifically with the group that is formed.

For example, there's something to be said for some styles of charter to be created by the chartering organization for certain groups, and there's something to be said for self-determination in others, and we probably need to as a group look at that but probably after we do this section. And I am all for ad-hoc working groups where possible. This is why I've got a fairly hard line on the survival of the fixed ones. They really need to be long-view, purpose built things, and consumer issues are clearly going to be a long view so this one I'm comfortable with. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Edmon Chung?

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier, just a short- I probably am tangenting off but as we talk about these standing working groups I wonder is there staff support and those kinds of things? How do they work into these working groups?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Staff support? Sorry, that was a rhetorical question. The current status of staff support in At-Large is that we are short of staff, and so the working groups are effectively enjoying the great help of our colleagues who are sitting here who are basically doing everything else as well, plus the support for the working groups. Unfortunately, we're not allowed the ability to have specific support for the specific groups at this very moment, but they are

doing their best and they've done very well so far. Perhaps in the future, hopefully not so distant, we will be able to allocate specific staff support for specific working groups. Hear, hear!

Edmon Chung: Sorry, but I guess the point is that as we think about which ones to keep as standing working groups that the resource issue we want to keep in mind as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, you're absolutely right, Edmon. And just to say I guess at the moment it probably would be Seth who would be providing any direct support for the working groups. Cintra, Cintra Sooknanan.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Olivier. Just going back to Cheryl's point on maybe having the GNSO join the last working group that we were discussing, in this way we can pool our staff support. So it's another mechanism of really not stretching our staff. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cintra, and for the record Carlton Samuels has also joined us. Welcome Carlton, oh, and Michele Neylon. Welcome Michele. Bienvenu! Okay, I do realize we're running late but we did start late so I would suggest that we would finish about 15 minutes late. We should really move onto the next working group.

We have an action item for the Registrant Rights and Responsibilities one, and so the Future Structure, Accountability and Transparency of ICANN is the next Working Group. And I do note that just below that there is also an At-Large Working Group on Future Challenges, which is the newly-born working group in At-Large. I believe that those two have the common word "future," and that the first one is the grandparent and the next one is the successor.

If I could open the floor to discussions… We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr as numero uno discussion, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, and I know I am going to jump in on a lot of these so just get used to it really. No, this is one of those which clearly has outgrown its usefulness as far as I'm concerned. At least the Future Challenges Working Group would be doing very much more appropriate work in this area, and we need to recognize the date and time and environment where this particular work group was put together.

It was put together in a JPA environment, not a post-AOC environment. In fact, for the record I'll make sure that that's easy to understand. This was created in the days when the joint project agreement between NTIA and ICANN was still even under discussion. We have since then gone done a pathway that has taken to something called the Affirmation of Commitments, and hardwired into the Affirmation of Commitments are very specific

requirements on ICANN on the matters of accountability and transparency.

I would like to think that the activities up to and including and around the At-Large Summit in Mexico and the brilliant work that this group did has not played an in any way small part in things like accountability and transparency taking the very important role it does in the Affirmation of Commitments, and I think in the closing of this one – which is what I am proposing – we should probably make sure that any archive is linked to the current activities of ATRT and the AOC so that someone looking at it and tracking through the history of what we have done can see where it has filtered into what is now an ICANN-wide issue, not just one for us. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. You did take quite a few words out of my mouth, but we'll open the floor for more comments or questions or suggestions. Wolf Ludwig.

Wolf Ludwig: Thanks, Olivier. I just wanted to repeat: we had a General Assembly in May in Belgrade, and at this point it was brought up by Wolfgang Kleinwaechter that there was a remarkable Summit declaration submitted at the end, handed over to the former CEO and ongoing Chair. And Wolfgang said he was partly missing a stronger   follow-up   from   the   At-Large   side   of   the

recommendations, the very useful recommendation we submitted in the Summit declaration.

And this was kind of an historical document and we shouldn't just put this onto the shelves and into the archives. It would be worth looking into it again and having an idea of what we could use for our future work and what we should push forward; that it will not stay an historical document but to recall it and to refill it into our work process. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Wolf, a very important suggestion. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and this is really a right of reply on that. I think it's interesting because what is missing in that observation is the very important fact that the ATRT, the very large community-based review, used the At-Large Summit declaration as part of its founding resources.

So it actually did play a very important role, and I think what we need to ensure is as we archive this material the really important bits like those declarations and the declarations on a number of topics, are left at the top of the tree so that they're easily accessed; and that we do take the time to make sure we have our history well recorded. So point well taken and we need to make sure that does occur. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Cheryl. Any other comments or questions or…perhaps Eric Brunner-Williams.

| Eric Brunner-Williams: | Thank you, Olivier; Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript. I noticed when looking down from this one, the Future Structure, Accountability and Transparency of ICANN Working Group, to the At-Large Working Group on Future Challenges and to the remaining list of working groups – I don't any actual existing bucket for accountability and transparency as an ongoing issue, and I hope that there is one. Thank you. |

| Olivier Crépin-Leblond: | Thank you, Eric, and may I ask whether you think the At-Large Work Group on Future Challenges is perhaps the right home for this? |

| Wolf Ludwig: | Quick remark – I think it's not a future challenge. It's an ongoing challenge. Thank you. |

| Olivier Crépin-Leblond: | Okay, thank you. So any other comments or questions? Perhaps not. Well, I propose therefore that we close that working group, and that we acknowledge perhaps with a round of applause the great work that it has done. I think it's quite incredible. |

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And so it should go into archival process, but it should certainly not only go into archival process but be linked to the At-Large work on future or current challenges which I think is extremely important; the big concern being that the new working group might be reinventing the wheel that the old working group has gone through. So certainly perhaps another action item that would be sent to the chairs of the At-Large Working Group on Future Challenges is that they study or they get their membership to study the work that the Future Structure, Accountability and Transparency of ICANN Working Group has done.

There being no objections around the table I think we can then move to the next working group which is the At-Large Working Group on Future Challenges, and this being a new working group I think we can then move straight to the next one, which is the IDN Policy Working Group. I do realize we are running out of time so we will need to speed our discussions a little bit more.

The At-Large IDN Policy also has no description but I do see that we have Edmon Chung who happens to be just a couple of seats away from me, and perhaps, Edmon, you could say a few words on this. Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung:	That's the IDN Policy. Actually I didn't even know that it existed, so it's probably my bad. I clicked through and it says that it's based on regional representatives so I probably was added on when I joined the ALAC earlier on. But I think in general the question really is whether we want this as a standing committee or a standing working group. I'm sure there are lots of IDN issues that will come and go over the years, so my general feeling at this point – unless people are crazy about this – you very rarely would hear me say that an IDN working group is not to be done but I think ad-hoc working groups as these issues come up might be more appropriate than a standing one.
	And in terms of being an IDN liaison, I do provide the monthly updates as reports back to the ALAC, so that probably should work and then we would use ad-hoc working groups. I see a lot of hands.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Edmon. First one in the list is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Then we'll have Wolf Ludwig; then we'll have – and I'm not sure whether it was Mohamed or Oksana who put their hand up first. We'll do ladies first so Oksana and then Mohamed – sorry, Mohamed. Cheryl?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you very much, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. When you look at the documents, Edmon, that sit under the IDN Policy Work Group they are archival of the output from both

previous and current liaisons, or in the case of some cases where you were liaison but were compromised by being in the work group – for example, work that James has done. So I wholeheartedly agree with you. I think it's actually a bucket where we have put things conveniently.

It clearly needs to live under the IDN liaison's control, but I think you should be able to form ad-hoc working groups to meet need, and we need to just tidy up the nature of how we're currently recording the history which seems to be as documents for this work group. Perhaps that needs to be looked at, and in this case you might need to work directly with Matt to make sure it's looking how you want it to be archived and sourced and resourced. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and Eric, you have put your hand up in the room. Do you have an idea where you fitted in the list of people putting their hands up physically as well? No? I'll append you to the whole list. Okay, next on the list is Wolf, Wolf Ludwig.

Wolf Ludwig: Well, I had just wanted to suggest Oksana for this working group because she's working since quite some time on the Cyrillic issues and I think she would perfectly fit into this working group from EURALO. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Wolf. And in fact, Oksana is next on the list. Oksana, Oksana Prykhodko.
Oksana Prykhodko:	Thank you very much. As Wolf said, all I would like to say is I participated yesterday in the working group, ICANN Working Group of IDN and I would like to join your group. Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Oksana. Edmon, you wanted to reply to some of these comments? Edmon Chung.
Edmon Chung:	I just want to be clear – I actually suggested closing it down in favor of ad-hoc working groups; where, for example, the IDN variants become an issue that At-Large wants to put a statement forward, then we would create it. I guess what I'm not sure of is whether you think we should have a standing working group to continue.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, Edmon. We'll find out. Let's continue the discussion. Mohamed El Bashir.
Mohamed El Bashir:	Thank you. I think we need to have a standing committee although IDN issues come and go, but there's lots of work on IDNs within

different constituencies. ccNSO has working groups, GNSO has working groups, there is a joint working group – so we need to have a group within ALAC that looks at those different working groups and tries to consolidate all that. Yes, the role of the liaison is important in leading, but also a community membership representing and working within IDNs – that's very important.

For example, yesterday there was the IDN Variants teams had met. At this table there were three people present on different teams – I was on the Arabic team, Edmon you were on the Chinese team and Oksana on the Cyrillic, so it would be good to group all those comments in a group. So I think it's important for this group to continue. The liaison could be leading the work overall in the IDN area.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Mohamed. Next on the list is Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier. I just would like to support the previous idea because I'm not involved into IDN issues but I would love to be informed from a general working group regularly about all those different issues which are going on somewhere.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra, and next is Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript record. There are times when I have to say things which are personally embarrassing – this is one of them. I started working on internationalizing operating systems in 1986 and I've been working in this area technically, professionally, for about one out of every three years ever since then. I kind of exist in a minority of one community within ICANN. I think our conception of IDN is limited to a very simple notion of what the technical challenges are, and basically Tina Dam has sort of formed the conception that the community has of what internationalization means for internet users; even just users of A-label text records.

This has resulted in some excessive siloization, so people think that Cyrillic is somehow distinct from other script issues, or that variants are well, some curious property of one script and unrelated to curious properties of other scripts. Where this shows up now currently is we have these six siloed activities which I do have to say I am glad to see the ownership of the variants issues in scripts is being now undertaken by communities other than primarily ASCII-based North Americans. That's a real improvement, that we have policy development even if it's merely technical policy development, but policy development taking place in Asia, policy development taking place in Eastern Europe.

This is a real win, because having it all done out of Mountain View is really not the right thing to do even though I've been doing that for the past 30 years. I don't think that the ad-hoc approach is the

correct one because I think that it tends to cause us to isolate issues and siloize them. Again, to pick a current nit: both Farsi and Arabic share a script created by the Unicode people over the objections of just about everybody I think who speaks Farsi or Arabic, but that's neither here nor there – that's what we're stuck with. But the people who are working on Arabic script who are Arab speakers don't know what the issues are for the Farsi speakers who use the same script; and this applies as well to the Indonesians who use another completely different language but write it also in Arabic script.

So my recommendation is that we consciously choose to have a permanent working group on linguistic issues and that we don't unconsciously continue to import this model of IDN as defined by the frankly not-very-well-informed people who set us down this path several years ago, who are primarily Anglophones with ASCII backgrounds. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric, and Edmon, would you be able to comment on this please and on all of what you've heard?

Edmon Chung: Thank you. I'm actually very pleasantly surprised. For many years I've been working on IDNs – usually I bring it up and most people want to shut it down, but this time I'm suggesting shutting it down and everybody's putting their foot up and saying that we want to keep it. So I'm excited, yeah, I'm excited about it and let's

get some work done. And I'm happy to help maybe put a formal charter together and put some structure around this so that we can have a standing working group to talk about this. And if ad-hoc issues come up we can always create ad-hoc working groups for specific issues.

On one item that Eric mentioned, I think it's definitely interesting. We take a look at it on a more linguistic side of issues, so definitely that should be incorporated into our refreshed charter. And I'm happy to sort of take the lead in getting it together. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay Edmon, thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I'm very comfortable with it being the shift back to what I'm seeing as a support mechanism for the diversity that really is IDNs. We only have a single position for an IDN liaison, and unless we get some very rare individuals in the future they're probably going to have an experience that is somewhat limited to their own script world. And so having a network that you can directly draw on to make sure the diversity of interests is there, and the coming and going of membership of that group would change, I think I'm very, very comfortable with that. But yeah, the charter needs to be matted out. So yeah, good direction, happy with it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Eric Brunner-Williams please.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Olivier; Eric Brunner-Williams again.   I forgot to mention in my litany or diatribe of a moment ago that one issue that came up during the Joint Application Support Working Group, which was tremendously on point I think but not the usual notion of IDN, was that we were suddenly aware that there were applicants for whom a single text label was inadequate.

And so to provide one of the canonical examples that I've used in that working group so that everyone will sort of know where I'm coming from, in India there are 22 languages which are used by government, and 11 scripts in which those 22 languages are written. As a hypothetical, there could be an applicant for some pan-South Asian community of interests that would need more than one text label as an applicant.

Now, independent of whether or not ICANN's charge for this is one price for 22 labels or 22 prices for 22 labels, there is the point that the concept of an applicant or the concept of a registry has thus far been entirely monolingual, mono-character set, and we have not really reached into this with the exception of the [SCTC] equivalents for China, which has been looking at and asking for a means to an alias or to have parallel names spaces in the DNS so that a registration for something and a registration for something else could both point to the same underlying resource.

EN

So this is an instance of a need that is really not about variations within a character set or IDNs as some exotic thing, but really a necessity that some community has to use two words instead of one as the organizing principle for their name space. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric. So it appears that we will be keeping this working group open as an ongoing working group, but perhaps an ongoing sandbox for all issues to deal with IDNs – with linguistics, with issues that are certainly very real out there. If I can ask that perhaps, Edmon, you continue with taking the lead on these issues and perhaps connect with the other members who have spoken today. Certainly we seem to have members from each linguistic part of the world so that's a really great start, so great.

Any comments or can we move to the next?

Edmon Chung: Just a quick comment – this is Edmon again. Thank you for all the volunteering work and I'll follow up with you on that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So an action item, Edmon, is for you to follow up and that's formally set into the record. Thank you.

So now the next one is the New gTLDs Working Group – apparently there are new gTLDs being created at some point so we hear, and so there is a Working Group that is in place which has

Singapore
no.41
18-24 June
ICANN
2011

started since 1st of November, 2007, when the ICANN Board approved the New gTLD Policy agreed by the GNSO, which seems to be quite a few years ago. And Cheryl Langdon-Orr would like to comment on this please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I think it's a silly thing to review something that we're unsure about its exact end date of its needs, so this one should be left untouched until such time as we know where we are in the greater scheme of things. Once we know where we are in the greater scheme of things then that's an appropriate review point.

And it may shift from a standing to an ad-hoc or it may need to go, as I suspect I would be arguing for it to go into a period of on-hold because we do know that there are particular review points and there will be requirements to tweak any Applicant Guidebook and various things. So I think this is one that is going to need to stay, and stay probably longer than just the go live of the gTLDs. I think it'll probably need to be there for the next round or two of new gTLDs. So I'd be leaving this one alone, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I think that you've made a pretty good statement in favor of keeping it, and due to the lack of time I believe that we can probably just all unanimously say "Yes."

EN

Let's keep that one and move on to the next one, which is the Technical Issues Working Group that deals specifically with technical issues. And Cheryl, you have put your hand up. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. This is a work group which was only recently repurposed, has been in fact blended from a number of other activities. I think it is far too early to be doing a second review. I would put this in the leave it alone pile.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl, and I totally agree with you. It certainly has blended quite a few other working groups and certainly technical issues are an important part of our work.

The next one is the WHOIS Policy Working Group. And Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record and perhaps some of you might be getting a hint that I have a highly motivated and vested interest in the activities of the work group, in work groups in ALAC and At-Large. We are well aware that WHOIS Policy is under the current Affirmation of Commitments Review Team activities; we are aware of upcoming projects and surveys and analyses being done in the GNSO on this matter. It

probably needs to be properly chartered and reorganized in a way that its leadership feels is more effective but I would be definitely keeping this one.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and in the queue is Beau Brendler next.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I think we should keep this one, but it strikes me it's very similar to the RAA one in the fact that there's a bunch of different spokes and hubs and directions, and this is being discussed in all different parts of the ICANN community, so the challenge for it is going to be trying to connect all those things and be relevant. But I for one would like to add my name to this one to help out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Beau. Are you suggesting that it might be blended with the other one?

Beau Brendler: I don't think blended. I'm just sort of saying that there's a lot of WHOIS policy discussion going on at the GNSO level, there's some going on at the privacy level among people in the NCSG and NCUC, and it's one of those things that touches many different mechanisms of what's going on within ICANN. But it doesn't necessarily have, because it's a thorny issue and a frustrating one

for many people I just think there'll be a challenge to try to get all the different spokes connected. So I'm not suggesting it be combined.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Beau, and next on the queue is Carlton Samuels.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair, Carlton Samuels for the record. I certainly am happy to see that there is confirmation that we keep this working group. The challenge as Beau pointed out is the many spokes that come to this group, and so the way to address that challenge is to have more persons involved from the different areas of need and interest – for example, the privacy interest is very vocal but in terms of the work group workload you don't get a lot of interest at that level. I can tell you that so far as I know it's been myself and Garth Bruen mostly in this Work Group.

And so I certainly endorse the co-chair's command that it needs to be kept, particularly the notes she makes of why it should be; and certainly in Beau's case, because it has so many spokes going through. The way to address it is to have more of the different interests involved in the work group. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. To that end I just wanted to note that in the chat space in the Adobe Connect room I sent, and I'd like for the permanent record, that "Perhaps the WHOIS Work Group is another of those areas of activity which we should be encouraging people to access from the Consumer Commons Space as well" because it does allow us to have that interface with other parts of the ICANN community. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, and because we are running out of time we might have to move on. But if I may ask as an action item that Carlton, as someone who has been leading some of the discussions on the WHOIS Working Group, may you perhaps liaise during the course of the week with other members here to try and drum up more support and certainly get more done on that so as to revive this group?

The next one is the ALAC Subcommittee on Finance and Budget, and I think that there is no question of removing that. We need to keep this.

And then we have three ad-hoc At-Large Working Groups, and perhaps these three can be treated together: the first one being At-Large IRT Process, the next one being the Applicant Guidebook Alternate Text Drafting Team, and the next one being the

ccNSO/At-Large Coordination. And Cheryl Langdon-Orr has put her hand up. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Before you move to the ad-hoc working groups may we take the advantage of informing the Chair of the Futures, the very first work group that we dealt with, now that Carlton is in the room – the At-Large Engagement in ICANN? It was proposed and discussed in your absence, Carlton, that that be closed because it has run its course, appropriately archived and there are other work groups that now take that up. That action was not put to the table in your absence but it would be lovely if you could give us your opinion on wrapping that one up, because then we could finish with all of our standing work groups discussion. Go ahead, Carlton.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Please, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair. Yes, Cheryl, I would agree, concur that the Work Group be wrapped up. I think that some elements as you say have passed into other areas and it's definitely one that the threads are there; they are now connected in other areas, and I think we can close this one and move to that Futures Work Group. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record yet again, but that's okay – just get used to it. To your question on the ad-hoc working groups being dealt with as a group, may I suggest that as the ALAC liaison to the ccNSO, I am moving to this table that that ad-hoc work group be formally closed at this meeting at this time?

The product of that work in fact now needs to be used and worked on but it does not need an ad-hoc working group to do it, and in fact it might end up being utilized with work that we do in the future with the Government Advisory Committee as well. So it would need to have a new, open and different ad-hoc space to operate in, so I move that that one be closed. I am unsure whether the others would be of that opinion, but that one – please close.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Any objections to closing that one – the ccNSO/At-Large Coordination? I see no objections so that will have to be archived and going through the whole process, so as for the archives to be easily reachable.   Perhaps working backwards, the Applicant Guidebook Alternate Text Drafting Team, the AGAT, may I ask Evan to say a few words please?

Evan Leibovitch:	Yes, this ad-hoc work group was created in anticipation that there might be a very short-term need to redraft text on the Applicant Guidebook based on issues and circumstances that were happening. That group was essentially put on hold when the current GAC/Board dynamic came into play regarding this, and so this working group has sort of gone into the same kind of holding pattern that was discussed about the gTLD Working Group.
	I'm going to suggest not disbanding it at this moment until the issue totally goes away, but I would say as of right now I guess deep freeze would be the best way to describe it – possibly to be thawed out if necessary but possibly, depending on how things go, to be disbanded at a future date. Right now I'm just not sure what direction it will go – that's being governed by other circumstances.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Evan, and next in the queue is Eric Brunner-William. And whilst I give the floor to Eric, may I also remind At-Large staff not to give microphones to speakers, because if you do allow people to speak then it turns into a mic and then it messes up the order, and sometimes the mic also disappears – and so I can't see who's put their hand up. Eric?
Eric Brunner-Williams:	Thank you, Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. I've been waiting for the Alternate Text Drafting Group to actually kickoff and do some work because I have the impression that there is a substantial amount of text that could be substituted in the existing

Applicant Guidebook to resolve issues – both those where there is conflict between the GAC and the Board, but also areas where the absence of a public interest actor with the public interest charter within the GNSO as a policy-originating body has led to text which fails to reflect the public interest, or as much public interest as it could.

So I'm actually speaking in disagreement with both Cheryl and Evan here. I don't think this should be mothballed or frozen or something; I think actually that it is reasonable to suggest improvements to text and not merely restrict ourselves to the public comments period as each DAG comes out, but as an Advisory Committee or an advisory group to the Board, to provide alternate texts and rationales for the alternate texts on an ongoing basis.

Additionally, while we don't actually know how long it'll take to get a final Applicant Guidebook for the 2011 or '12 round, there is also the next round to consider as well. So I would like to see this not killed or frozen or put to sleep or ignored or whatever. I think actually this should be something that does have ongoing work product to generate. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric. Evan, you wish to add?

Evan Leibovitch:	Eric, this is Evan Leibovitch for the record. I would welcome this wholeheartedly then, and if there's a need being seen to start things up at this point, with the help of yourself and I know, Cintra, you've mentioned interest in this – there's certainly other people that would take an interest. Some of the attention and energy from people has been taken up by the JAS work which has sucked up an enormous amount of time as everyone knows, but that doesn't mean that there's things that are not JAS-related in the Applicant Guidebook need to be looked after. If the volunteer resources exist to examine those other areas I'd be the first to stand up and applaud attempts to work on them.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Evan, and sorry, I'm trying to move through quite quickly now. We are outrageously over time. This group is therefore kept for the time being, and the last one is the At-Large IRT Process, which when looking at the webpage has no members which is interesting – I'm not quite sure how that would work. Can anyone say anything about the IRT Process Working Group? Alan Greenberg. Perhaps not.
	Okay, well not saying anything might be also for the record, and of course I turn over to Cheryl as someone who has something to say about every single working group. Here's Cheryl Langdon-Orr.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Oh, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record and, Olivier, you have no idea. I actually exercise self-control – I could say a lot more about

many more things so be very, very careful what you wish for. I think the IRT Process Working Group has run its course. Should it need to be resuscitated at some point in time it would be a simple matter then to do so. The sheer lack of recognition of what on Earth it's meant to do around the table probably indicates that as an ad-hoc working group it was improperly chartered and certainly not properly archived. So unless anyone objects I think that one should be put to sleep and archived.

While I have the microphone, we are not, I assume Mr. Chairman, going to deal with the cross-constituency working groups because they are outside of our purview. But could we note for the record that there is a necessary action item to get that list up to date because it is woefully not up to date?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and yes – action item which I gather staff is writing down, or will be listening to when they will be listening to the recording to put that list up to date. Cross-constituency working groups needs to be made up to date. Alan, Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Now that I remember what it is, I think this is one that we should have some sort of little button made or something to identify how good we have been about managing our work groups, given that that one has been functionally defunct for over two years now and is still on the books.

EN

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Alan, so definitely no round of applause for this one. Right, I think we have gone through our list. We are running outrageously late. What I would suggest is we close this session and that we have a five-minute break for everyone to go and grab coffees and for our next invitees to take position in the meantime. Thank you very much.

And if I may ask to speak to the Secretariats or leadership of RALOs in these five minutes it would be great. Thank you.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, welcome back. May I ask everyone to take their seats please? And may I also ask staff to update the pages because we're way on the cross-constituency working groups on one side and the other side, although fantastic and looking very nice, is not what we're going to be talking about right now. It might be more productive, yeah, who knows?

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay ladies and gentlemen. We're running half an hour late. It's 11:37 and we're now going into the second part of our ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session. The next part of our discussion is having a visit by several people, and the first person who is currently visiting us is not Akram Atallah as written on our schedule, but it's actual Juan Ojeda who works with Akram. And you're the Finance Controller, aren't you?

So the discussion is going to be about finance, strangely enough, and the discussion I think will focus primarily on our requests which we have made to Finance and which have not been, for the majority of them been granted, unfortunately. The process by which Finance has implemented, has run this year is definitely a process which I think everyone will agree has improved enormously when one considers it with previous years; and in fact, the At-Large Advisory Committee has released a statement yesterday I believe, on the 17th, with regards to the Finance FY '12 framework.

I'm not sure whether you have read it, Juan, but there is certainly an acknowledgement of an improvement in the process; but at the same time there is a deep disappointment with regards to some of the choices which were made for the actual financing of ALAC operations and ALAC projects, or At-Large projects should I say – actually the wider At-Large. And I see nods of approval from people around the table.

There are two things we can do. The first thing I think that I would suggest is perhaps going through quickly in the next five, ten

minutes, going quickly through the funding which was approved and which was not approved, and perhaps take any questions from the wider group that is currently sitting here. It is important to note that, was it about a week ago, there was a call with Juan and with several members of the Finance Committee, and a couple of At-Large members that joined the call as well and questions were asked.

Unfortunately the answers of course, which we would have liked to have, would have been Akram and Juan to bow under the pressure and say "Yes, you can everything you want," but unfortunately it was not the case at that call. And perhaps this might happen today, I'm not quite sure. Yes, the door is locked now so Juan, there is no way out, the only way out being "Yes." But if that doesn't work perhaps we will be able to discuss those matters in a bit of a more civil manner.

So I would hope that if we can have on the screen the first thing being the requests and the details, and I see no one is at the computer that is controlling the screen so that is pretty important. Can we jump directly to the ALAC requests please, the Board… There's a table which has that. And we'll discuss those quickly. I don't want to spend more than five, ten minutes on that and then move on, because we're supposed to have 45 minutes.

It's a PDF, okay, so we don't even have that onscreen.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	And whilst this comes up, the moment this is on the screen we'll jump to it, and then I'll give the microphone over to Juan who can go through each of the major points. Is that it? Okay. So I guess the first one is the capacity building and outreach for the AFRALO ALSes in Dakar, and in fact three regions have submitted similar programs or similar projects, and the projects being Travel Support for certain number of participants.
	It really is the putting together of some kind of General Assembly or even wider Summit or capacity building session, which we in At-Large believed is absolutely vital to our activities and also fitted completely within the strategic plan, the wider Strategic Plan that ICANN has submitted. That said, the response was that for a General Assembly only six participants could be funded, and unfortunately it's a little bit like making a football team – if you have five players only that does not make a football team. You need eleven in any case, and same for here – if you have six out of 36 participants, just taking those numbers as examples, that does not make a General Assembly, neither in Africa nor Latin America nor anywhere else.
	So perhaps we could start the discussion on this and then get moving a little bit further if we can touch on some of the other points. Juan?

Juan Ojeda:	Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, members of the ALAC. So just to try to communicate in terms of what the process was behind this decision, and unfortunately I am speaking on behalf of conversations, but in essence what the goal of doing this partial funding was to try to achieve some type of outreach by providing funding for the regional meetings to local regional members of the ALAC community to attend these ICANN meetings. I know it's not exactly what the ALAC had requested. I know there are plans for a broader outreach program across all ACs and SOs and stakeholder groups as well, and I know per Akram that's in the works of working on that for fiscal year '12.
	Having said that I realize that it's not meeting the requests of the ALAC for a General Assembly. I think too, and again I'm paraphrasing here, but due to limited resources in the budget the communication was that the resources aren't in place for having three General Assemblies which I believe was the request from the ALAC in the current fiscal year, so as a compromise this was presented.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Juan, and we immediately have a few questions or comments from the floor, first being Alan Greenberg.
Alan Greenberg:	Thank you, and I'll note I'm speaking not as an ALAC member since I'm not, not as an ExCom member since I'm not – but as someone with a fair amount of history in this process. I'm

gratified at the level of interaction we've had this year which is better and we actually got some answers back, which is an improvement over previous years when we often tossed things over walls and never heard anything back again.

We did ask for three General Assemblies. I understand the concept that you don't have the money to fund that, but as Olivier mentioned, coming back with three thirds of a soccer team and saying "You must not play together" doesn't make for very good soccer competition. If you could not answer our requests I really wish there had been some dialog telling us that and looking for ways that the money you have given us would be useful, because yes, we can bring six additional people to three meetings each but it's not going to accomplish probably any of our goals.

So we will manage to use ICANN's money but not accomplish the goals, whereas I think we could have come up with some innovative way of using the same amount of money – we would have liked more – if there had been some dialog instead of just tossing over the wall what the final result was, which I find very disappointing. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Juan?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you, Alan, and I appreciate that fact, and I do admit over the past few months we have had some good dialog and I definitely

look forward to continuing that. In that respect now, I can't speak on behalf of anyone on the powers that be, but I would certainly encourage this current forum right now to have that dialog that you were talking about – possibly a repurposing of the funds, if you will. Granted, I'll state on the record there are no promises that I can make, no commitments that I can make, but we'd definitely love to hear what some of those ideas might be, some of those creative suggestions, if you will, for repurposing of those funds.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes Alan, if you wish to respond.

Alan Greenberg: Well first of all, I would like to think that if we say "We can find a much better use of money in the same general intent as the money was allocated," we would not have an objection saying no, we can't repurpose that. I would like that think that. I mean we're not going to say "We'll buy lollipops instead of send people to meetings," but I will point out, and I'll try to do this gently – it's not your fault that you don't have the memory of your predecessors, but we have discussed the alternative to what you have proposed.

What you are proposing has been proposed over the last five years several times, and we have categorically rejected it each time and proposed the alternative. It's unfortunate that there is no corporate memory that allows that to be used. It's not your fault, but I'll also point out that reality and politics and things being what it is, it's

sometimes very hard to change something after the fact where it's trivial to change it before the fact. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Alan, and corporate memory is definitely a point which I have brought up with Akram when speaking to him in our SO and AC Chair discussion that took place on Friday afternoon and evening. Perhaps the At-Large would like to consider at some point during this summer when it has some slack and some time to write a formal statement about the lack of corporate memory in ICANN and something that we see as being an absolute danger to the good running and satisfactory running of the organization.

Next on my list is Sergio Salinas, after that Evan, and after that Sebastien. Sergio?

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you very much, Chairman. For the record I will say my name again. I am Sergio Salinas and I represent LACRALO. I'm going to speak in Spanish.

Dear Juan, I say thanks to you for your presence in this meeting. You have said something, you said "limited resources for ICANN," and reading the document I found out that we're sitting over $52 million for resources. And each time when we have an incoming amount of $10 million for the new gTLDs, so my question is do we have limited resources?

In the case of our region, we've been waiting for more than two years for a General Assembly, and I would like to remind you that in this structure we are the weakest link because we don't have the money and therefore we do not use the internet industry to make our living. In fact, we come here to offer our values in order to help you to increase the active conditions of ICANN. And when you tell me, and I want to be very respectful in this: when you tell me you do not have enough resources I really get sad and angry, not only me, myself, but other members in the regions. And I would like to ask you why you speak about limited resources. Thank you very much.

Juan Ojeda: Thank you, Sergio. Generally speaking, I mean there is a reserve fund for a *Black Swan* scenario for any potential issues that may arise. And if you look at our financials for last year, we were so stretched in our resources we weren't able to make a contribution to the reserve fund. All of our revenue, if you will, was used to fund the operations and the projects of ICANN.

In terms of the new gTLDs, I can't really speak at this moment in terms of the program and what will or will not happen. But what I can say is, as has been communicated, as has been posted, there is an element of the application fee revenue that will be received from new gTLD which will be used to pay back this historical development that's been funded. And specifically within this current fiscal year, as we posted on the draft budget, we've taken on a great amount of projects and initiatives – for example, the

ATRT recommendations implementation which is something new that we haven't done in the past. There is an IDN Variance that is being performed and WHOIS studies, and at the end of the day with this economic climate there are some difficult decisions that need to be made.

And so we'd like to think that even within our basic core and operation functions that we take on we service the community in that way as much as possible, recognizing that at times there needed to be this additional vehicle, if you will, for the community members and community leadership to be able to communicate these additional needs above and beyond the usual operating plan and budget process; to be able to do so. So we were able to allocate some additional resources to fund what we presented here.

Would I have loved to come to this meeting and say "All the requests are approved"? Absolutely. I'd be the most popular guy in the room, but unfortunately given the economic climate we live in we just can't do that. So I appreciate your point, I completely understand what you're saying and we're trying to live within those means. In fact, if you recall on the framework, the original framework that we posted we were actually in a deficit position. If that would have been approved as is it would have required us possibly dipping into the reserve fund potentially; it all depends on what the cash flows would have been.

But based on community feedback, a lot of members from the community expressed a concern about that, so we had to streamline our budget a little bit more to come in line with our

expected revenues. So I hear what you're saying and I don't disagree with you, but there's only so much revenue that we can forecast to generate and we're trying to do the best we can within those parameters.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Juan. I'll go down the list of queue at the moment, who's speaking. The next person is Evan, Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there, Juan, this is Evan. I want to take a slightly different tack, and rather than talking about ICANN's resources I want to talk about ours, specifically the volunteer resources that were taken up to complete the list. There's an awful lot of volunteer time that was taken, some people may think taken in the anticipation that there would be a response that didn't come, and what I mean is had there been some indication of some of the assumptions that were made ahead of time, or some idea of the amount of money that was possible ahead of time, that an awful lot of volunteer work that went into this might not have had to be expended.

I'll give a specific example. Under a number of the "funding not approved" entries, there is a mention saying specifically "Priority has been given to support participation and engagement of existing communities and community members." This obviously was the rationale given to deny approval for most of the external outreach-related requests. At very least, had that assumption and priority

been given to us ahead of time a lot of effort that went into this by a lot of good volunteers might not have had to be done. There were a lot of projects put in that had we known about these prioritizations and the amount ahead of time, we might have spared the effort.

I think as much of a problem as saying "Okay, we understand there's certain things that are going to be approved and certain ones that aren't," but wasting the time of volunteers and depressing volunteers by allowing them to put in things that you know they're never going to get approved is a problem. Nobody denies the fact that there's limited resources, not everything's going to be approved, but at very least let us know the priorities that you're working under, the assumptions that you're working under, the amounts that are involved – at least so we're not wasting our time putting things in that we don't know we'll never get approved but you do ahead of time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan. Juan, would you like to answer?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you. Just to be clear for the record, and I understand your frustration, Evan, truly I do. But just for the record there were never any preconceived notions of what would definitely or wouldn't be included in the budget or would be funded. This prioritization process, if you will, was truly ever evolving. The initial intention that we had in terms of community providing the

commentary to be able to prioritize never panned out, for reasons that this group specifically has communicated in the past. So these prioritization assumptions, if you will, came about during the process of staff in prioritizing these request. This was never a preconceived notion and I truly apologize if A), it comes off that way, and/or B) for the unfortunate waste of time as you so pointed out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Juan. We have a list of people in the speaking order. The next person is Sebastien Bachollet. Sebastien, please.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much, and thank you for allowing me to speak today in this honorable assembly. I'm very proud to be a part of it during the few years, and I don't want, Juan, to put you in any trouble. I have no right for that and it's not my seat on the Board that could allow me to do anything, but just I want to make sure that the words that are used are the right ones. You say "the decision" – we don't have yet a budget. The budget will be decided on Friday eventually, and up to Friday we can change everything.

And it's the staff proposal that is on the table. Maybe it's a little bit more because I guess the Finance Committee adopted it, so it's a little bit further than just staff proposal, but as you know, as the Finance Committee suggests or agreed to have a meeting with the ALAC or with part of ALAC, whatever we want to do to discuss

that issue. It could have been interesting to ask them to come today, not to have two meetings with ALAC, to not take two times the same people's time but never mind.

I want to tell you that a Board member of the Finance Committee is willing to meet with you and to discuss that issue, and I think what is important from what I heard today is that you are not happy with the decision proposal because it's not taking into account your proposal; it's something else. You are here, you make your proposal and the answer is "We can't do but we can do something else." And it's not aligned with any of your wishes. That's, from my point of view, that's not possible. We can't have a budget with something where we say "Hey guys, we serve your community," and the communities say "We never asked for that – it's not answering our needs." Then we need to rework.

And I will do as much as I can to have this reworked in the next few days. And I think it's important – I want to address to my ALAC and At-Large fellow colleagues. I know that you are working on these issues for years and maybe I can't say that I have the memory of the corporation because I am not staff, but some of you in this room have the same or even more. But we are struggling about that since June, 2009, and with very bad questions of communication. And it's not that because we do more communications that we do good communications – yes, it's better to communicate but I urge you to communicate well, to have results that are acceptable by everybody.

And for the moment I don't see that, and I would like very much that before a Finance Committee member comes to ALAC you try with the staff to find an acceptable solution. And I am sure that there is some way to do that and some possibility within the full budget of ICANN to help this community to be served at the levels they need to be served or he needs to be served, because it's important for the whole ICANN. And I am not saying that because I used to be in this community.

I think that it's important as a single Board member but I guess the Board will agree with me that this community is very, very important and will be more and more in the future; and that we need to serve the community well. And thank you, Sergio, for having said these and I think what you said is that you have to go on. It's difficult but you need to continue with this. That's why I say go ahead. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sebastien, and if I could put for the record an action item for staff to liaise, may they liaise with you, Sebastien, to try to find some slot where we can have the Board Finance Committee meet with the At-Large Finance Committee members, or at least a certain number of At-Large Finance Committee if we manage to round them up? We have a very busy schedule and I guess you also have a very busy schedule, so that's an action item please, and that's of course to be actioned right after this meeting ends.

We have a long list of speakers who have put their hand up. Eric Brunner-Williams, you have a microphone again, yet again. I'm not sure whether it was for a previous time or whether you have put your hand up. Eric?

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I did put my hand up and of course immediately it was turned into a microphone, so I tried putting up a smiley face and that lasted for a little while, and then that went away too leaving that mute microphone. I wanted to get in the queue to ask a question about a budget request which is not the ones which have been asked thus far, so if you don't mind just changing subjects slightly. Let's see if I can pull up my own text.

The item that I submitted, which was intending to identify the contractual barriers to access to data for the purposes of improving data collection, improving the data available for policy measurement and policy development, I recall getting a request for more information. What information would have been useful to making a determination of whether or not this was in budget or not? And I actually don't remember the amount I had requested; I think it was quite small in terms of staff time and total cost.

And I have a follow-up question if you could just fill me in on the details of what I should have asked in order to have this relatively minor request granted. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Juan?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you. So with this I assume you mean FY'12-32? Is that the…

Eric Brunner-Williams: I actually have no idea where it is on this document.

Juan Ojeda: Okay, the reduce [EOT] barriers to policy-

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes.

Juan Ojeda: Yeah, the staff needed more information in terms of what exactly was being requested, in terms of was it staff time, what the support, what the monetary support would entail, whether it was teleconferencing. It just wasn't very clear and so we reached out via email, and I believe during one of the ALAC calls prior to the 17th of May and we weren't able to receive any further information. So absent that information we had to put that as funding not approved.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yeah, I scratched my head when I received the communication asking for more detail. It is sort of an open-ended activity to try to figure out what we don't have or what obstacles we have permitted ourselves to have that prevents us from knowing things, but initially at least it's simply a review of contracts in order to determine what language is present which prevents us from having academic access to operational data. There's not a lot more clarity.

Well, I'm afraid that I reached the conclusion that data was not sufficiently valuable to actually go and obtain, and that it would be useful although somewhat damning to actually admit that we don't need data in order to make policy. I hope we can improve this in the future. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much for your comment, Eric. Next on the list is Tijani Ben Jemaa. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Olivier. Juan, as Sebastien was saying it's not because there is more communication that the communication is efficient. I felt it because we had several, many meetings between ALAC, At-Large and yourself and your department, and from one meeting to the next I don't feel that there's a better understanding. We had requested the financing for projects and the financing obtained does not allow, enable to us to perform any projects. The process was improved for sure, and we thank you for this. We talked a lot before, during and up to the end but the result was the same.

My problem is that we are not able to negotiate to discuss really. I had told you several times already that the projects can be discussed together but you tell us this year we can finance only these 100, "So what are your priority projects that we can finance this year?" That's how we can finance projects. We cannot fraction or divide, give small fragments to each RALO to satisfy these requests.

There's another issue that seems crucial to me is the participation, active participation of ICANN community within the IGF, and I do not feel that there is not a single understanding of this concept which is very important for ICANN even more than for us. But it's important for us, too, because ICANN community's participation is very important for ICANN's image in a forum where there are not only friends but also foes. So it's really free, it's really insignificant but it's always disapproved.

So I said many times already and you know it, first of all tell us what are the projects that are not approves, if they are not approved, when will they be approved for those that can just be postponed; and for projects that are crucial you should tell me why they cannot be financed, especially when the finance is insignificant. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani. Juan, would you like to respond?

Juan Ojeda:	Yes, thank you Tijani. As I previously mentioned and as Mr. Sebastien pointed out, the budget as is, as currently presented as a draft on the 17th of May is not finalized in terms of the allocation of the resources and projects. So as I previously mentioned to Mr. Greenberg, if we want to we can have that discussion and again, with no promises and no commitments for the record that I am making on anyone's behalf. But we can have that dialog where we'll say funding three soccer teams of five members is not going to do me any good. Let's pull the resources and fund something that will work.
	Granted, it may not be everything that the ALAC wants but at least something that the ALAC finds substantial. I am promoting or engaging that dialog now or in the near future, whether it's in this forum or with the BFC to have that discussion and see if something meaningful and tangible for the ALAC can come of it.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Juan. Next on the waiting list is Charles Mok.
Charles Mok:	Thank you, Olivier. I echo everyone's comments about their unhappiness and disappointment, and Evan about the wasting of time and the volunteers' time and so on. Many of us stay up late at night doing all these calls and trying to make things work, and Juan, you said that it was not a preconceived notion about the lack of resources and the allocation and so on. Well, if there isn't any preconceived notion I think there should be. If you know that

there's a possibility that there isn't enough resources going around for all of us then I think that message should have been communicated to us long before, rather than for us to spend all this work and come up with nothing.

In particular, I have to say for APRALO because we score zero, and I must be led to wonder is it because we didn't try hard enough or is it because we were being punished for something that we didn't do right; or is a signal being sent to AP that we are not important or that we're doing too well and we do not need any support? And I understand that the pot is very small as you now tell us, and yes, we need to have enough people on a team and so on and so on, so maybe we were just the unlucky one this time and maybe it will be someone else next time.

But I think the perception that's being sent to us is very negative, and I think rather than just send us a file to say "Okay, you get this, you get this and we get nothing and so on," well, there's got to be a message to us to tell us what is happening. I mean we have to be accountable for our members, our ALSes, and we go back and say "Sorry, we are not getting it this time and someone else only gets a little bit as well, and maybe we'll get better next time." I mean that's not a message that I like to take back to my ALS members.

So and again, if we do it again next year and the same thing happens, and it's just a rotating game and so on; and someone else might be- Actually no one is coming out ahead. If there is a priority I hope you will tell us so we can at least understand. If the process doesn't work by us suggesting what we want to do maybe

you should start telling us what your priority is and we follow, and we try to follow and counter-suggest; rather than for us to spend all this work coming up with all these recommended ideas and then coming up with a zero score.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Charles. Juan, would you like to respond?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you, Charles. On your first point, with the preconceived notion, that was – and apologies if it came off that way. That was not in regards to a limited resources or a bucket of resources that would be allocated. As we communicated initially in Cartagena, we described the prioritization process where based on community input the priorities would be prioritized from most important or more critical to less critical; and wherever that line was defined were where the resources were kept at, then those would be the priorities, the requests that would be accepted.

So I apologize if at any point in time it seemed like we implied that everything would be available to be approved. That was never the case. In regards to a preconceived notion, what I was referring to was requests, for example, to attend IGF and the rationale that was provided was that due to limited resources Travel Support funding would instead be focused on additional support to ICANN meetings. That was never a preconceived notion leading up to the requests and to the process, but it was evolved and came about during the process.

This was the first year that we've taken on this process. Was it a smooth process? Not by any means. We've done what I believe is our best to come up with as equitable as a process as possible. In regards to APRALO, I think unfortunately it was just timing in that we are talking about the fiscal year '12 budget and this meeting just happened to come in the fiscal year '11 budget. Had the timing been when the Asia-Pacific meeting would have happened sometime in fiscal year '12 similar to the other RALOs there would have been some funding for that, so it's not a reflection, positive or negative, on the performance of APRALO.

I trust that this is a hardworking group of people and I appreciate the late nights. I'm sure you're not the only one in this member of the community, so I appreciate all and anyone's efforts. So hopefully that gives you a little more clarity in terms of the decision process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Juan, and I guess you also appreciate the cynicism in Charles' statement of an eternal *Groundhog Day* that we are living again and again and again. Moving along swiftly the next person on the list is Andres, Andres Piazza.

Andres Piazza: Okay, and very shortly but in Spanish, Charles took my words. He expressed his ideas in a very good way. So I support his motions and I also saw other motions supporting his motion. I think he represents the general idea, and I would like to add my own

personal reflection that might help to the corporate memory. When in 2006 and 2007 At-Large was at the very beginning, it was just the beginning of the group or the very beginning of the group, we had resources at that time at least for these types of meetings, which are the essence of the bottom-up process. This is what we have today.

Today we have many resources assigned to other aspects such as translation, full translation or interpretation, remote participation areas which have been improved, but in this respect there has been a drawback or we go back in time. And this goes against what ICANN did at that time according to our expectations. I am leaving this meeting so I can say this, I can express this.

So from this perspective we are not reflecting our achievements because when assigning resources ICANN has to support that alternate level. For example, we're assigning resources to the translation and interpretation area. That is okay and this helps the community for interaction, but this specific bottom-up model of ICANN is difficult to support.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Andres. We'll continue on the list of speakers. Next is Dave Kissoondoyal.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yes, Dave Kissoondoyal for the record. I have a question for the general public. Before we had the public dashboard which is

EN

giving the budget allocation and the budget utilized per SO or AC, but now I can see that this reporting as changed. So can you please confirm to us whether you have been changing the way the financial reporting is being done?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Can you rephrase this a little bit? The formats of the reports are you looking for?

Dave Kissoondoyal: In fact I have it pasted, if you see on the chat? We had the public dashboard which gives the reporting, the financial reports for ICANN. I do recall before we had reporting which gave the budget allocated per Supporting Organization, per Advisory Committee, and then the budget utilized. The reason I'm asking this question is that for this reporting we can see that if one of the SOs have not utilized fully its budget, this budget could be reallocated to other Supporting Organizations. But now I can see that this reporting is no longer available on the ICANN website.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Juan?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you. Yes, so you're referring to the EAG reporting. So it's something that will be performed at our fiscal year-end, it'll be reported for the year and I realize that it wasn't done throughout

the year as may or may not have been done in years past – I really couldn't tell you, part of that corporate loss of history. But what I can tell you is for the next fiscal year we plan on doing that. In conjunction with the new financial reporting system that we're implementing we plan on updating that reporting, whether it's a quarterly basis or a trimester basis I don't know right now, but we are in the plans of providing more timely reporting on the EAG. And if you notice, as part of the fiscal year '12 budget we've also included those amounts in those categories that you're requesting.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yeah, perhaps you haven't got my question appropriately. Before we had the reporting, we had, let's say for ALAC we see X amount has been allocated as budget; and then part of that X amount, Y amount has been utilized. But this reporting existed before. I can see that okay, this reporting no longer exists, neither financial '09, neither for '10 or '11.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So if I may just add, you're basically looking at specific reporting of ALAC, SO and AC allocation levels and use for each one. That's what's missing.

Juan Ojeda: Olivier, if I may for the record request a sample of those reports. If it hasn't been posted since '09 and '10 I definitely don't have copies of those.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, shall we just put this into touch or maybe as an action item to follow up on this perhaps? Okay, excellent. Thank you. Next on the list is Sebastien, Sebastien Bachollet.
Sebastien Bachollet:	Thank you. I think there are certain issues in the bottom-up process that we work on, and we need to work on them always, all the time. I will now switch to English. I would like to have, I will not say next year but the next year after, a budget or some line of budget for three years, like aligning the strategy planning with some budget issue. And I hope it will allow projects like an eventual At-Large Summit if one day you decide to push this idea again, or any sort of project.
	And why it's important for your organization is that as some activity is going to be more important when the ICANN circus is coming to your region, it's important to have a view. At-Large will need two years but if we can get two years, if we get three we will have two and that will be important. And I hope that we will be able to have that, and maybe it's also one request that you can have in the process because the discussion about strategic issues and the operating plan will start in the near future and it could be one of your inputs also. Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Sebastien, and Sergio, earlier you put your hand up. Would you like to say a few words, Sergio Salinas?

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you very much, Olivier. I just believe that, I never discussed this with Sebastien but it's exactly what I was going to raise – the fact that we can plan ahead, a few years ahead what are the steps that we're going to follow because we also need to organize ourselves. You can't really have this kind of discussion but perhaps today we will be increasing our participation more in ICANN if we could actually discuss if we really are going to be able to have our idea of a General Assembly.

In the case of LACRALO, which is what Andres said, the first region organized in ICANN, in ALAC actually – I want to remind you that we had a meeting in 2006 in Puerto Rico, that was 2007, I'm sorry; another region in 2009, (inaudible) because in 2008 we couldn't really do it; and in 2010 we have nothing, 2011 we have nothing either, and in 2013 we don't really know. So this actually concerns us because we actually have a few issues that we need to work on. That's all, thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sergio. Juan?

Juan Ojeda: That's right, Sergio, and as Mr. Sebastien said we are looking into having a budget for three years, for three years ahead because we actually agree that it is very important, that it's critical that many of the projects and activities that they develop with this community

are not only limited to one fiscal year but actually they relate to several fiscal years. That's why we agreed on this, and what I expect to do in the future is to be able to have the process of the budget development plus another activity that we will hold throughout the whole year, that will not actually start in January, December or February in ever year. But I actually want to continue promoting this communication among us because I actually think that it's important and it's critical for us, that's why we agree on all of this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Juan, and do I take it from this then that you can give us a commitment that the projects which are not funded this year will be funded next year?

Juan Ojeda: I would love to do that but I will have to consult with our fellow BFC member, one fourth of the vote right there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: How disappointing. Next on the list is Fatima Cambronero.

Fatima Cambronero: Thank you, Olivier. I'm going to speak in Spanish – Fatima Cambronero. Just a brief comment to support what Andres was saying regarding the bottom-up process: this is like the essence of ICANN. This process is really like the essence, and working

collaboratively among all of us is important. I have the feeling that with this new budget we will actually have to compete between the RALOs to see who actually deserves to have funds to hold their meetings, and I don't really believe that anyone here wants this.

We actually are used to working collaboratively and we support APRALO today, then APRALO supports us on a different day. It's difficult actually to focus on working collaboratively when many of us do not live on this, we have other jobs and we don't really need to feel that we deserve to hold a face-to-face meeting every year or every two or three years. This actually is part of the bottom-up process and it's natural; this is natural to ICANN. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Fatima. Juan, a couple of words?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you, Fatima. Actually in development of that process we realized that this perception existed and it seemed that this process was promoting competition. And that was not the intention. We were looking for the comments of the public in general but we don't think it is a perfect process. And I actually hope in the following months, and yes, to be working with the community to be able to improve the bottom-up process in the development of this process so that we do not have this perception or this feeling that one RALO is competing with another RALO. That's not our aim.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Juan, and I understand that you have a hard stop in ten minutes so I mean, Cintra, last comment and then I'm going to ask whether maybe we can sort of work something out perhaps. Cintra, Cintra Sooknanan.
Cintra Sooknanan:	Thank you, Olivier. Juan, you did say that it's not possible for you to commit to any requests that were not fulfilled this year to be part of next year or the following years, but the requests that were fulfilled, can we take that as the status quo, as in we shouldn't expect less; or at least we should anticipate that amount of funding? Thank you.
Juan Ojeda:	Well, thank you for not putting me on the spot. I wish that I could tell you that I am the person who pulls the levers and makes all the decisions but that unfortunately is not the case, or rather fortunately that is not the case – much to you chagrin, Ms. CLO. But as we have previously mentioned in a prior meeting, I think it might have been in San Francisco, I'm not sure, but if there is funding for a particular project that is approved and it's part of a bigger project, a multi-year project, I don't see a scenario where that wouldn't be funded in future years.
	Like I said, certainly without any commitments or any promises we can certainly, I think we need to have further dialog because I

think as it is the current requests that were approved are not to the satisfaction of the ALAC, and so we can have that discussion sooner rather than later. And if there's anything that the ALAC, that we can work with in terms of repurposing those funds we can certainly look at that and see how that breaks out into this multi-year budget.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Juan. Last question, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, and of course, Juan, I do like to get the last word so this is highly appropriate, and it is in fact an offer and a comment so you won't even need to get a last word in after me which is even more appropriate; although Olivier may wish to thank you, I suppose.

Look, you knew that this was going to be a testing of a new process and one that would need to be modified, and I'm sure we're all very happy to have been part of the process even though there were some difficulties in our assessments, and certainly some of the challenges of the amount of effort put it versus the net return might be something we need to look at very carefully.

If I'm hearing you correctly, however, I'm hearing that we are also looking towards a number of very important changes – the new backend financial system, which will allow drill down and reporting in very different ways which will help all of us

understand what is going on at any given time; the movement towards a three-year budget, which as you well outlined earlier is going to make a difference to multi-year projects.

But we can't possibly let you leave without recognizing the enormous need of in these conversations, in these changes of process, in what is happening with you now and will continue to happen as we build what is a better model, that this has to be captured. And I've got to say the frustration that you've heard from many of us, and in particularly the Asian-Pacific Region, is not as Olivier had said "your fault" – it is not. What it is is the fact that we have not captured what we've gone through before again and again and again, and guess what? We're about to have the same conversations with Global Partnerships where previous financial controllers have been in the room and agreements where we can find ways to work smarter in mutual methods with prior planning and with partnership opportunities with other parts of ICANN.

We've got nowhere for years, so it's not just our budget – it's where there's mutualisms and leverage and benefits off a number of budget aspects in ICANN that we need to take that to the next steps. So don't think this is sort of a very aggressive group – it's not. We want to make this work and we're very, very pleased that there are efforts on ICANN's part to do it as well. So thank you and let's look at the strange days that may follow as a bit of an opportunity. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl, and knowing that you have a hard stop in about five minutes, I did notice one thing which was that you were open to reorganizing some of the allocations. The primary problem that we do have with regards to a General Assembly is one where eight people or six people does not make a General Assembly.

There has been discussion between the RALOs in the lead to this meeting today, and in fact even some last minute discussions to the possibility of pooling some of the resources; and whether there might be a possibility of having a General Assembly or a Summit or something pooled up from the resources that we have from each region into one region. Could you just give an indication of whether there is a possibility of this happening? Or do you need more information from me to-

Juan Ojeda: Thank you, Olivier. I think I'd love to work with whoever it might be, whoever the members may be of the ALAC on putting this down on paper somehow, what this would entail. And as I previously mentioned, and much to the disappointment of Ms. Cheryl Langdon-Orr I am not the person to pull the levers but what I can say is that I will communicate this to the powers that be and push for it, and promote it as much as possible with the meta-message in mind that this is something that the ALAC can attach itself to; can take and bring something tangible from it as opposed to what's previously and right now included in the funding.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Any other additional comments or questions before we let Juan go and be happy that he survived the session with us?

Juan Ojeda: Thank you, Olivier. It truly is a pleasure. It may not seem like it, it's just more than anything I love the passion of this group of volunteers, and I really- And we can make it off the record: I really admire this group of volunteers and I apologize for the sins of my past, if you will, but I really truly look forward to working with all of you to improve the process so that even at the end of the day we may not agree on what gets approved but at least we have everyone's buy-off on the process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you very much, Juan.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And moving swiftly into our agenda being extraordinarily late, the next person who has been so patiently waiting in the seats behind me is Mandy Carver who is from Global Partnerships. And if I can ask Mandy to please take position at the table?

Mandy, a microphone please. So welcome, Mandy Carver.

Mandy Carver:	I actually don't know if you want this broadcast to your remote participants.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Of course we do. Welcome and apologies for the delay, please make yourself at home.

Mandy Carver:	No worries. I was referencing Cheryl Langdon-Orr passed me as I was coming to the table and she said that she had to step out of the room but she thought she knew what I was going to say. So perhaps following up a little bit on the previous presentation I do know that you have a sense of repeating conversations. Sometimes the people in the room have changed, sometimes the situations have changed – the limits haven't always.

I do have slides, they are very minimal and what I am hoping is this can be a productive dialog about what you all are doing and what you have in your calendar, what we have tentatively in our calendar and where we can leverage each other's coverage. But as a start to that, the whole discussion of what is actually outreach, and that is an expression or a term that's used in a variety of venues. Communications and Marketing Department does outreach, the Participation and Engagement function within Policy does outreach; you all do outreach, we do outreach. So what I really would like to do is talk to you all about what you include

and who you target versus who we may be and how we can work together.

So outreach can be everything from our dealing with a community that doesn't know what the DNS is, and therefore what is ICANN to specific invitations from existing constituencies that have a particular issue about a change in the policy direction of ICANN, to a changeover in a constituent where there has been a political change in a country – you've had a new Ministry made responsible for the internet space, if you will, and they need to understand what it is that the role of the Government Advisory Committee might be, what is the role of the ICT Ministries, what is the role of the ccTLD Managers, etc.

So Global Partnerships does everything from technical types of trainings to more overview, educational things. A lot of it is being responsive to requests as opposed to our being able to look out and say "Well, that's a place we haven't been active and we should go in." We know the multi-stakeholder model and we know where we've been able to reach certain constituencies within those geographic regions and where we haven't, and you as a group have a particular focus. Obviously you have a priority for your outreach and participation.

We have a multi-stakeholder responsibility within our Department. The registrar/registry liaisons have got their particular group, but we would be doing educational outreach in arenas that don't have any or have very few accredited registrars for instance; it's sort of who's physically able to be in a space? Now that is also a way that

we could be leveraging better those people who are already physically attending certain things. So I think what tends to happen is that the concept is "Oh, well if we had the resources we could do it, go and do X, so if you will fund us to do X we will be able to do that."

Sometimes, and Juan has just been talking about that, sometimes there are funds for that and sometimes there are not. What I want to do is for us to get to the point where we're talking about where are all of you already in your real lives, because this is the second level or the third level of volunteer participation for all of you. But you all already have primary roles and you are all active in arenas outside of ICANN, and so you could be carrying the message into those spaces where you are already active.

And so I'd like to talk a little bit about how we can leverage those kinds of…how we can synergize what's already there, as the topic was raised to work smarter rather than harder. In a very limited pool how do we – and I mean limited in time of the volunteers here, time of the staff, literally the number and then also the resources to be able to get places? And that also means remote participation and projecting materials and presentations in to certain places.

So I want to have a conversation about all of these topics – what you all feel it should include and who you want to target, where we can work together, where we can leverage what you're already doing, and where we diverge; what things really would be the role only of the constituency, and what things would be a role for

Global Partnerships to participate with. So do you want me to just run through these and then you all can weigh in with conversations and ideas?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes Mandy, I think it's easier if we go through your whole presentation. I understand it's quite short, and then we can just open the floor for discussion after that. It's up to you.

Mandy Carver: That would be fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, great.

Mandy Carver: Okay. I want to make sure I'm hitting my points but sometimes it's easier to just respond to your questions than natter on.

There are already tools and you all will get a copy of the existing calendar. I've put the Global Partnerships website up there as well which indicates upcoming activities. I mean these are sort of best guesses of different events that we may have people at. It isn't always Global Partnerships; sometimes it's other members of the ICANN staff or Board.

The calendar that I sent around is those meetings that we're aware of. Some of them we know we'll have people attending; some are

an effort to respond to requests that we've had in the past from the community wanting to know about other events. And I've had a conversation with Gisella about how these now can be fed into the At-Large calendar that exists on your Wiki. What we would hope can also come out of this, though, is response coming back from all of you: what events that are on your calendar are you all going to be attending anyway? Because we have situations where we're invited to something, we can't go but if there are already members of the community who are going to be there we can provide you with materials.

That isn't finding someone to fly halfway around the world to go because we can't find a staff member to do it; it's you're already physically going to be in the room, then let us get materials to you. This also comes up knowing who's already going to be there if we have late-breaking conflicts which unfortunately do occur, where we've agreed to participate in a venue and are supposed to have somebody there, and they can't go at the last minute. Well again, who can we substitute in for those if they're not set up to do remote?

And for those who are not perhaps completely comfortable with subjects, we've also done paired participation where the community member who's in the room presents the slides and is on Jabber with a staff member who is elsewhere who can assist with answering questions if the granularity of the audience's response is such that the community member is not comfortable in addressing it. So I mean these are all ways that I think that we can

better build a partnership and better leverage your resources, our resources which are both limited.

This addresses where we have common goals, where we have resources that we can move forward together on the same topics. Some of what the various communities want in Travel Support and other kinds of things is how do we get more people who are already identified to the table. So for instance, the ccNSO community knows how many ccTLDs there are – how do we get the ones that have been off the radar or are not participating for lack of resources? How do we get them to participate in ccNSO conversations so that their voice is included in the policies that are directly going to affect their group?

Then there are others who are looking for "How do we bring people who are not at the table because they haven't been identified yet as possible constituents in?" So some of it is education and outreach for ICANN as a whole, and some of it is building a specific constituency so that it can be a stronger and more effective participant within the process. So some of those are going to have different priorities depending on where you're sitting, and again, I don't write the budget.

There was a question that Juan got about can we assume then that what was requested that wasn't funded this year will be funded next year – can we at least assume that we'll have the same level of funding? We're told in the departments that we can't make that assumption but it may be different for the community. But anyway, there are these existing tools, there may be more and I'd

like to get more participation and feedback from all of you in how you're using them and what kind of information you are comfortable in sharing with us so that we can more effectively work together on that.

And Matt, can you just go to the last slide? So this is going to leveraging existing coverage. What do all of you, what are all of you as regional leaders, where are you prioritizing your activities? What is going on in your regions that is most important? I mean we need that information as much back rather than our telling you "Well, there's going to be a roadshow that's occurring here and we're going to have staff that's presenting on this, because that's reaching a population that is unaware of ICANN." But you guys are in the field – what do you believe is most important to your region and that you're going to be attending so we can get things?

And obviously if we have a lot of overlap we want to try and leverage the resources, spread them out more, use those overlaps rather than duplicating each other's work and effort. And Cheryl's back in the room but she knew what I was going to say, so at this point I can say thank you and I'd like to take questions, or open the dialog.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Mandy, and as you were speaking and giving us this interesting presentation we had a queue that started building up already, and the first person in the queue is not Cheryl

this time, Ron, but my other vice-chair, Evan Leibovitch. Evan, please.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, this is Evan. Hi Mandy. At the risk of this sounding a little self-serving, part of what I want to ask you has to go to some needs that were identified out of our region and some others, specifically to do with At-Large outreach; and that has to do with trying to find At-Large end users that are not typical policy people, not typical civil society but actually trying to find the internet user that normally might never be found anywhere near ICANN. And so for instance, one of the proposals that had been put forward together between North America and Europe was for instance going to almost consumer-oriented events that were totally normally off the radar. I don't see them anywhere in the list of meetings, anything.

Mandy Carver: That's correct.

Evan Leibovitch: So we'd actually consider things like CeBIT in Hannover, Germany; COMPUTEX in Taiwan; CES – things that are considered to be almost consumer and are usually totally off the radar of ICANN-type events. Is this something you could see Global Partnerships having an interest in because it's so different, I guess, from what you've been doing so far?

In terms of At-Large this is the kind of outreach we need to do to get people who wouldn't even normally consider themselves to be involved in internet policy, people that are end users, gadget geeks and things like that; and to get them interested in domain policy and that kind of thing.

Mandy Carver: Evan, I think what you've identified is building, bringing new people into a constituency and perhaps a completely new constituency – and I'm not saying you're defining them that way. This is, as you say, it isn't something that Global Partnerships at this time would have the resources to add to its outreach. And I know that it is an offer that has been made by At-Large to cover, and I guess the question then goes into that question of the priorities that At-Large would have about bringing in new folks who wouldn't otherwise know about domain policy.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry. Let me extend it to an analogy you used before – the idea, for instance with the ccNSO, bringing in countries that weren't involved. One of the goals within At-Large is to have at least one At-Large Structure in every country; that is a defined goal, that's something that we want to have. And frankly as a parallel I see that as being very similar. You don't want to have a country without a ccNSO being represented here; we'd also like not to have any countries without having at least one ALS involved in the At-Large process. So I mean I see them as being very similar in

terms of that kind of need, so I really hope that would be on your radar.

Mandy Carver: I guess the other question would be what's the organizing principle for that group, and it's harder to… One of the discussions is you could have a booth at a setting like that and people who are doing other kinds of things and looking at the latest iPad or whatever would then see ICANN in a space like that. I mean that is one type of outreach, and I know that that request has come in through the additional funding, the mechanism that was there for ACs and SOs to put forward. You're asking me can I say "Well yeah, you give me those three entities and we can get you presentations"?

Evan Leibovitch: No sorry, I used that as an example. There's a whole bunch of requests that were mentioned that were rejected because the prioritization that was given for existing participants, and in the allocations that were set out by Juan it wasn't just that – I used that as an example because I was personally involved in it and I knew it better – but there were a number of different proposals that were made, and the answer given back was "rejected because prioritization has been towards involvement of existing entities as opposed to what we'd consider to be outreach."

I only used the three as a specific example but saying in the allocations that have been requested, what came back was the current prioritization that was given to us was for existing entities

at the expense of outreach. So is there something that we can do together with Global Partnerships that will help alleviate that a bit on a more general basis? I gave you one example because I knew it but I didn't want to limit myself to that.

Mandy Carver: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. I just wanted to intercede, just adding one more thing to what Evan has said. There are three ways to participate in a non-ICANN conference: the first one is to send a participant who will just attend the conference, the second one being having a booth there, and the third one being not only participating in a workshop but perhaps staging a workshop, which is what actually AFRALO has done last year at the IGF in Vilnius and it was a very successful thing.

On all three the return on investment is huge. It's huge because you're not paying salaries. Part of those costs are being taken up by the participant themselves, but it is totally unfair for the participant to take 100% of the cost. The returns on this investment are not only as we said for At-Large or for ALAC but it's for all of ICANN. You bring a new ALS in from a country that has not got either an ALS or a GNSO participant or a ccNSO participant; and due to the nature of some of those countries, everyone is interlinked somehow and one thing leads to another, and you end up having a ccTLD joining. This is something which

actually particularly happened with Ukraine where we have Oksana Prykhodko sitting at the table here with her recently acknowledged At-Large Structure; and at the same time, strangely enough .ua joined the ccNSO in a much more strong way than it was before.

Of course we'll never get any acknowledgement from anyone in ICANN for doing the groundwork that is being done but I think it's good that we have it on record, and I hope that with Global Partnerships we could work more in that direction because what you're getting here is an extraordinarily good return on investment – people that are on the ground that are actually making the internet work on the ground.

I won't ramble on, I know there's a queue. Cheryl and then afterwards Carlton, and then also there are questions from remote participants, and afterwards Dev. But first Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. It just strikes me that whilst we're talking about opportunity and partnership we might also look a little bit towards some formalization of some strategic planning. That goes back I think particularly to the conversations we're having now about the mutual benefits where we have activities that can increase ccNSO membership, GAC membership, and At-Large participation. We have already gone down a pathway with a previous review between ccNSO and At-Large where we've compared where we

have countries where both memberships exist and identified ones we don't; and at our last meeting with the Government Advisory Committee where they're particularly interested in finding out where we as At-Large Structures have connections into countries they don't have, it just struck me we're missing part of that equation and that is we need to be talking to Global Partnerships as well because it would make sense for us to all know what we were trying to fill in terms of holes and perhaps then better plan how we could do it.

While I have the microphone the other thing that struck me as you were saying to Evan in terms of ability to provide some resources, materials, etc., I wonder if at some point – particularly in the developing and emerging economies – whether we could train some speakers to be on the ground, a little bit like a speakers' bureau where our At-Large folk could with a standard set of materials be able to – without going through a long and even expensive or even funded process – simply say to a local telco or computer group "I can come and talk at your dinner about ICANN" and know that they have the current hot topics; that it is the corporate line but that we're all speaking from the same cheat sheet. So they're just the two points I wanted to raise. Thank you, Mandy.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Mandy?

Mandy Carver:	Thank you, Cheryl, and I think those are both excellent suggestions, and what I'd like as a takeaway is from this what's the next step? You've got our proposed next six months of travel or the meetings that we know are out there. What's the feedback on that? What is the advanced planning for the next six months among all of you? So let's move forward on it, and I'd like to have some mechanism that we can agree on coming out of this – what are we going to do next.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	We've forgotten about the shared calendar conversations that we've had a long time ago, where our staff and some of your staff can at least share calendar information. Just the simple things like that we need to pick up and make happen.
Mandy Carver:	So I have given that next six months to Gisella and she will feed it into your calendar, but as I was asking while you were out of the room, I can look at your calendar on the Wiki but what of those are you all already attending? Where is the priority? Of all of those things that are listed on the calendar, what is it that you think are most important?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Mandy, and in fact let's have this as an action item. And I know that it's already in hand, Gisella is nodding. However what I might add is to perhaps ask everyone who is here present

and also on the list for everyone who is travelling to specific events and so on to perhaps put their name down so as to know who we have attending what event; and for those names to perhaps be shared with you, Mandy, so as to perhaps have some synergy at some point if there is a requirement for someone to be able to take a position.

But if I can then also ask that if we do have specific people who are going to some of these meetings and do not have funding from ICANN that there might be a position for those people to get at least partial funding if that is the sole person that will be there and you haven't got any other person that will be attending from Global Partnerships.

Mandy Carver: One can but ask. I would hope that part of the conversation is where are you already going to be going as opposed to where, if you had the funds, could you go? Because remember, our limitation is around the same thing – "Where, if we had the funds could we go?" – the calendar would look different. "Where, if we had the funds, could we send other people?" – the calendar would look different. So what are the most important ones and where are you already going in your community?

And the toolkit, the current slides, one of the things that I didn't touch on but we've talked about previously, when At-Large has materials and the RALOs have materials, we do thumb drives that have your most recent materials that we pass out. So wherever

we're going, if there are materials and electronic files that you want distributed we can do that. Similarly, what we're looking for is that synergy: where are you already presenting on something where you could offer not to go to a new meeting – because that would be lovely, but the first step is where are you already going? That's also the information we need.

Now yes, if you know it would be great, this thing is happening in the next city over and it would be a minimal amount of money but you could reach this group, or you've already got an invitation but there's no way for you to do it we can have a conversation. But that's a narrow pool.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mandy, and the next person in the queue is Carlton Samuels. Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair; Carlton Samuels for the record. I want to make three comments. The first comment is, and this is probably – both of you know me. It's a [bug bear] for me because I've always said this. It seems to me that ICANN doesn't believe that the value or our investment, the investment of At-Large members in the ICANN effort is minimal. It always irks me that this seems to be the condition.

I, in the last four years, I have participated in projects and activities and events, none ICANN-related, and have had to present on the

hoof ICANN-related information to those meetings. Some of them have even involved recruiting people into coming to an ICANN meeting. I remember that a GAC representative from St. Lucia actually applied for a Fellowship by my suggestion and got into the meeting.

Now I'm not saying this- I know others do that all the time around the room, and the resources that we use are minimal. Most of the resources we put in our ours, my time. For example, every time I come to an ICANN meeting I take vacation time. Every time I come to an ICANN meeting it costs be in excess of, between $400 and $500 US out of my own pocket to come to an ICANN meeting. I have skin in the game, and it is not recognized – small things, like the ALAC/At-Large put together their documents on thumb drives and are giving it to us.

For example, two weeks ago I was able to take my thumb drive and at a Caricom International Conference for Education managed to pull some stuff from there to talk about what is happening in the ICANN world because it was asked in the room at the time; it was not something that was planned. It came up and I was there and I responded and I got time to respond.

The point I'm making here is this, it's like Cheryl says – harmonizing schedules, harmonizing calendars will help because you get information beforehand, that's good. But also having what Cheryl talked about, a speaker's bureau and training for people who can respond and react quickly in an area is also important. Having documents and having documentation readily available,

speaking points where you're having everybody stay on the same page is important – that's one way to deal with that.

And I believe if you start putting those things together and seeing how individual members contribute to the whole, I think we can get a better outcome to it. And Global Partnerships, I know you're trying and I've seen elements of strides in the last couple of years. I would wish for you to continue doing that, and I would just say that if we try harder to harmonize I think we'll get better results. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Next on the list is actually Matt Ashtiani who has a few questions and comments from our remote participants.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, Matt Ashtiani for the record. The first question is from Joly MacFie. She says to Mandy… Oh he, sorry. Joly if you're listening, my apologies. He says "Speaking personally I'd be happy to be a part of the cross-RALO working group that would develop strategies. I'd like to focus more on just recruitment."

And the second, it's actually a question now, is from Dwi Alfreda. She asks "What is the real program now or the prospective program of ICANN related to Global Partnership/ALAC?" So I believe she's asking what is the prospective program in relation to Global Partnerships and ALAC.

Mandy Carver: Dwi, forgive me if I misunderstand your question. What I would hope the prospective would be is we continue to distribute your materials.   What Carlton is referencing is exactly the kinds of things that we want to leverage. We want you all- I think the idea of talking points, materials, speaker's bureaus… I don't want to speak on behalf of Communications and the new gTLDs but there was conversation about trying to have ambassadors. And you all are already stretched but you all are also already in other venues for your other roles, but when something comes up you can take advantage of that. You are in the room.

And also I think we need a mechanism for that information to be fed back to us as well. So we need to be able to get materials out to you in advance for wherever you're going when you see it as appropriate, but also feeding it back in. So Dwi, we are interested in continuing to distribute your materials. When we do "What is ICANN" and we present those overviews, that's all of the constituencies. And so we are talking to the different ways to participate on whoever is in the room, and on those thumb drives which Heidi – is Heidi? Yeah, she's here remotely.

Heidi and I have had this conversation – the thumb drives came out of the Global Partnerships budget. So where we can we want to support and where we can work better together we want to do that. So we do want to continue to promote At-Large and we want to help you promote yourselves, and we also want to help you promote ICANN and all those other roles.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Mandy, and one last question or comment from Tijani and then we'll have to adjourn this meeting and move on through our agenda. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Mandy, please put on your headphones. Okay, so this was just a witness account I want to say about the workshop we had in Vilnius. The synergy was complete because we organized with Heidi, we had sent material from ICANN, electronic material and documents that we distributed correctly and several members of the Board were there so we also had the report for ALAC; maybe not for your department, for ALAC it was done.

Mandy Carver: Yes, and I know that particularly around the IGF that was a panel that you put together very successfully and promoted and were able to go and present. It would have been easier if we were able to provide funding and we do do some support to the regional IGFs so that they literally can take place or providing in kind support to the international ones for their scribing, etc. That was not in any way- When I was referencing Carlton's comment about, because he was in the room for something else and it came up, and he was able to… That wasn't a comment that somehow you all wouldn't be reporting back to ICANN what happened at an event. It was we wouldn't necessarily know that he had had that experience.

So this is not about some distrust. I believe that all of you are trusted interlocutors on behalf of ICANN and not just on behalf of At-Large. What I would like is we've discussed how do we get more advanced planning together, how do we put together those kinds of toolkits and talking points so that we can move forward more? I mean I realize that I probably have now more institutional memory than some of the other people who've been presenting, which I find frightening but…

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You're now a veteran, well done.

Mandy Carver: I know, and my hair's gotten a lot grayer during that period.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And on this note, Mandy Carver, thank you very much for joining us. This is an ongoing dialog; I'm sorry we have to adjourn this meeting.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: David and Filiz have been waiting very patiently and we are very much behind schedule, but it's been very good.

Mandy Carver:	Thank you. I'm going to go back here and listen and we will have a follow-up conversation about next steps both with staff and how we can move this forward.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you. And just a housekeeping order – the lunches will be served for those who have ordered lunch. The lunch will be served here and I think we'll turn the next session into a lunch meeting, so we'll probably have to crunch the icebreaker exercise. Oh, I see that it is gone. The room is cool enough to feel a bit the same, so now I invite Filiz Yilmaz to join us and David Olive. And by (inaudible) they have suddenly appeared next to me. Yes Charles?

Charles Mok:	Yes, I just wanted to quickly say that I dropped a pin for you. Yes, David, put it on and yes, it's for our APRALO Showcase happening at Monday, 2:30 outside. And I hope you can come. We unfortunately will be crashing in terms of the meeting time with the gTLD Update but hopefully you can come and grab a little bit of coffee and food and so on before you go into the other meeting. But hopefully you can stop by to our APRALO Showcase. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Charles, that's particularly important. We've had some fantastic showcases and really the At-Large is all about its ALSes and its At-Large Structures, and it'll be really

great to learn about what At-Large Structures in the Asia-Pacific Region are up to and what they're doing, what valuable work they're doing with the community.

Without further ado the next thing we're going to have then is a presentation from Filiz, Senior Director of Participation and Engagement, and Matt is on the Adobe Connect room so we'll have everything on the screen. Filiz, the floor is yours.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thank you and hi again. Having me here, I thank you again, because this is one group that I can report back and receive some very valuable feedback. It's quite important for me to be able to interact with you guys wherever you can find a spot for me on your schedule.

So I won't take longer and I'll proceed immediately. There are three things that I want to report, particularly in this meeting that we have been busy together with the Public Participation Committee as well as I at ICANN myself. Those are remote participation tools; again the newcomers' activities which I really want to report you back because there was so much interest from this group in regards to those services at the beginning, and this is only the second time we are doing it. And we learned some lessons from San Francisco, hopefully bringing that up to speed here. And I also want to talk about ATRT recommendations and the plans going on over there because some of them, as you know, relate to public comment processes, a certain number of them, and

I thought it would be a good time for me to report to you about those and give you a glimpse of how things are moving.

So in regards to the remote participation tools, you are users of it. You have Matt here; I hope things are hoping for you, and if not, again, please let us know. But what we see in general for these services, we see rising numbers in terms of the connections and the people that are getting used to and seem to be using these services. What we can tell is basically the… This slide has two graphs, but for some reason in yours there is only one. It doesn't matter, I'll tell you it's not a very interesting graph anyways. It's basically saying remote participation connections are increasing on our side. What we see are more and more remote participants using the services.

We are also increasing the number of rooms that we serve at the ICANN meetings. So what's happening over here in this graph you see, there is a drop from San Francisco to Singapore but that's only because in Singapore we are serving in twelve rooms but all of them are receiving the services. So we are using the services in their maximum capacity. The thing is I believe there's a lot to do with the perception and awareness about these services. As people find out that actually there is such a service then they go and use it, but some of it is really not being aware of them.

So I ask for your help in your regions, if you have people interested who are not here, who couldn't come here in person, it is very much possible nowadays to use the facilities of internet at an internet conference like this, and make sure that those who

couldn't be here in person can still follow up the meetings to the best, as much as the ones that are here in person. So that is the main message I want to give about remote participation tools, and if you have any comments about them, if you hear comments, let us know.

See, there is a graph there hiding behind somewhere. Alright, newcomers' activities. Now, for most of you I believe you've been following up the reports about this, and for those who are new here maybe I'll just summarize why it is there. The idea partially came from this group, and I first met with you as being also a new attendee of an ICANN meeting myself while trying to figure out all these abbreviations and groups of people, and not knowing exactly what's going on and where.

And with my correspondence with you, slowly but surely this idea developed that newcomers need some roadmap and handholding at the beginning, so we want to make sure that they get to speak and start making the best out of this week as soon as possible. So we started these activities in San Francisco. The main idea is that we're basically integrating newcomers into the ICANN meeting as quickly as possible, and we want to make sure that they leave the ICANN meeting all satisfied and well informed; and to some extent they want to be part of this community even further, so they want to take a place here.

So we will continue our engagement through these programs but I'll just give you a glimpse of the activities. So two types of main activities we have performed in San Francisco and it's going to be

the same here. We have a lounge area where we recruited fellows from the Fellowship Program, so it turned into this program of community giving back to the community. And I quite like the concept of it – we provide the facilitation as staff and we guide them obviously, the team, we do not let them out there on their own but it's working very well actually. There are some of you who have already worked on that bit – [Raquel] took part in San Francisco, and Fouad, yeah, he also worked partially on the team.

So we did a survey afterwards and the satisfaction level was 99% among the newcomers of the San Francisco and we want to continue with this activity. The other thing we have done… Well, you know, we always say "ICANN meetings do start on Sundays"; regular attendees of ICANN meetings, we start working on Sundays like you are here today working all 100%. But for most people, for some reason since the Welcome Ceremony is on Mondays, they think like it is tomorrow – the stuff will start tomorrow.

And I'm not going to argue if this is good or bad or should this be changed; what I'm doing, I'm taking the advantage out of this situation because newcomers, often Sunday is a slow day for them. So what we've done is we've turned it into a Newcomer's Track session list all day, so we provide Introduction to ICANN and Policy Update sessions as well as Remote Participation Services and whatever we have for that particular time – like new gTLDs is an important issue at this time so we had New gTLD Basics; I'm just coming from that session. So Policy Update and Welcome to

EN

ICANN are kind of the statics, constants of that day; the other presentations do vary depending on the geography we are in or the issues we have at hand. Again, this particular activity received very good feedback from the newcomers of San Francisco.

Now, the ATRT bit. So as you know, part of the ATRT recommendations are about public comment processes and how to make them more efficient, and encouraging for a broader participation from the community. And we are looking in regards to the implementations or plans for them, and while we were doing that we have identified if we would update and design and restructure the public comment webpages a little better. And already you are providing easier navigation and you are presenting the content in a much better way, so the attention level to those pages will naturally raise.

So we are working on those, and by the end of June we will have some new designs. The content will not change; everything is the same as you are used to seeing there, but there will be some more structuring on the pages that it will allow you to navigate much better. Instead of a whole list of things now, which is listed on one page, you will have better structuring on the page.

The other thing is about early awareness about upcoming public comments. This was one of the particular recommendations that was made among the ATRT recommendations, it's particularly tagged as Recommendation #21. And we've been engaging with the SO/AC Chairs, and Olivier got the message at the time. What we are trying to do through consultation internally among the

ICANN staff as well as the SO/AC Chairs, we try to get some data in regards to the topics, agenda topics that these groups already have or are about to have, because as leaders you are aware of what is to be discussed next, or you've already worked on some work plans or you hope.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We wish we were aware, but unfortunately we often are not because we often have to respond to whatever else is going on in ICANN. So unfortunately our crystal ball is not good enough yet. Thank you.

Filiz Yilmaz: Yeah, and hopefully this thing we are doing will help you because we will be listing these other groups' points that are upcoming which you may be very interested in. I know you are trying to do some coordination work among other groups, so we will publish that together with the updates on the redesigned webpages later this month. And please let us know if you have any comments. I will be already meeting some community members about this already, during this week.

And then the next step on this will be coming up, the categorization list, so each public comment will be tagged with some category to ease the reader to spot on what the issue is about; as well as we will also move on with the comment-reply-comment structure, which was also a part of the ATRT recommendations. And we will oversee, by the end of this year we will have all these

elements come together, but the first bit is really making sure that the kitchen works, which is basically the design, redesign of the public comment webpages, and that will be happening by the end of this month.

And there will be more notes about this in this meeting during the Public Participation Committee Community Update. We had this back in Cartagena, and I remember this group again was a very good source for that session because you provided so much feedback there, so please come again. We really would like to see you if your agendas will fit. It will be on Thursday, 23rd of June, in the Canning Padang ballrooms, so it's the main meeting rooms. And the Board Public Participation Committee will be addressing about and updating you with regards to their activities, recent activities, as well as they would like to hear from you what's your take on those.

Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Filiz. It's been a very interesting update that we've had here, and I'm particularly pleased to see the progress that is being made in each one of the subjects that we have raised in past discussions that we have had with you. Certainly one thing which I think the At-Large will find extremely helpful is the virtual crystal ball that you will supply by showing what other groups are going to work on.

As we just mentioned, I'm not sure whether we will be able ourselves to contribute much to that crystal ball but we certainly will be one of the recipients of the information, and that will help with our own work because sometimes we end up being totally overwhelmed – in fact, maybe not sometimes, maybe all the time.

Questions and comments? I can see Cheryl waving her hand, strangely enough that crystal ball worked, so Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I actually have a crystal ball, a genuinely real large piece of obsidian, and interestingly enough when I do some lectures in another life, it has a stand and I put a single coin under the stand. And when I ask people to gaze into the crystal ball to see what is revealed – because this has got to do with business and profit and things – actually depends on where you are positioned as to how many coins you see.

So even crystal balls can be misleading, and I think we also need priority as well. It's going to not meet the needs that certainly the ATRT had in mind if all we do is have five equally important things happening at the same time. We also need a mechanism to be able to have the community say "Well thank you very much, GNSO, but this thing from ccNSO really needs to go before that," or whatever – so work in progress, glad to see it's happening.

Just one thing that did strike me when you were talking about remote participation, and I just wanted to make sure that we pick

up on the opportunity for the diversity in language to be explored properly with remote participation. And I was very excited to have Roman sit next to me in one of the wrap-up meetings actually in San Francisco, and I watched him real time live code a chat space application which would allow – we were certainly able to have Russian go into Chinese and Chinese go back into Filipino and various things.

So I do know that you've got talent onboard that is playing with some possibilities, and I'd love to see you perhaps have some strategic meetings across that way as well. It's something that our At-Large community would make a huge amount of use out of just in our ordinary work, but the option for example for Dwi from Indonesia – he was delighted to hear that we have Mandarin being offered in the room here. He would have been delighted if he was not quite so stretched listening to us in Indonesia, and to have a chat ability where my Australian can be turned into real English for example would be really, really handy.

And it's the sort of thing that I think ICANN, with its rare global position, could actually develop its own app that probably would be world's best practice. So you've got some talent onboard; just see if you can pick up some of the opportunities. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Next in the queue is Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier, and hi Filiz. I just have three questions regarding the Fellowship Program, and maybe I missed it but I'd just like to ask the question again: the Fellowship Program, is it for developing countries only or for countries from West Europe as well? That's the first question. The participation in those beginner's sessions about DNSSEC, new gTLDs, all that stuff, is that obligatory for Fellows? And the last question: what is the kind of follow-up with Fellows that participated in one or two ICANN meetings? Thank you.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thank you, Sandra. Well, there are some parts that I can answer but I need to make this clear, that Fellowship is a program… Oh, do you want to explain the Fellowship Program?

Mandy Carver: I'm here, I'm sorry. I was having a side conversation.

Filiz Yilmaz: So if you could repeat, Sandra…

Sandra Hoferichter: Yes, the Fellowship Program, is it for Fellows from developing countries only or also for Western European countries or American countries? Second question about beginner's sessions and the webinars offered before and during the ICANN meeting – is it

obligatory for Fellows? And the last question: is there any kind of follow-up for Fellows who participated in one or two meetings?

Mandy Carver: So, as Filiz was starting to say the Fellowship Program is an outgrowth of Global Partnerships, and when it was established under a whole process of taking materials up through the Board and getting approval for it, it was specifically set up to bring in participants from developing economies. And I say "economies," not countries, but developing economies does mean that if you are a person of limited resources in a wealthy country you're not going to have the same opportunities as a person of whatever resources from a less wealthy country. And that was done so that we had an external maker – we had the World Bank listing of economies – rather than being in a position where we're trying to assess individuals' economic wherewithal to attend a meeting.

So yes, it was for developing economies. The Fellowship Program, unlike other Travel Support, Constituency Support, has a lot of requirements and strings attached to it. We heavily, heavily suggest that people participate and come to the ICANN 101. In fact, Janice went from managing Fellowship to then providing that material as well, to running that session as well in conjunction with Filiz. So yes, they are supposed to go.

We also have an alumni program. Let me first say, for the Fellowship Program itself and you are a Fellow, welcome. No? Okay. So for the Fellowship Program they have a series of

requirements, both before they arrive, during the meeting and after they go home, so they have to attend certain sessions including the Fellowship Program session every morning where they're getting-Yes, it starts at 7:00, it does. There's Sunday events where the alumni can introduce themselves to the current, whether meet & greets, there's the ICANN 101 session. We encourage them to participate in specific events; we try and help the Fellow find the track depending on what constituency they represent or are most interested in.

Attending the Fellowship Sessions are mandatory. They are in part set up that way so that it's breakfast, so if for instance they're a member of an existing constituency – if they're a new GAC representative or they're a ccTLD person coming in – they can still attend their constituency events, they can still get to the Council meetings. But they would also have the opportunity to be in the Fellowship Program, to have the presentations each morning from different members of the community, the different ACs and SOs and their Chairs. There's a whole mechanism for that.

They have to do a report at the end about what it is they've taken away from the meeting, what they're taking home, and actually the payment of the stipend is keyed to their completion of that process. So that's something else that you need as compared to other Travel Support. We recognize that an ICANN meeting is a very rich and varied environment and it's hard to drop somebody in for one meeting and have them be able to both absorb it and take it away.

So they can be supported for up to three meetings and then we very much try and graduate them.

They have to apply again each time. It's not a given. And we then try and rope our alums into mentoring new people coming in, pushing them into the NomCom – that sounded wrong – "encouraging" their participation through the NomCom process, encouraging their becoming involved in the other constituency structures that already exist.

And then we're trying to put together certain kinds of things that would allow them, yeah, there's Facebook and Twitter and there's all these other things where the Fellowship family then can continue to communicate and participate, and generate interest and push forward other people from their communities and constituencies that they're interacting with to get them involved. Did I answer those?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Mandy. We have a queue. We have Ron Sherwood first, and then we'll have Cheryl and afterwards we'll have Cintra and Dev.

Ron Sherwood: Ron Sherwood, ccNSO ALAC liaison. I have a question – is the Fellowship, the series of Fellowship activities at an ICANN meeting, is it inclusive or exclusive? For example, Virgin Islands is a very poor part of the American economy which is considered

to be a wealthy American economy. If the CC or any other outside organization is prepared to sponsor a person from that community to the ICANN meeting, not be supported by the Fellowship Program, would that person be excluded from attending Fellowship or would they be permitted to be included?

Mandy Carver: Anyone, anyone can come to the Fellowship Program, and we actually have had collaborative efforts where there are other programs that are bringing people in and they're all welcome to come. So our capacity to fund someone who would have been applying through the online mechanism and it's an independent selection committee, it's not staff that selects, that's one set of criteria that's under the terms and conditions of the program. But anyone is welcome to come to those sessions. We're happy to have the participation and to share the information.

Ron Sherwood: And would such a person be able to participate in the pre-arrival online sessions, and the alumni and the post sessions?

Mandy Carver: That's a very good question. I don't know that they would necessarily be part of the alumni network but I can ask. A lot of the things that we would promote are things like the fabulous webinar that the Policy Department does in advance that a lot of staff listen to because it is an amazing resource. And so that's not

somehow limited to just Fellows. It's also possible that someone who would have attended under a different Support mechanism. What you posited, an example where they are residents of an economy that would be beyond the level…

And I have to say that when we took the World Bank layers, we took least, middle and upper-middle developing, so we came fairly far up in the rankings for eligibility.   Now, we are also in the process of having a discussion around terms and conditions about whether the World Bank ranking is the right one, because there have been some communities whose economies have changed because of issues with natural resources or whatever else, so that is an ongoing discussion. But no, if you're here access to those materials is not limited and I don't know if we would necessarily…

We're trying to build a network of people with shared experiences who can go forward and be ambassadors for ICANN and the multi-stakeholder process, not necessarily for the Fellowship Program alone. But you've raised an interesting question and I'd need to go back and look at the terms and conditions and then also talk to Janice about the way those resources have now been developed from conversations with the Selection Committee and others.

Ron Sherwood: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Next on the list is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, and you don't have to come back because it's not a question, Mandy, but it is absolutely to do with Fellowship. I just wanted to point out two things: because Fellowship has been running for a particular number of cycles now, the maturation of the process really is extraordinary to watch, and as you know I'm a card-carrying supporter of the program and I think that's terrific.

I wanted to link it to the newcomer's activities, too, because I ran into a newcomer in the lift today very early in the morning, and you say "Hello, hello," and I saw green and I went "Ah-ha! You're a newcomer, we need to talk," and we did. And it was I thought a huge compliment to the preparation that's been going on that this particular person already knew that one of the places and spaces she wanted to come and look at was At-Large. And there was a really quite in-depth understanding, so that's just kudos and it's well deserved.

The other thing I wanted to just mention which I think is timely but maybe we could have a bigger role as your At-Large community, is something that I believe is a first this time, and that's where previous Fellows – people who've been Fellows I think at least three times, so alumni members who are at this meeting have also been offered, and I have no idea of how many of them there are. I just know I am mentoring someone who is doing newcomer work

and everything else, so they've looked outside of the alumni for someone to hang your coat strings to and sort of work with and mentor. And I think that's really very clever. If that's going to expand then I believe there's some extraordinary talent in the At-Large community that could be drawn unto that. So that's just my points for those. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. In the queue next is Cintra, Cintra Sooknanan.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Olivier. I actually do want to touch on a point with regard to the Fellowship Program and how effective it is at this point in time. I don't know, I mean I suppose like EURALO, LACRALO is crippled in our Caribbean ALS representation simply because quite a number of territories do not qualify under the new classification. I was wondering, perhaps you can answer, if there's any review of that and how far along you are in terms of that review, if any.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Filiz, would you like to answer that?

Filiz Yilmaz: Well, actually yes, this is part of the program that has some certain structure at the moment, and this team, Global Partnerships is

overseeing this activity. What I can promise you is I'm going to take this into my notes and proceed that to them, because I can't answer that on behalf of them obviously, and Mandy is busy. I'm seeing she's being pulled again.

[background conversation]

Cintra Sooknana: I'm sorry. Do you want me to explain?

Mandy Carver: My understanding from Carlton is that you are raising the issue that there are, within certain regions you might have one- Well for instance, within the Caribbean you have some that qualify and don't because of the nature of the list that we used. And we're examining that right now. There's a discussion about how do we address the concern, and perhaps the World Bank wasn't the right list to use. Should we be using one of the UN lists that carve things up slightly differently, or looking at small island nation states, those kinds of criteria.

That's an ongoing discussion that's happening right now. In order to move that we would have to change the terms and conditions of the program, so it's one of the things that we're looking at. We don't want to be inequitable in the way that we look at this, but we also didn't want something that would leave it to individual…

Yeah, we're trying to have as clean and transparent a program as possible so that you can see and we can tie it back.

Cintra Sooknanan: Has there been any engagement with the community, like LACRALO for instance? We haven't heard much.

Mandy Carver: We've had quite a bit of engagement coming up through constituencies talking to the Global Partnerships Manager, Regional Relations from those regions and through alumni and non-alumni of the Fellowship Program; people who've gone to apply and don't find their- So we have, what I would say is direct feedback from the community but not institutional feedback.

And so the first question is can we raise the issue with the selection committee about what would be involved here, and then is there a mechanism to simply make the change or do we need to go through a formal getting feedback from the organization? So we absolutely hear the issue because people go to apply and they say "My country's not there, but here's the GDP that I'm looking at and here are these issues." So I would say what we've had is direct community response opposed to us going to the various institutions to ask for feedback, which is not to say we won't but we may do it without having to have that formal.

Cintra Sooknanan: Well, I'm just speaking in terms of LACRALO but I know that we do have a particular outreach program and sit in countries that we do want to solicit, for lack of a better word, representatives. So may I suggest that you work with the RALOs in terms of developing perhaps those criteria and also looking at flagging countries or jurisdictions or economies that fall within this group.

Mandy Carver: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cintra. And last, Dev, was your comment on the same base or were you going to bring something else to the discussion? Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: It'll be brief. I guess it is following on that because a lot of the FY '12 budget requests for outreach were deferred because the explanation given was that until the PPC develops a overall outreach plan for all constituencies and stakeholder groups. So I guess what exactly needs to happen for that to happen, so that when our ideas for outreach are presented they can then be embraced and supported?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Dev, and thank you very much to Filiz for coming to speak to us. Just one last thing I wanted to add, the fact

that you are going to be meeting with Sandra as far as education is concerned – education of users and education of people who are going to take part in the ICANN process. I understand it's Sandra and Wolf and a couple of other people. Of course those people are now involved due to some of the work that was done by Working Team B, that has developed some processes and some proposals for the ALAC to consider in its continuous improvement program. So thanks very much, Filiz.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And thank you to David as well. And thanks of course to Mandy who was also here at the same time. And she's gone. Oh, she's still here. She's hiding behind my back, right.

Quick housekeeping note: we have to go to the GAC meeting room now. We've got six minutes to cross the hall, however the GAC apparently only has half an hour to see us which is a little bit of a problem because we were supposed to see them for an hour, so I've just learned about this. As a result may I ask that we are back here in the room in half an hour at 2:30, and we will be able to make use of the facilities that we have here for a policy discussion, discussing all of the different policies that we do have.

Some people are waving whether we need to take our things with us next door and then bring them back – I have no clue if you will

find them when you come back. I would hope that you do but then again, don't take my word for it so perhaps take everything with you next door and then bring everything back. There are two doors, I don't know if we have the resources… ICANN has few resources.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, so we will have someone who will remain here and watch the bags and watch a few things. Whatever you do, do not leave your $20,000 that you have won yesterday at the casino – that might have to come with you. Anyway, we're moving over to the GAC room. Thank you.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, this is the continuation of the ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session I which started this morning just after 9:00 AM and is going to go until 6:00. We've just come back from the GAC and ALAC meeting and had a coffee break, and now we have Patrick Jones who is here with us and is going to speak to us about the SSR, Stability & Security Review – is that correct?

Patrick Jones: Security, Stability and Resiliency Framework.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Resiliency, fantastic. Well Patrick, you have a small presentation for us so I guess we'll let you go ahead with it, and thank you for joining us.

Patrick Jones: Well thanks for having me back. As you know I gave a pre-briefing to At-Large in April before the FY '12 SSR Framework was posted.   And we posted the framework on May 2nd simultaneously in the five UN languages.

For us, this was a step back and our previous two SSR plans were 60-page Word documents, very weighty with a lot of good information but perhaps not displayed in the best way for the general user or for others in the community to understand very clearly what ICANN's role is in Security, Stability and Resiliency, what are our key priorities and how ICANN fits with the greater ecosystem.

So we came up with a new Framework; it was posted in two parts. Part A was intended to state very clearly where ICANN has, from a foundational aspect in the bylaws, in the Affirmation of Commitments and its other documents, a role in Security, Stability and Resiliency; and then to say after that foundational piece how ICANN fits in the greater ecosystem, and breaking down even

further internally how security is handled from the Security Team and as well as its connection to other aspects of the organization. So that's all part A.

And then there was a second piece, Part B, to provide greater detail and also some overview of the fiscal '12 priorities as well as to try to create a distinction between those things that are ICANN operational; those things where ICANN serves as a collaborator, facilitator and coordinator with the community; and those areas where we have some observation of activities that are led by others but they're not led by ICANN staff or led by ICANN as an entity. So that was kind of the breakdown, and hopefully it was presented in a way that was clear and useful for the community.

It's kind of hard to see presented on the screen but what I did is I took a screen capture of the announcement to show a breakdown, and I'm pretty proud of the way it was posted in five languages simultaneously. We haven't done it that many times at ICANN for large documents and so I was quite pleased at the way it was posted. So the document after May 2nd, after getting an informal request from the ccNSO to extend the comment period we added in a week, so the comment period ran through June 7th, and we received only a small bit of comments and that's okay, but I wanted to have a chance to come back to this group and sort of give an overview of what was received, who staff and consultations with, so that's the next slide.

Before the document was posted we had a pre-briefing with SSAC as well as a call with At-Large. We had interest from a work team

with the ccNSO to get an understanding of what would be –
actually, that was right after the publication of the SSR Framework
– as well as receiving some comments from the Registry
Stakeholders Group in the comment forum that staff, as in I,
answered in the comment forum so that it would be open and
transparent for the community; I offered that up also for others to
ask a question during the comment period and I would commit to
providing a response in the comment period.

There weren't any others in the community that took us up on that
but we did receive comments before the close of the period from
ccNSO, from…now I'm drawing a blank on who else we received
comments from…from a small group that we had in the FY '11
comment period. I did a briefing to a group of international law
enforcement and security experts at the National Cyber-Forensics
Training Alliance in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in mid-May, and
then we had done briefings to smaller groups of business and
government participants from the IT Sector Coordinating Council
in Washington, D.C. That was more of an informal, just "Here's
the SSR Framework and if you want to comment please do."

So we try and spread out to those who may not always come to
ICANN meetings and at least provide the same notice that there's
this document out there. So the next slide is key themes. My
perception is there is general support from the community for this
new format and the way it was posted. We had some very targeted
comments from the ccNSO and from the Registry Stakeholder
Group requesting improvement of the definitions used in the

Framework and precision on describing ICANN's role in SSR. That's not something new and we are going to continue to work on refining those definitions as part of the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group, and that'll be in the next topic once I finish.

And the other piece was that there was support for an environmental scan to assess the current internet security ecosystem and ICANN's role in that, and involved a broader bit of the internet community than just registries, registrars and others that come to ICANN meetings but include enterprise users, the user community – I would say that's At-Large and others, academics – and include them in that work.

So the next couple slides I have are extracted out of the SSR Framework. This shows again the distinction that we tried to make between those areas that are ICANN operations, so our internal IT, L-Root, DNS operations, the DNSSEC key signing facility and mechanisms, as well as Compliance; and then the functions that I call string evaluation, so right now that's the IDN ccTLD Fast Track; things like meeting logistics, delivering on this meeting as well as other meetings and administration, finance.

Then there's those areas where ICANN acts as a coordinator, collaborator, facilitator – so that's policy coordination, Secretariat services, serving as subject matter experts, ccTLD training and other events like that. And the third area where there's activities in the ecosystem that are led by others where we have some awareness or observation, but ICANN staff and ICANN

community structures aren't leading those efforts but are either aware or following them. So I hope that's useful to At-Large and to others to know that we really are trying to make that a distinction and have that be picked up as something that we are stating very clearly – there are areas where others lead and we're aware of them but not trying to lead them.

And the next slide is again the state internally at ICANN – what are our core areas? So that's global security engagement and awareness, security collaboration, DNS capability building –so that's the training programs that are done with the regional TLD organizations and other partners in the ecosystem – and then our corporate security, business continuity efforts and risk management, as well as the things that we do cross-functionally to support DNSSEC, the IDN Fast Track, New gTLD Program and others. And if I've rambled on too long and people have questions stop me.

So the next two slides, and I think right after that I get into the DSSA Working Group and I'll turn it over to Olivier or someone else. In the SSR Framework we had identified some areas we consider might be worthy of discussion at some point down the road in greater detail, and that is in the category of emerging threats. So we try to make a distinction between the threats that are leveraging the DNS to deliver some kind of botnets denial of service attack, social engineering attacks, some kind of threats that are using the DNS to deliver a harm to users; versus those threats that are against the infrastructure itself – so threats that are trying

to either take down or happen to registry/registrar providers. That can also include disasters that happen and authentication compromises such as the one that happened a couple of months ago with Komodo and the SSL certificates compromised.

So the next slide are some emerging issues to watch and how that will play out within SSR. That includes the IDN Variant project which now there's six case studies and the groups are meeting here in Singapore this week; issues of government interventions into and impacts on the DNS, so issues like in Egypt and Libya and Syria and other countries; emerging issues around DNSSEC implementation, adoption, greater use.

I'm sure there's quite a bit of work to be done to this day about IPv6 and the follow-on increase in adoption of use there, as well as – and I think this is probably an area that has had much less study, probably because it doesn't immediately touch on the ICANN world but it's something to consider – and that's the interaction between the DNS and mobile applications or applications themselves and how they connect to the DNS.

It's something that for awareness maybe At-Large could think about or others think about what's the connection between applications and domain names, and a unique identifier system? And then the other, we're hearing quite a bit of interest and engagement from the law enforcement community and how they can work more closely with ICANN and ICANN stakeholders, and that's going to continue.

The next slide goes into community work, and that will touch on the DSSA, and maybe this is an opportunity to turn it over, either to pause and ask for questions or I can introduce the DSSA as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Patrick. I was going to say perhaps we can pause first and discuss the DSSR and then we'll just do the DSSA as a little add-on at the end of the meeting. So first, any questions for Patrick Jones? And I see Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Three things if you could just elaborate on briefly. Is the botnet issue, have you been seeing an increase in that or have you been talking to people who are seeing that as an increasing problem? What's the scope of it? The second is can you briefly just put a little more detail to the root hijacking issue? And third, when you're saying you're talking to user communities about this kind of thing, who is it that you're engaging with? You know the At-Large should be engaging with those people, too.

Patrick Jones: Maybe I'll take the last one first because I'm listing "user community" as engaging with At-Large. So that's describing the communities that we're talking to.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, I didn't mean it like a territory thing. I just meant if you're talking to groups of people who are worried about this stuff we just wanted to know who they were.

Patrick Jones: So on the botnets, I think that's going to be a topic in the DNS Abuse Forum for Monday afternoon, so I might want to leave it there. There's quite a bit of work, and I don't know how many of you heard the DNS Abuse Forum discussion in San Francisco, the presentation from the Microsoft representative about the Rustock botnet. There is quite a bit of work underway that I don't know how much can be discussed publicly – those follow-on actions from Microsoft's court action. There is a considerable amount of effort in taking that and putting it into implementation, so the botnet issue is still happening and that's an area where ICANN's acting as a sort of collaborator facilitator of efforts that are initiated by others. And I apologize on the second piece.

Beau Brendler: Root hijacking.

Patrick Jones: Ah.   So that's listed as an emerging issue but really it's one that occurred probably about a year ago with, I believe it was the I-root incident of traffic that was noticed in Chile, that appeared to go to China. It's one that I'm probably not the person to spend a lot of

time talking about it but it's something to watch. I list it as an emerging issue as it's one to watch.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Patrick. Any other questions or comments from any other members of the At-Large? I do have a question for Patrick: do you believe that the involvement of the At-Large community and the feedback you're getting is enough or would you like more interaction with users out there regarding the issues that you're having to tackle on a daily basis?

Patrick Jones: Well, I was hoping that- I expected Jeff Moss to be here so that I could introduce him to this group, so he is now our Chief Security Officer and Jeff has a long history and is an expert in the security community. I think it would be good for him to hear what your issues are, and Cheryl, I guess you have a question. He's new, he wants to hear.   At-Large represents a different community and it's important for him to hear what the concerns are from this group. So keep doing it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Patrick, and it's certainly a core thing for internet users to have a stable internet that they can operate. I think Cheryl has a question or a comment. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

| Cheryl Langdon-Orr: | Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, and it's actually a comment so you can relax a little bit there. It just struck me as we're talking about the engagement with the At-Large community that what we're doing, you're engaging effectively in fora like this with representatives of the At-Large community. There might be opportunity for not only wider outreach to the edges with people who are perhaps engaged in education outreach, consumer awareness-type people and groups which many of our At-Large Structures probably have either access to; or in some cases where we are member-based organizations of other organizations we might actually have direct contact with key people in various countries and provinces. |

So we might need to do a little bit of strategic planning on some of that. I think that would be something to have as a future action item. Then the almost flipside of that is that it struck me that here I am, sitting as a representative at this table that came here from ISOC AU as an At-Large Structure and we've got this little company called Sophos as a member.

I suggest that some of us might actually have organizations that make their daily bread and may have expertise that we could also leverage off to have regional outreach and issues, but it might also be people who, when you want to talk to some of those at the edge community involved, in this case in prevention, we might have some unofficial official pathways to get information that might not be as easily sourced if we were looking at commercial relationships other than that. So maybe we should do a little bit of

strategic planning about who we have access to and what we can utilize. Thanks.

Patrick Jones:

I think that's really helpful, and also if you are aware of events in your regions where you think it would be useful to have someone from ICANN come and talk about security efforts… As this meeting marks the end of FY '11 so we head into FY '12 we're looking at our schedules and what events are out there where we're being asked to come and provide an update.

Since global security outreach is still one of our areas if there's something that is a major event in your region and you'd like to have someone from ICANN come let us know and we'll try to see if that can fit. And if we're going to have someone that may be travelling and can make an effort to be there then that's useful, so please pass that on. Send it through either the At-Large support staff as a request or just as a "Here's an event that's happening." Please let us know.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I specifically wanted to know, it can go via staff, it's not a problem but it goes to you?

Patrick Jones:

You can certainly send it to me as working with… Jeff will be leaning on me quite a bit to help him get up to speed on what the interests are, so yes, send it to me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Patrick.   One last question perhaps, the recent IPv6 Day that took place on the [16th] of June, just a few days ago actually. Has this raised any SSR issues at all? Have you been monitoring this or was it a non-event?

Patrick Jones: My sense is that it went rather smoothly. I also would like to get an update from, Leo Vegoda is ICANN's resident IPv6 expert and he would be the person to deliver what the observations have been from IPv6 Day, but by all accounts it's been a rather smooth and good thing, and that is continuing to increase the awareness of IPv6. And I'd be interested if that's raising the interest level at the edges and with the At-Large community, too.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. May we ask you to perhaps ask him and come back to us because it is an SSR issue?

Patrick Jones: Certainly, yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic. Well, the next part is just a quick review of the DSSA Working Group which you have touched on, and please just correct me – I'll go through the slides that were prepared by one of our colleagues, yes Mikey who is one of our co-chairs.   But the

whole group has worked and has given some feedback on this so I didn't want to specifically target one person in particular.

I think we can go to the first slide please. Just to give you an idea of what the DSSA is – you might have seen a few people walking around with a DSSA badge, a pink badge on their bigger badge. And basically the meeting, during the ICANN Brussels meeting the At-Large Advisory Committee, the country code Names Supporting Organization, the GNSO and the GAC and the NROs, which is something new – usually the NROs are not involved – but the NROs all acknowledged the need for a better understanding of the security and stability of the global Domain Name System.

And this is considered to be a common interest across all SOs and ACs, certainly an interest for At-Large. And so the idea was to have a working group put together to undertake a collaborative effort where everyone involved would contribute. The activity since the San Francisco meeting has been basically on organizing the Working Group so as for it to be operational after the Singapore meeting. The idea was to of course launch the Working Group, build trust between the different actors – because often those different actors are not used to working with each other, and it is important that everyone has full trust because some of the issues that will be dealt with will require full confidentiality.

It is sometimes difficult for organizations that run the DNS or that run networks to share information about the level of threat that is out there without sharing sometimes some commercial information, which they don't need to share with other people. So

there's some information gathering which took place and the approach to the work was defined.

If we can go to the next slide please, that defines what the Security, Stability & Resiliency is and I think that we've already heard about this a little bit earlier with Patrick, so I think we can skip to the next slide. The organization of the work is, well it's got the co-chairs on one side who act really as program management steering committee. It has the ACs' and the SOs' councils which will act as the customers and formal connection to ICANN itself, and they will also provide the resources and support. It is through the ACs and SOs that the information will be collected certainly with the contacts of all these ACs and SOs.

There are the Work Group members and experts. It is important to note that there will be outside experts enlisted to work on these issues; certainly the NROs will bring some external experts that will work on the program. The Working Group itself is not really involved in collecting or designing equipment, or programming or software that will collect the data, but it will get that data from somewhere else and it will certainly need the collaboration of those external organizations to provide all of that data. And then there's the support staff as in any working group.

Next slide please. The approach is quite simple – identify the threats, analyze the threats, and solicit comments and develop a report from them. If any of the points are decided by consensus to be excluded or rejected then they will just hang there and they will

not stop the work of the Working Group. It will just move on to the next level for those parts which will have reached consensus.

And finally the work plan, the overview of the work plan – the launch is what we've been going through so far. The next step is to address the readiness issues, identify the threats, analyze the threats and then prepare the reports, and hopefully celebrate by the end if we do find that the results aren't that frightening. But we'll only know once this is in place. And so in the last slide, the target for Singapore that we've had so far is to draft the DSSA charter, establish the membership as I mentioned a little bit earlier, and conduct a kickoff meeting which will take place during this meeting.

Sorry Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've had a couple of meetings but this is the first face-to-face.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: This is the first face-to-face, that's right. We've had several meetings already. There have been a number of co-chair meetings taking place on one side and also full meetings with the full membership. It is worth mentioning that the membership itself is more than 30 people and organizations. We have several people from At-Large who are involved in this. It is particularly important; may I remind everyone that we're well represented on

there and that we take the opportunity of being able to say what we need to say and take full advantage of that opportunity.

It's a very important subject, but if we are given so many seats, so many positions to be able to take part then we need to take advantage of what we're given. If we're not then in the future we just won't be taken seriously, so particularly important.   Well, that's the whole… I did say "voila" didn't I? That's the whole DSSA. Do you have anything to add to this, Patrick, by any chance?

Patrick Jones: No, I think that covers it well. This is important that it's a cross-community, community-driven effort and staff is supporting it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, and with this thank you very much. Any questions or, I don't see any questions from around the table so I think we can just thank you for joining us. Patrick Jones.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, and before we jump to the next subject I am of course looking for Evan and Evan has disappeared. He's in the back of the room? Evan, could you please take your position? I believe you have a small announcement or question to ask the group.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So Evan, yes, we've just had just before this session a meeting with the GAC and I believe there is a question or a proposal that you would like to make. Please?

Evan Leibovitch: And forgive me about this, I was talking to Cintra and Tijani because I wanted to at least talk to them ahead of time before I invoke their names in what I'm about to propose. I know, fussy about that kind of thing.

Anyway, those of you that were in the meeting between ALAC and the GAC, I hope you found it somewhat productive, in some ways very frustrating about process and about the very different ways in which the GAC and the ALAC move, create advice; and the very different ways between the way the GAC operates and give s its advice and the way the JAS Working Group operates.

With extreme thanks to Eric, a possible solution was created to get around this logjam. What has been proposed is to create a very small team from ALAC, a very small team from the GAC, to get together within the next 24 hours and to start to work on a solution based on some of the things that were brought up at the meeting today, and with the intent that the result of this will be a joint ALAC/GAC statement to the Board on applicant support.

This is not specifically a JAS thing; this is an Advisory Committee joint communiqué to the Board from ALAC and from the GAC on the specific subject of applicant support. The reason I was speaking to Cintra and Tijani at the back of the room is because the proposed team is the three of us plus Avri Doria, plus Eric. I'm asking for okay from ALAC to move forward with this group.

The GAC is similarly meeting and has assembled its own team. We already have a tentative time but the intention is to focus on a solution based on what the JAS has done so far, based on the ALAC responses to it and based on the GAC responses to it, and come up with something concrete that attempts to deal with some of the process-related and cultural and style-related obstacles we've encountered to date. I'll leave it at that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan, and I see that Cheryl had her hand up. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Evan, I just want to be really clear in my mind: this is something that the GAC has already agreed to put people into, yes or no? And then I have a follow-up.

Evan Leibovitch: The answer is absolutely yes. Alice is taking the lead and in fact has already assembled a team.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay.   With that understanding I would caution us to be very careful about how we word this and what we do in terms of process and resolution, because I think this needs to be seen as an Advisory Committee activity, the output of which is very much standalone from our activities in the JAS Work Group. And I'd also want to be really clear that that does not mean that what happens in this joint-AC activity cannot be fed in through the participants that are also in the JAS Work Group to that group's activity, but I think we need to make sure it's really clear that there's a separation of church and state here and what the purpose is.

This is specifically generation of advice to the Board from the two Advisory Committees in this organization that have the right to do so. I'm comfortable with the concept but I think we need to make sure that the material, the written word and the record is really, really clear.

Evan Leibovitch: And the answer to that is that specific issue has already been thought out. This is not JAS-related at all; it is inspired by the JAS and fed by it but it is an Advisory Committee activity and that alone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can we not have the JAS feeding it? Can we have it, should it be so desirable in its outcome the JAS able to be fed from it? Because if it goes the other way we're going to get into deep doo-doo.

Evan Leibovitch: The JAS is not disbanding. It's my anticipation that the two processes will go forward. This is an attempt right now to deal with the process differences between the GAC and the JAS.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Thank you, Cheryl. Just for the record, that action item was something which the ALAC took away from its meeting with the GAC. The members of that specific working group are all At-Large members, and yes, it is among the list of tasks for those members to report to the ALAC who will then report to the JAS Working Group, which can then report to the two chairs of the chartering organizations – just to make sure that this is the case. And it will report I guess simultaneously but I'll leave that of course to the JAS Working Group chairs. That action has had nothing to do with the JAS Working Group chairs; it is purely an ALAC action.

Thank you. Okay, Cintra?

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to also agree with your last statement. The fact that we spent all our time speaking about support and having such strong statements by the Portugal GAC

representative to really build a system that is open to all applicants, not just the rich ones, I think that this is important for both the ALAC and the GAC to meet. And it's not just something that looks nice to JAS. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, I think perhaps do we need to submit a motion for this? I turn over to my co-chair who knows about these things. So I guess we have to have the motion worded, and the motion being that we have a timeout, okay. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is nothing more dangerous than doing wordsmithing on the fly. You have in principle support. I would suggest that when the next convening of the ALAC occurs that by then the appropriate resolution is presented to us, we briefly convene, it is seconded and then we go through the process of approval. Because dotting the I's and crossing the T's is going to have to be done on this one, so let's get that drafted and then make it happen. It's not going to hold up the process – you can go with in principle support. The specifics of the resolution need to be knocked out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evan?

Evan Leibovitch:	This is Evan. Is that okay even though it's likely that this team will have to meet even before that motion takes place?
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	When are you planning on meeting?
Evan Leibovitch:	Tomorrow at 3:00.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Absolutely no reason why it can't be dealt with well in advance of that. It doesn't have to be dealt with face-to-face, but we have to look at the words and we have to agree. You've got a full quorum here but they can do it virtually or they can do it face-to-face, but I would suggest we could probably do it in a Skype chat room. The rules of procedure allow for electronic agreement but we do need to see the words.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, so action item that this motion has to be drafted. May I ask Evan to draft this motion please with help from staff?
	Okay, and without further ado let's move over to the next part of our program, and I do apologize of the delay. We have Scott Pinzon and Christina Rodriguez who have both joined us. Matt Ashtiani of course is already with us this afternoon, and we are going to speak today about the communication tools which we

have already spoken about in past meetings but which are I guess evolving.

Thank you very much for joining us, Scott; thank you, Christina. And should we start first with you? You have a presentation I guess to give us, or questions or a full dialog? Homework, okay, well I can see yes, homework. So Scott, that's it – you have the floor.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There might be some last-minute changes going on there. Well, if I can just add in the meantime and do a little bit of adlibbing, there has been coming from the last meeting, there was a move to ask the RALOs for their communications. Some Regional At-Large Organizations provided some input on this process; some did not. I gather that only the ones who have provided input really have a need for communication and those that have not might be very happy already with what they have. Perhaps this is not the case so this is your time to bring some input into the discussion.

But are you ready now, Scott? Fantastic, so you have the floor.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'm really happy to see you all again. I did not prepare slides because I wanted to hold an open

discussion with you, and I had three topics in mind that I would suggest and then you can let me know if it sounds suitable to you. I wanted to give you an update.

Last time I met with you there was a request for a "Beginner's Guide to Being Cyber Savvy," and I thought I would update you on that. We had a lot of discussion about what would it take for At-Large to begin its own video podcasts and there seemed to be a fair amount of excitement about it but I don't know if there was clarity about what would be the goal of it or what are you trying to accomplish with it. So I brought a tool that if you want to we can use for discussion to try and work through that.

And then I was also hoping maybe I could get some guidance from you on what At-Large would like to see happen as ICANN moves into a phase of making the world more aware of the possibility of new gTLDs. So those are topics I'm hoping to discuss and hoping to any you might suggest.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you, Scott. So what do you suspect we should do? Should we just go through this profile and start filling it together or how do you suggest working this out?

Scott Pinzon: I had forwarded this in advance and I didn't know if it was something some would work on or if you wanted to do it now, I bow to your own sense of what's efficient.

EN

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I think many of us have had an opportunity to look at it, to think on it, perhaps to have even put fingernail to keyboard on it. But it would be very productive when we have the numbers of regional interests at this table to have a sort of group think unified exercise. So if we're going to, say, use this template and explore the options of the cyber savvy project, for example, or insert whatever title you like, I think it would not only help us learn how to use the tool and the benefits of that but it would also help crystallize that we have a trans-, cross-, or multi-regional view.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Scott, do you have any…

Scott Pinzon: Yeah, I wonder if it would help if I describe this a little bit. Previously in my career I was a freelancer for six or seven years, and many times clients would come and say they wanted to do something. And you know, they had this picture in their head of something that would be fantastic whether it be the "Guide to Being Cyber Savvy" or a podcast that helps popularize the At-Large consensus statements on things, whatever. But there's some

very basic things that need to be worked out in order to hit your target successfully, and even to know whether you have or not.

So I'm happy to leave this with you; I'll just walk through it real fast. There's nothing magic about it. There are certainly other ways you could do this but it might prove a useful tool for discussion. So the form is projected and to walk through it quickly – "Name of Project," that's pretty obvious: you put the name of whatever it is. The "What is it" is meant to be dead literal – is it a video, is it a brochure, is it an audio clip, is it a white paper? Whatever it is, and then "Description" is where you would go into a little more detail about how you picture it.

These next couple are actually very important: "Who is the main audience?" A lot of times in communications when you feel like you have perhaps limited resources there's a sense of wanting to make something that's just for everybody, and that rarely works. The more audiences you are trying to tap the more you diffuse the impact of the piece. So it's often constructive, I find, to identify one key audience that you really want to get to the most. I would guess in many cases in At-Large that would be the internet end user but not necessarily. There may be times where actually you're creating something that you hope will be persuasive to other ACs or SOs, I don't know, but the point is to identify a main audience and then a secondary audience.

The next field is "What is the communication objective?" That's kind of big words for a simple question: after your audience views this thing or reads it or whatever it is, what should be different

about them because they encountered it? What should they think that they hadn't thought before? Should they be persuaded in a certain direction? What are you trying to get them to believe? So that should be explicitly stated here.

The next field asks "Is a call to action appropriate?" Many times when you are trying to create some movement within a community there's something you actually want them to do after they look at your piece, and it may be "go to the public comment forum and express your opinion," or it may be "talk to your RALO and make sure that your voice is being heard through your ALS chapter" – I don't know what an example is, but sometimes there is this call to action. You want them to actually do something so again, you just list it here.

And the strength of all this is if you know who you're talking to and you know what you want them to think, and you know what you want them to do suddenly creating this piece actually gets easier because as you edit it, it's easier to see what does not support these particular goals that you specified.

And then this next field is one that people often overlook, and it says "Success of this project will be measured by what?" So let's say that you are creating "The Beginner's Guide to Being Cyber Savvy" – one way you could measure its success is just to track how many times it was downloaded. If we put a lot of effort into it and it gets downloaded 20 times, is that a success? Maybe not, it's up to you to determine. You can also consider things as simple as

anecdotal responses from the community but it's always better if it's something that's quantifiable.

And then the rest of this is really more administrative – when do you want to have it done by, is it being done as part of maybe a bigger project or not – but I think the fields that I've covered are really the important ones for helping you decide what you want to do and increasing your odds of hitting the mark.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this tool, Scott. I think it's particularly helpful in looking at the question that has been sent to the lists and the fact that whenever we meet with you we like the idea of having podcasts, having videos, but don't quite know what we would like to portray out there. It is good to be able to ask ourselves the questions. I wonder whether anyone has questions about the questions to start with, because certainly there is a lack of… It appears to me that there is some kind of lack of understanding and maybe this will really help. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I scribbled on this paper like I typed at the last one, and I've got the same question in the same box, and it goes under the guesstimated price or budget. I really am very doubtful that we are equipped to answer that, and I don't think that matters whether we're talking about a whole bunch of thumb drives with information on it, a podcast, an all-singing or all-dancing video.

We really don't have the answer to that because we don't what resources ICANN has and what the cost and leverage and those various things are. For example, we did broker with ARIN, yes the RIR with its Hollywood contacts, and I do mean Hollywood contacts – we could have some serious all-singing and all-dancing stuff done if we ever got some dollar for dollar equivalency or some project backing.

So we've got to work on maybe that one. If we're going to be using this as an internal tool the question of what department pays for it I think should literally be deleted off this because these things need to be seen as hopefully a whole bunch of opportunities which we'll go "Oh great, now we can prioritize them and socialize them and get wider ICANN agreement to."

And then the related project and dependencies, I think this needs to be split into two to make it more useful for us, and I'll tell you why. I think there'll be internal dependencies and projects that we are aware of, but I believe it would be very silly of us as part of ICANN to not do a sanity check with the rest of ICANN and know perhaps what Global Partnerships or the Board or who knows what – Security, Stability Review Team – might be doing. I'm just thinking "Cyber Savvy," there may be something that they're doing, and there might be a nexus, an opportunity or a "we can't do it now because the budget's gone from that to that thing over there."

So they're really the only things that I thought might need a little tweaking for our use. I would suggest if we were going to add

anything in, the longevity – how long do we expect this to be relevant for. That's the thing I think maybe sometimes, cause sometimes cheap and chief will do because it's not going to be there for perpetuity; it just needs to meet a short-term need. That doesn't mean it doesn't get archived but it's a very different budgetary approach. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and next on my list is Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier. I mentioned this in the last session already but I think the promotion of the New gTLD Process should definitely take part within the end user community. As I recognized even from a developed economy like Germany, there is no awareness of this. And especially that's the thing I was quite surprised – small retailers, internet traders, internet retailers, I asked them "What do you think about the opportunity to register .shop under .shop?" They didn't even know. And I think this is a great lack of knowledge.

And I agree with Cheryl – this is of course a matter of budget. If you can approach a Hollywood star to sing or dance the New gTLD promotion, or if not, but I think we should not miss any opportunity. And I think the New gTLD Process is a very good opportunity to do a sort of outreach to the end user and to use this to explain the whole internet ecosystem, because if you go into the

deep and you start to explain new gTLDs and the concerns and all those things, and then the end user gets to understand the ecosystem and international connections about those processes behind which we don't have to explain in detail.

But I think the end user or the retailer or whoever we focus on – and I would, for the moment from my point of view, I would focus on the small business industry, which means not the big ones. They might know, but the small ones, they have the online shop and they sell things, so for those people I see good opportunity to do the outreach and to get them to understand and to think about. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sandra. Any comment from Scott?

Scott Pinzon: Sure. So we're branching from this to a new topic. Is that fine?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's the same sort of topic but yes, it is branching in some way. Yes, please go ahead.

Scott Pinzon: Okay. Well first to Cheryl's input, fantastic. Your comments are well received and I actually do hope that At-Large would like to take this and make it work. It's a generic form so your modifications sound spot on, so great. I will make sure that you

and Olivier and Evan have the soft copy of it so if you want to you can start changing it as necessary. The one goal I wish for is that you keep it close to the length it is because I've seen people do ones that are very detailed and very long and then nobody ever wants to fill it out, because by the time you have you could have done the project. So thanks for that input.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And in fact, if we're going to close that subject I was going to suggest, a suggestion actually from Seth, that we might wish to have you fill out an example project profile so as to see the kind of answer that you're looking at within that table.

Scott Pinzon: I can provide you the one we made when you asked us for the "Beginner's Guides." We filled out one of these.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Pay attention.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We'll fill you in later, Seth, but that's hugely useful from where English is not the first language that is going to be here, because we can interpret these questions very, very differently. I've no idea what a call to action may mean in some countries but I'm quite sure it's not the same as what I'm thinking, so an example of a filled in one and something that's relevant to us because it's a

project we know about would be perfect. Thank you. And that might have given you a hint then, Seth, of what that was about.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Cheryl. Cintra, any comment on this specifically as well?

Cintra Sooknanan: Yes, just a quick one. Thank you, Olivier. With regard to related projects/dependencies, does that also include other stakeholders within ICANN that may be interested in working along these projects or that kind of thing? Is that the meaning of "dependencies?"

Scott Pinzon: Yes, what's chiefly in focus there is if there's something else going on where the project you're describing cannot be completed until this other thing happens. So for example, ICANN desires to start making people aware of new gTLDs but there's a sense in which we can't because the Board has not said that we're going for it yet and we have no idea of the date when applications could be accepted. So in my mind those are dependencies we're waiting on before we could start really creating materials about new gTLDs.

Cintra Sooknanan: Okay, therefore may I suggest that you also put in "/other stakeholders"? I mean a lot of gTLDs are cross-community, so

you may want to pull interest or capacity from other groups within ICANN.

Scott Pinzon: That's great.

Cintra Sooknanan: Yep, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cintra. And I just wanted, before we jump to the next subject which Sandra has brought – look at the screen speaking about the AFRALO feedback to the ExCom. I understand that several other RALOs have also brought feedback to the ExCom, some have not, and what I was going to ask since we do have the time is that the other RALOs do look at this; and for those that have already filled that page, would they be able to fill project profile pages from that?

I'm turning over to Tijani to see. Obviously AFRALO has filled quite an extensive amount of information on the Wiki. Would AFRALO be able to fit this in project profile pages?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Sure.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, and I see NARALO has also put some feedback on this or brought their input forward. If I could please, please, please, triple please ask LACRALO and EURALO to also join them, and APRALO to join them as well. Of course if you don't that's your choice, but then do not complain afterwards that you are not going to get any material for your region. Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Thanks. I'm not entirely clear what feedback was sought. We have a little bit up there, but the relationship of that to this form I don't quite understand what we're trying to do here.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Beau, and I can sense this because I have been asked a number of times. Maybe we can have Scott explain this to us since he is here.

Scott Pinzon: Yeah, I'm happy to respond. Many times when I've begun to work with At-Large on a project there's often passion and excitement for a chance to express yourselves, and there's often passion and excitement about doing it in several languages. And sometimes that's all the data I can get. There's so much excitement about "Oh, people will hear us and we'll all be represented" – the rest of the equation at least doesn't make it to me. So they're going to hear you doing what or saying what and why?

So this is simply a tool to try and provoke the rest of that. It's great to express yourself but it's even more effective if you consider your audience, what they can understand, what they care about. So that's all this is for, to try and help sharpen up that side of it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Does this answer your question, Beau?

Beau Brendler: Well it does, but I think a way to kill initiative is to hand somebody a form to fill out. So I'm just wondering if there's another way that leadership in the RALOs could try to identify somebody in their region who's particularly excited about a project that they've talked about that we think is good and can work directly with you. I don't know. I don't mean to be negative but this doesn't do anything for me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Beau. Next, Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier. I sort of had the same question when I got this: are you expecting us to fill in multiple forms and these are some of the ideas, and then you can take a look at them? The real question is, is this a form so that we can submit our ideas and you

would create, or what are we supposed to respond in terms of from APRALO for example?

Scott Pinzon: My thought was that this would be something that the RALOs would work out with ALAC leadership, ExCom, whatever you call it; and then one form with a clear goal comes to us so that we as ICANN Communications know what to do.

Edmon Chung: So one form from ALAC?

Scott Pinzon: Yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair. Thanks for this. I think this form is going to be useful because now I think I can now crystallize what I was trying to put forward before. So I thank Scott for that. I don't know if you're going to show the sample form because I guess I still don't understand the call to action appropriate part again, so if you could explain that?

Scott Pinzon:	Sure. Sometimes you may just want to educate someone. A lot of times, like when we made the "Beginner's Guide to the Domain Name System" – it's just good information for any end user to have. There's nothing they should particularly do. But there are times when I would guess At-Large is actually advocating a position and they may actually want someone to take an action such as "Vote on something" or "Go to the public comment forum."
	So if there is something you want a person to do, if it's explicitly identified it helps you create a piece where it all adds up to this punch line of "Oh, I should go call my Parliament" or whatever it is you're after. Does that help?
Dev Anand Teelucksingh:	Yes.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you. Next in the queue is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr:	Thank you, Olivier; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. And I'm getting really tired of saying that but it is really making the life so much easier for the interpreters and for the transcribers, so it's not just that we like the sound of our voices for those on the audio link only.

Just to maybe give a little example of what Dev's question means, on the form I filled out which was my "Cyber Savvy" fantasy, what I filled out this time here anyway, my call to action – because I thought, gee, that would be a good idea – was "Would you consider running your local event with our provided toolkit on how to be cyber savvy?" That's a call to action, and my measurement was number of kits requested. So but there may not always be a need for a call to action, but if there is it's often something you can measure.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And Cintra, did you… Okay, Cintra, one last comment on this.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you so much, Olivier. I was just wondering, there seems to be a kind of hard stop with this form; it doesn't really follow through with what the outcomes are in terms of audience feedback. Is there any mechanism for us to collect say, perhaps if we're doing outreach to ALSes, how many ALSes actually do apply to become At-Large Structures, how many organizations do actually follow through with the process and we achieve our outcomes from these projects? Is there any mechanism for us to put in a field relating to that? Sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may, Cintra, I would think that in the form that is the measure you identify. Remember, all this is doing is getting material prepped, prepared and then creatively developed. And it allows you to then say in that "What is the measure?" your measure would be, if this is an ALS outreach or new ALS something or other, podcast – "numbers of ALSes referencing podcasts when they apply." So it isn't all things to the whole process; it's a very important part of developing a clear set of guidelines for creating the outreach tool or the communication. But certainly you can't just have it all in here.

Something else has to happen, but it's really nice if it's been identified here because then it becomes an action item to make sure you do remember to give a feedback form if it's a face-to-face or measure the ALSes, or have a "tick the box – where did you hear about us?" and it says "podcast." So it helps marry it up as a trail.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and I wanted to turn now to the next question which is the one that Sandra asked, which is utilizing At-Large as a channel for the New gTLD Process marketing I guess. Is that how you phrased it – "reaching out to end users"? And I wondered if there was any feedback on this, because certainly Scott has come to me and asked whether this was something that At-Large was going to be interested in, and there have been indications in the past that we would be interested in

doing such a thing, but the question being is it something that the end user would like to hear about. So the floor is open for that.

We have a queue. There's Edmon and then there will be Beau, so Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier; Edmon here. This is a topic I think I've raised a few times in the last couple of ICANN meetings, and so the New gTLD Program, we know there'll be an outreach, a global outreach program. So two questions: one, the same that basically Olivier mentioned – how is ICANN going to utilize this great network of ALSes around the world to reach out to the people that are probably most relevant?

This is the first question, and the second one is I actually was just being pointed to the updated global outreach program proposal from ICANN for the new gTLDs. I realize that there is no public comment period for that. I wonder why that is the case and why the whole global outreach program shouldn't be a subject matter of public comments so that we can have comments from the community about how to improve that particular program.

Scott Pinzon: Thanks for the questions. So the issue of outreach, I would like to provide a little bit of context, because part of what ICANN is thinking right now is that when it comes to new gTLDs there's nothing much an end user can do. So in other words, let's assume

for the sake of the discussion that tomorrow the Board approves the process and off we go. What is called for next is at minimum of a four-month awareness raising communications plan, but the goal we've been given with that plan is to identify all potential applicants.

So the goal that Kurt has asked us to march toward is that by the end of that time no one comes forward and says "Oh, the application window has started and I would have liked to do this but I didn't know about it." So in that initial phase we're basically talking to people that may want to operate a TLD and effectively become a registry.

So it appears at this time, again just for the sake of discussion – I don't know but applications may not be accepted until mid-January 2012. The evaluation process for all those applied-for strings will be at minimum nine months, so in effect it won't be until 2013 that an end user actually has new choices of how to register under different TLDs than they do now. So candidly, my thinking has been it's not time yet to take messages to end users, but part of why I wanted to discuss it with you is if you feel otherwise I would love that input.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Edmon, if you'd like to respond?

Edmon Chung: Yeah, so I think I sort of brought this up in our last meeting in San Francisco as well, so there are three areas that end users, and all end users are potential applicants in a way. That's number one, then number two is a lot of users could be potentially be the community that certain applicants say they would be representing, so they need to know that somebody might be going out and saying they represent them. The third one is they are all potential objectors. They need to know because they need to know to go to object. So these are the reasons why end users need to know as well, and I think as mentioned in Germany the similar situation – I think those three areas are important not to forget.

Scott Pinzon: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Edmon. Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Thank you. I know this is just a matter of language and I don't mean to be particularly hung up on it, but when I heard the word "marketing" of new gTLDs I guess, does the At-Large have a cohesive position at this point on new gTLDs? And I kind of think I agree in some ways with what Scott is saying about waiting, but I also think that maybe this might be the time for the At-Large to discuss or try to educate the public on issues related to confusion, because that's what a lot of the boilerplate language that you see

about new gTLDs that talks about consumer issues says – that new gTLDs will cause consumer confusion.

Well what does that mean? I mean I think we could be a big help to everybody by defining that. If people think there's going to be consumer confusion in the marketplace about new gTLDs, this is supposed to be the group that's supposed to address that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Beau. Evan, do you wish to respond to this?

Evan Leibovitch: Not really to respond. I mean Scott, I don't know if there's something to say to that. I know from at least some of the circles I've traveled that I've heard that there's a lot of resistance to the thought of being part of some gTLD marketing machine, that At-Large is going to magically evangelize things when in fact we've had in some ways a very contrary position to the way that the Applicant Guidebook has been rolling out; and as of this moment still continue to have some very significant problems with it.

So I think there's a role for At-Large to play and I think it's very in line with what Beau is saying in terms of the consumer protection component of it; that is, what do gTLDs mean to the end user? And by that I don't even mean the registrant – I mean the people who are actually typing things in their browser. When a domain isn't assumed to just have .com or .net or .their country attached to it all of a sudden there's a huge amount of things and a

domain.com may be very different from the same domain name.shop or whatever. There's a real significant potential for confusion here and I'm thinking that the message that At-Large has on new gTLDs may be substantially different from the industry message on new gTLDs.

Scott Pinzon: Yes. This is Scott; I'd just like to respond that I actually am very sensitive to that issue and that's part of why I came here to ask for your input. I want At-Large to be able to express itself regardless of what any other SO or AC is feeling. And I can see why there would be sensitivity about being perceived as, oh, to use…you know, yeah – you're not meant to be shills for the registrars and registries. I get that.

So whatever you want to say I want to help you say it. I have to mention, though, that there are realistic limits to the budget. So for example I will take onboard Edmon's comments and consider them further, especially the part about anyone may be an objector. I can't accept that any end user could be an applicant when it costs $185,000 US just to apply. But the support mechanism doesn't exist yet. and I share some of your sense that the whole JAS effort should be moving faster.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Scott. And next we have Eric Brunner-Williams who has put his hand up, and then we'll have… It's not Alan

Greenberg; it's Carlton Samuels and then Edmon Chung, but first Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Eric Brunner-Williams for the record. I wanted to point out to you that there are vendors here who are offering to carry the support costs of applications for applicants, so the assumption that applicants have to have $185,000 in cash I think is a flawed assumption. I just thought you'd like to know that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Eric. Next, Carlton, Carlton Samuels.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair; Carlton Samuels for the record. I just wanted to point out that the reason why, if you look at the ALAC statement on the GNSO global outreach, we made the point specifically that when you frame the messaging, the message ought to be framed in terms of the end user. It's a very critical distinction to make in messaging, because while you can formulate a message that goes for the registrar, registry constituency or someone that will buy one of these $185,000 doo-das, it's framing a message for the end user is different. It takes a different set of skills and objectives.

But I truly believe, and I'm supporting Edmon in this here, that if you frame the message for the end user I think you'll have a more important communication model. That's my two cents' worth.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton, and just actually as a matter of record, Scott has very kindly shared a video with me of the proposed campaign that ICANN is going to launch. He did ask whether he would have the time to show it here. It is a little bit long, five, ten minutes – eight minutes, nearly ten, and in my view it wasn't aimed really at the end user; it was more the applicant for new gTLDs which look more like the business wanting to apply for a new gTLD than that.

                           So it is very, very valuable I think that your input here could perhaps help you produce a video that is more aimed at the end user than something that is aimed at just potential applicants, saying that this is the biggest thing since sliced bread. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier; Edmon Chung here. I want to raise another item. You mentioned about end users might not be the primary target of audience, but okay, I'm going to try to be very direct in saying that I think one of the things I want to bring up is that I think ICANN can… As an ALS and probably being somewhat bias, I can use this budget for the global outreach and part of this budget to, through ALSes, towards our constituencies and our geographic localities in a way that could be much more effective to

reach the people in those regions and doesn't necessarily have to be end users. Because I think a lot of the ALSes will have the capacity or the ability if given some resource from ICANN to do perhaps even a better job than a global advertising company in certain areas, towards certain constituencies and localities.

So that's one of the things I don't, besides the arguments about end users, objectors or whatever. I think ICANN should really think about utilizing this network to market this New gTLD Program if you want to use the word "market" – we like to use the word "outreach" but it doesn't matter. Use this network and if for example, I'll just jump in and say from ISOC Hong Kong, if you give us some funds we can make sure that… We totally believe that we can use those funds more effectively than a global advertising company can to reach the right people in Hong Kong.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Edmon. And Scott, how likely is that to happen? Sorry, I have to ask.

Scott Pinzon: I think that would be a difficult case for me to make up the chain to my management, and I, you know, I'm just being candid. I could see a lot of things that ALSes could do without requiring funding, so it's a little- To me it's just a little bit off-putting if we say "Hey, what kind of messages do you want to send to your neighborhoods?" and the first thing you say is "Well, how much money are you giving us?" We're not on the same page.

Edmon Chung:	That's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that right now I'm looking at the proposal, and at me as ISOC Hong Kong, if we put in a proposal to run part of the program… Because you're putting out an RFP for advertising agencies to do these kinds of things, right? But I think there needs to be room for me as ISOC Hong Kong to put in a proposal and say "We can do this for you in Hong Kong." But right now I'm totally disadvantaged by the way it's set up.
Scott Pinzon:	I see, I see. Well so if you're willing to create a proposal that is, you know, realistic and of the quality of other people that would respond to the RFP that absolutely would be considered, and it would give me weaponry to take up the chain because it would not just be a vague "Give us some money." It would say "Here's the objectives, here are the people we know that you don't. We know the twenty most influential bloggers," or whatever it may be that I do think advertising agencies would be hard pressed to find out. So if it's spelled out in a business-like fashion it has much more possibility of happening.
Edmon Chung:	But we need to be given a chance. I think other ALSes might have that capacity as well in their localities, but the way it's set up right now you're looking for global advertising agencies. If we put in the proposal let's say "We'll focus on Hong Kong and the

[Xiandong] area, or Hong Kong/[Macaw]," an area, then we won't even get reviewed. That's one point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: "It's the edge" says Carlton.

Edmon Chung: What might be more effective for ICANN is really the calling. Ultimately we do believe it and we have a really good network that you can leverage.

Scott Pinzon: Sure. So this is a fantastic interchange. I think this makes it worth the trip for me anyway. So the other hurdle here is the concept of the phased approach, that it's too soon for end users. And again, I'm open to input. I'm not saying "that's how it is," just that has been our thinking so far, that yes, and there is a sense in which any person could wind up being an applicant. But when you have limited money to spend you have to go for the obvious candidates, so the thinking has been for the rest of 2011 we're going after governments and non-profits and businesses that probably can roll up the money to seriously do this.

Later, once the application window has happened I think there will already be inherently much more openness to the desire to reach the end user and to consider the kind of proposals we're talking about here. We can also try it now, but I know the thinking in Marina del Ray is well, if we don't get some highly qualified

applicants the whole thing isn't going to work anyway. So we have to go for them first. That's the thought.

Edmon Chung: Sorry for hogging the mic.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, and please introduce yourself every time because the transcript is going to look absolutely awful.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here again. So again, it's not just about reaching end users – it's about reaching potential applicants I think. And I am sorry I'm the only one jumping up and down saying this but I'm sure other ALSes probably could feel the same, and they of course in the capacity as an ALS through the ALAC, yes – we are reaching out to the end users. But in this program we can act as a different agent as well, but right now as it is set up we don't stand a chance. And as a community, as a participant from an ICANN community I think the funds should be leveraged in better use, and this is one of the opportunities to better use the funds and to reach more potential applicants through this channel.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Edmon, I realize that you're particularly excited by this and perhaps, could I ask that you follow up with Seth afterwards and perhaps also collect some of the input from the group. I'm closing

the queue now but I still have just Sandra and Eric Brunner-Williams. So Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter: Thank you, Olivier; Sandra Hoferichter for the records. I'd like to agree with Edmon Chung, and I see the end user as the multiplying resource to bring the whole gTLD process to a successful end because they are the persons that should register; otherwise we will have those who are in the line now and nobody else. So I would really encourage ICANN to produce outreach material on this, and I also agree to do this on a first move at least via the ALSes and not via an advertising company. If it fails you can spend the money on an advertising company as well, but on the first move we should use our own resources within ICANN as well.

And just to explain to you some of my experiences, last week it was quite hard for me to explain what the New gTLD Process was all about if the person doesn't even know about this, and it would have been very helpful for me if I would have a website, a flyer or a video to point to. Because I know about the process but I was not very good at explaining it to be very honest because there was a lack of knowledge on some points and the questions I realized were other questions, and those we are discussing here which I'm prepared to answer.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra. In the interest of speeding things up I think that this is going to take place soon. Remember that the process

hasn't been launched yet so I don't see how marketing material can be released out there if the process hasn't been launched. But once it will be launched I gather that Scott will make material available and that the At-Large will be able to use some of that material. Is that correct?

Scott Pinzon: Absolutely.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. And last in the queue is Eric Brunner-Williams.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript. Edmon, I just woke up. You said something interesting. Are we really talking about the communications period? Is Scott's budget something that really shares a purpose with the other budget that's set aside for the communications period which is intended to provoke the response from the sleeping applicant proto-applicants or the reservoir of potential applicants? Is that what you're getting at? Great, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Well, since Scott has reached nirvana a little bit earlier I think we can release him now. Thank you very much for joining us, Scott, and we are going to move quickly to Christina who is here from Language Services. And I know that we have had

extended discussions even earlier with regards to languages, and perhaps, Christina, could you give us a little bit of an update on what's going on? And then we'll take questions, and I'm so sorry that we're very late at the moment.   So Christina, you're on. Thank you.

Christina Rodriguez: I'm going to speak in Spanish just as I can. I know that this was one of the pending issues, that was receiving the opportunity to know if it was possible to renew the service in terms of telephone conferences with interpreters.   That has just a bit more to the expectations that we all have regarding the service itself.   And of course I am working on this. I am pretty sure that well, we are in June so for the calls that will start in September at least, because of all the setup that we need and the setup that we need to do with the company that provides the telephone lines, I think we will be able to start having the first possibilities to work with the people that you like – that's the interpreters working here with you.

Now, regarding translation, as I said before during our meeting in San Francisco we said that you would be lucky enough to have a lot more material translated, and the idea is precisely to attempt to increase the number of languages that we translate into. We expect to be able to include Portuguese into the languages that we translate into. This issue is something that I am pushing a lot and I think this will be approved, the possibility will be approved.

Now, regarding all the outfits that's all I have to say and I'm open to any questions or comments you may have.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Christina, the first question comes from Sergio, Sergio Salinas.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you, Olivier. Christina I see that you have a voice problem so good afternoon. Now, the question is are we going to leave Adigo and are we going to go to another system, or are we going to keep our interpreters? That's the question in particular.

Christina Rodriguez: Well, there is, to continue with the company that provides us the telephone service, the conference telephone service and attempting to deal with the negotiations with them and telling them we want to work with our interpreters and not with theirs because they have passed many tests and we have had many opportunities to see that the number of times when they work are less. This work, I talked about one of the calls that I listened to and it was really tragic, it was really tragic.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Next on the queue is Tijani, Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Yes.   Thank you very much, Christina.   Thank you for this improvement of the translations that are obvious.   This improvement is also the increase of languages translated and the adoption of ICANN modeling, and all of that these are very concrete improvements with regards to interpretation but I am very pessimistic.   Gisella made you hear a call that was a catastrophe with regards to quality, but that was not the only issue with regards to the quantity also.   I saw the budget, the FY '12 and I see nothing that is scheduled to improve the quantity of teleconferences.

Currently teleconferences are only in English.   I'm not only talking about the AFRALO teleconferences but also mainly the working group teleconferences.   They all work in English, and these are the people who do not speak English are left on the side and they cannot participate in the policy making.   So this is a catastrophe, not only At-Large.   So I want to congratulate you with translation but in regards to interpretation much needs to be done still.   And you told me that we are going to work with these new interpreters, but with regards to quantity and quality there are still things to be done.   Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: Christina Rodriguez just for the record.   Regarding the quantity of teleconferences with interpretation that we can provide, this really depends on the need.   If you present me with the need I have no

problem at all in adding these calls that you want to have with interpretation. You need to understand that this-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Christina, what we've had so far is to have a threshold of a number of people that need to have interpretation on a call in order to be able to request it. And that's one thing that we were told in the past so as not to "waste" ICANN resources. I'm not sure who mentioned that but that's what was given to me as, I wouldn't say instructions but certainly as guidelines as to what At-Large needed to do so as to reduce the costs. Now if this has changed then great, then I'd be ever so happy to say "Yes please."

Christina Rodriguez: The idea is, of course, and I think you will share this with me… Well certainly if we are going to schedule a call in which six or ten people will participate, six or ten people who speak English and only one person that speaks French then it's a pity really, or more than a pity − it's actually a huge expenditure for only one person speaking in that other language. So what I say, and I actually invite you to put together people, to attract people so that they participate in these calls. And bearing this in mind I have no problem at all. Do you understand what I mean?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I do, but some of the working groups are distributed across the regions and only have one or two representatives from each region,

and in fact some of the regions are not completely speaking one language; some of them speak more than one language. So it is difficult at that point for the working groups to have interpretation because there might be just one or two people that are in the working group.

Christina Rodriguez: Okay. I am interested in being able to work with you on this. I had no idea that this was going on. I had no advice that you have this need. When we're talking about more than one language, you perhaps can tell me which are the languages that we're referring to. Is it only French and Spanish or are there any other languages?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, Olivier speaking for the record. Obviously there are many languages – if you look at Europe you're looking at quite a few, but obviously when one is looking at primarily of course the language that we're offered so far – Spanish and French.

Christina Rodriguez: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, I see that Tijani has his hand up and Edmon has his hand up, and unfortunately there is a queue so the next person who has been very patient so far is Yaovi. So Yaovi, you have the floor – Yaovi Athooun.

Yaovi Atohoun:	Yaovi. My question is relative to the website. There is a process, I just want to have an update. I remember during the last meeting you said that there is a call and you are going to send a company, and just I want to have an update about the website being in many languages.'
Christina Rodriguez:	If you could speak a little louder, a little closer to the microphone because I couldn't hear you.
Yaovi Atohoun:	I wanted to know more about the website in many languages. There is a process. During the last meeting you said you are going to select companies so I want to know when this can happen for the website, at least the homepage in many languages.
Christina Rodriguez:	This is Christina Rodriguez for the record. Perhaps this answer would be better given by Scott Pinzon.
Scott Pinzon:	This is Scott. I actually don't know what Christina said in the last meeting. I can tell you we currently are just contracted with a company to do a major overhaul of icann.org, and multiple languages is very much in view. Right now ICANN is not translating enough of the content to do for example, the entire

website also in Spanish or the entire website also in French or what have you, but along the lines of what you said, if at least the homepage we will start there.

The homepage will be fully built out in all six languages and what you'll get at first is if you select a language it will offer you all the resources that are available in that language so that at least you don't have to hunt all through the website and go to pages that are 90% English to find the one thing in Russian or what have you. So we're starting there, and this new development will be up before 2011 ends.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Scott. Moving down the list we have now Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Oh, in fact, Chair, I'm going to defer because you actually brought out what I wanted to say about the working group translation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you Carlton. Next on the list is Tijani, Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Christina, when we're talking about working groups, if we already that working groups don't work only in English there's a discrimination from the start. People who do not speak English do

not register in these working groups so there's a discrimination at the very basis, at the start. So we don't know how many people who speak other languages will participate because they will not come – they know they cannot participate! That's a problem. We have to install the principle of multilingual working groups and when there are only English speakers then there will be no translations done.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: How many meetings of working groups do we have a month? Can you tell this to me? One, two, three? Approximately six, eight, ten? One a week, two a week?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Four or five if one looks across the working groups that are in place, about four or five.

Christina Rodriguez: So let's say one a week then.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Those aren't the only calls we have. We're just speaking about the working group calls – there would be about four or five specific

ones that do require interpretation which are between one and two hours long each.

Christina Rodriguez: Perfect. I'm not saying I'm going to put this into my budget to study this, but actually I will sit down with Gisella so that we really work on this and have a working group, an appropriate working group with the Language Support you need and you can also have more people that approach these working groups.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Christina, and next on the list in the queue is Edmon, then we'll have Aziz, Carlton; and we'll close with Eric Brunner-Williams. Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Thank you, Olivier; Edmon Chung here, and to use the Mandarin interpreters I'll try to use my not very good Mandarin. Hello, everyone. I hope that you are all understanding what I am saying, or the interpreters especially. My Mandarin is not perfect. I feel that this is an important issue so I'm going to speak in Mandarin, however it may not be directly related to the content of our discussion but apart from the working groups in ALAC, for the other working groups we should pay more attention to this issue; especially, I feel, for the IDN issue.

All the IDN working groups should provide more interpretation for working groups related to IDN. And furthermore, in ICANN there

are six different variant working groups. For those six working groups I feel that this can be at least a trial, something that we can start from. So we should have English and the interpretation. So we can start out with these IDN working groups to see if it works.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Edmon, for these words which in their native language I did not understand a word of, but in the interpretation I understood all of. And actually I do want to say this is a first for At-Large to have such an intervention in Mandarin, so well done and well done to the interpreters!

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I hope that we will make use of the interpreters later as well for this language. But Christina, would you like to answer the point that Edmon has just made, please.

Christina Rodriguez: I'm Christina Rodriguez for the record. I just want to talk about this. I don't know which working groups are supported in terms of languages, but I would like to tell you that you will have the language support in the working groups.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	The list is closed but we do have three more people. Aziz Hilali, Aziz.
Aziz Hilali:	Thank you, Olivier. I want to also thank Christina and her team for the efforts made but I would also like to mention a purely technical issue with regards to AFRALO teleconferences. Half of the time we spend asking people to repeat what they said. We hear very poorly and there are frequent interruptions. For example once I was connected only at the end of the discussion which was a bit late, so this problem we should… We consider in Africa there are telecommunications problems. With regards to my country our infrastructure is interesting and I was interrupted many times.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Aziz. We're dealing specifically with interpretation issues (interruption) as during calls may not be anything to do with Christina. But I think that will have to be taken on record, and certainly, as far as I understand the matters are being taken up with Adigo which is our provider. Could we just say a few words about this perhaps, Gisella, because you're the person who usually has to deal with all of the people that get cut off the calls and then come back on and off and on and off and on, have to be redialed.
	The question being have you seen an improvement or are we seeing more and more problems, because Aziz certainly has trouble with not being called back in time. Or maybe should I give you 48 hours to let you think about this one? I think we'll kick this

one into touch and give 48 hours for this controversial subject, and we don't have the time anyway. So next one, Carlton – Carlton Samuels.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair. For the record, Carlton Samuels. There are two things I want to emphasize and it speaks about what Tijani says. If you are going to wait to know that you're going to have translation in a Working Group it's too late – you would have already… There's a barrier to entry issue. There are people who would not participate because they know that they cannot effectively participate without translation, and that is the point we face.

For example, in the Caribbean LACRALO's been very insistent from day one about translation and translation services, and it was primarily for working groups that we were going on about it. And it's a recognition that if we can speak to the edge in the language of their daily lives then it might not be an incentive for then to participate. So I need for you to take that aboard, that's the first one.

And the second issue is about quality of the translation. Because my language skills are really very poor, beyond English, that is, there is a real need for translation services that can speak in colloquial terms with the end users, because for example, Spanish – it's not Castilian Spanish you're getting. It's the Spanish that happens in Venezuela in the barrios and so on, and that is

something that needs to be sensitive to. And I think this is where the translation services has a gap in terms of the quality of it and the effectiveness of it. We have to be real mindful that when we're dealing with people, participants at the edge, the language, the forming of the language itself is a little different from the classical ones. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. Christina.

Christina Rodriguez: The Castilian Spanish, Carlton, is the Spanish from Spain. LACRALO is Latin America and the Spanish that you need to hear in LACRALO is exactly a Latin American Spanish or a Spanish of Latin America, and you have great differences between one and the other. And within those Spanish languages of the Latin American countries you will find differences.

Anyway, that is something that is real and a good interpreter works with a neutral Spanish for Latin America or the Spanish corresponding to Europe according to the need that you might have. And the same thing happens with written translation, which is different from interpretation. Translation is dealt in the same way. We have to focus on the target user and the target audience who is reading or listening to the final product. And that is the language being used; that's why we use the language experts.

When it comes to the interpreters being used up to now for LACRALO, Adigo has been using interpreters. One of them is from El Salvador or Panama – Maya – and you're right, she has in my personal opinion the accent or she uses words which are very specific of her nationality or her region. And that is a real mistake in a translator or interpreter.

Carlton Samuels: The reason I'm bringing it up is that I listen to my Latin American friends, I listen to Sergio speak and he uses a different set of words than I hear on the translation, and I know that there's a disconnect. I know it and I'm not, my Spanish is that much – I can understand lot of it but I don't speak it very well. There's several examples I could go to, but it's different.

If you listen to Jose [Ovidio] speaking it's different and we need to understand that it's Sergio speaking and he's going 500 words per minute, and the translator is not getting it. We are not getting it either, and that's the thing. There's this gap for us who speak English in the work group on the teleconference where he's speaking and I know I'm not getting what he's saying simply because they're using different sets of language to talk.

Christina Rodriguez: When it comes to your issue, the only thing I can tell is that you need as a group to prepare a small or brief, not manual but let's say a kind of policy so as to work within the group, and considering all these people – as it is your case, as it is your case – to consider all

those people who cannot understand different types of Spanish. For example, if right now I am speaking a Spanish as I speak in my country or my home you wouldn't be understanding me.

So it is my responsibility, it is my personal input and it should be the input of each of you and the responsibility of each of you to speak in a way that everyone understands what you say. And this is for you and for the interpreters because as it is the case, for example when we mention our names at the very beginning of our speech because we must do it for the sake of the records. The same thing should be implemented in the teleconferences. You should take into account that in teleconferences you should speak slowly just to show respect to the other people and to the interpreters.

It happened to be that once I listened, I always listen to your teleconferences because I need to revise the quality of the teleconferences, and I've been talking to Heidi and Gisella about this. I have three lines I listen to – the English line, the French line and the Spanish line. And sometimes it happened to be that I listened to the people talking in the English line and in the Spanish line – they're having a totally different conversation. So the order starts at home.

If your organization starts at home, if you organize yourselves and you manage all the situations respectfully then you will have a better final product with a better quality, but you have to take into account that you are the ones who have to implement that. It is not the interpreters fault but it is your responsibility.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Christina, and I want to inform everyone that the queue is closed already and has been for a while, so I'm really sorry for everyone that I'm saying no to. There are two people left. We're running way over time: Eric Brunner-Williams and then Sergio Salinas to close the debate. Eric Brunner-Williams, please.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you; Eric Brunner-Williams for the transcript. And I want to point out that we recognize the need for the transcript and we say our names, and we also try to speak in a reasonably slow but not too slow voice, and we make allowances for not merely the translators but also for the non-native speakers who have the ability to work in English. But I want to concur with my comrade Tijani about the bias and the self-selection that exists when we do our work in one language, and it is not sufficiently resolved by translation.

I point out that it is notable now that we're doing policy development in languages other than English. In this meeting of ICANN for the first time in the ten years that I've been involved, we have people doing policy development – granted, it's only about IDNs but it is policy development, implementation development in a Cyrillic script language or languages, Russian and Ukrainian; in Chinese.

So I think we have more than just to look at the translation as the solution to our problem, but we can look to this example and find similar opportunities in which policy can be equally made, or perhaps better than equally made, in a language other than English. We have a large number of working groups, of tasks, and yet everything that we do in ALAC is in English. I suggest that we take a hard look at what we can do in languages other than English, not necessarily by the entire body. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Eric. Christina, do you have anything to add to this?

Christina Rodriguez: Not much to say about this, but I would like to tell you that if you could do something like that you would have my support when it comes to translation so that your work done in other languages could be translated into different languages for the rest of the team.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Christina, and last but not least Sergio Salinas, who has been a fierce defender of multiple language working groups. Sergio.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will speak in Spanish. I promise Carlton that I will speak slowly from now on. I think there was an

issue that was left outside the discussion, and that is the topic related to the interpretations when we have ALAC meetings with other groups. On the 13th of June we had a meeting at a certain time and it was only carried out in English, and I was left out of the meeting. And it was an interesting meeting; it was an important meeting for me and for the region because it was related to the issue of the (inaudible).

So with the same logic we are only two people, only two Spanish-speaking people in the region and we are outside any discussion in ALAC because of the language issue. So I would like you to take this into account because it is a fundamental part for diversity, which is the aim of this structure. And another thing that I would like to mention is it is true what you mentioned, that it's a problem. Sometimes interpreters are not the problem but Adigo is the problem because it is not working well. But I know this is not related to you but to the company we have hired. Thank you very much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sergio. Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: I am Christina Rodriguez for the record. When it comes to technical issues of the conferences it's not 100% my responsibility. I do have the responsibility to check this so I promise I will communicate with Adigo, I will talk to Gisella and see what are the technical problems that you have and to see how we can solve

these problems. I am interested in working with a good company. I don't want to pay someone who is not delivering good service.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Christina. It appears that of course we need to have some progress on both sides. One thing that I'm particularly encouraged by is your proposal that we look more closely at the issue of if there's just one or two people on a working group that need to have interpretation we can actually examine having a little bit more flexibility with regards to having the call in two or three languages, and I think that will certainly please some of our members. It certainly pleases me because I'm not particularly happy to have to say no to people.

Yes, there is a requirement for ALAC members to be able to express themselves in English and to be able to take part in work in English, but it is something I think as time goes we might wish to – I'm not saying do away with from day one but certainly be more flexible towards because we can only become more international by actually being able to function in more than one language. I think it is unfair for people who are not native English speakers to be able to be as functional as people who are native English speakers.

So thank you, Christina. Any last words?

Christina Rodriguez: Yes, just one final comment that perhaps it would be my request for you. I am very interested and you're giving me information about the specific working groups, the members of these groups; the amount of people requiring interpretation not just to see how many people you have in a teleconference. Because while I am speaking I am thinking that in order to provide you with interpretation services for ALAC you need interpreters. Perhaps we might find easier ways and less costly ways to implement interpretation.

 If I had known this before perhaps I would have acted. Perhaps we are not requiring in these situations another line for Spanish; we can… I compromise myself when I commit myself to make a great research about this but please, give me the necessary information to be able to create a strategy and see how to approach this in order to give you the necessary support that you need for your working groups.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Christina, and may I ask that staff records this as an action item, and could I ask Sergio to take the lead on this please? Is that something that you could do?

Sergio Salinas Porto: Yes, of course I will.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you.   We're outrageously over time so I think we can release our two prisoners here, Scott Pinzon and Christina Rodriguez. Thank you very much for coming to speak to us.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And we're still not finished but we are going to try to go through the last points of the day rather fast. The first thing that we need to speak about quickly is what Evan had alluded to a little bit earlier, and I think we have a possible resolution that is in place. Is that correct?

Evan Leibovitch: Yes, with Seth's help we do have a resolution to make.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Is this on the screen? Is this ready to fire?

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I should say there is a cocktail going on after this, a Welcome Reception. It's just in front of the door and it starts only at 6:30 so

you're not missing anything yet. In fact, you have seats while others have to stand, so you probably are the privileged lot.

Evan Leibovitch: I guess until this goes up on the screen I can read the motion out for the record. This is Evan speaking again. The motion is as follows: "Resolved, the ALAC approves the formation of a small At-Large Working Team to collaborate with a similar team of GAC members already created on outstanding applicant support issues in fulfillment of an agreement coming out of an action item from the GAC/ALAC meeting of today.

"This joint team is tasked with developing solutions to those outstanding issues related to the New gTLD Program. Proposed solutions would then be brought forward as a joint GAC/ALAC statement to the ICANN Board. Members of this Working Team are to be myself, Tijani, Eric, Cintra, and Avri."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan, and do we have liftoff with regards to having this on the screen please? So just to explain, in order for this to be able to proceed forward I'll be calling for a vote. That can take place immediately because we have quorum. May I ask Seth to perhaps in the meantime count, or is it Gisella perhaps? Yes? Gisella, would you count how many ALAC members are present?

So we have quorum, fantastic. Do we have a seconder? I see Dave with his hand up, a seconder – Dave Kissoondoyal. So, the question is yeah – it's barely possible to read it but "Resolved, the ALAC approves the formation of a small At-Large Working Team to collaborate with the similar team of GAC members already created on outstanding applicant support issues in fulfillment of an agreement coming out of an action item from the GAC/ALAC meeting on Sunday, 19th of June, 2011. This joint team is tasked with developing solutions to these outstanding issues related to the New gTLD Program. The proposed solutions would then be brought forward as a joint GAC/ALAC statement to the ICANN Board. The members of this At-Large Working Team are to be Evan Leibovitch, At-Large Lead; Tijani Ben Jemaa, Eric Brunner-Williams, Cintra Sooknanan and Avri Doria."

This is proposed by Evan Leibovitch and seconded by Dave Kissoondoyal. If I may ask now anyone objecting to this motion to put their hand up? I see no one putting their hand up. Anyone abstaining? And I gather that therefore the rest are for, and if you would please put your hand up then we would be able to take a count – only ALAC members please, thank you.

Okay, thank you. And do you have a record of what the names of those people who have put their hands up are? I have a nod from Gisella, so that's fine, that's carried. Evan?

Evan Leibovitch:	Thank you very much and there's already been an initial meeting time and place already slated, 3:00 tomorrow. And thanks to Gisella's hard work we already have a room assignment for it. I'll communicate this back to our GAC counterparts and start working on it right away.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you, Evan, and well done.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Right, and before we go to the last part of our schedule we have two minutes for Matt Ashtiani to give us a quick rundown on a couple of things, just additional things that we are doing in At-Large. Is it Twitter and Facebook and all of the additional communication tools that we have at our disposal, which so far, may I add, have been totally underused. We have asked for them in the past and either it is a different set of people who wanted to use those and have asked for them and now they've gone; or we are not aware that these tools exist or we might not be aware of how to use them.
	Certainly outreach is a particularly important part of At-Large, and the moment we can build a community based around these tools I think we'll probably have a tighter and a community that can benefit even more from At-Large than it currently is. So Matt, you

have two minutes and I'm sorry I've already taken one of those two.

Matt Ashtiani: That's fine – I'll try and break a record for the At-Large and do a whole presentation in two minutes. So this is my title page, there we go. I'm not going to actually explain what Facebook is. I don't think anybody here needs to know what that is. If you do we can talk outside. I know outreach is of particular importance to this group so I've put in some facts for Facebook and how global it is.

If you want, I know everybody here is pressed for time so if you actually want to look at this just please download a copy of the slides. Twitter I will touch on because I've gotten a lot of questions on it from the group. Just for a basic understanding, Twitter's essentially a micro-blogging service where people can put a post that has to be 140 characters or less. Users on Twitter can follow each other, so if two users are following one another, if someone posts the other follower will receive it.

Currently right now we have one follower which is Rod. There are no followers in this group. It is-

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think it might be important to say what the name is.

Matt Ashtiani:	I'll get there. It was actually announced to the ALAC announce list when it was created. So Twitter is a very global thing. It's most used in the USA but big users also include India, Japan, Brazil. Portuguese is actually the second largest language represented on Twitter, even though Brazilians make up 3.5% of Twitter users. So just something to consider, that it's not just necessarily an English-based service.
	Hash tags – I know an AI from the San Francisco meeting was to create a hash tag for Twitter. I created a hash tag. It's ICANN_At-Large. So what is a hash tag? This is a question that has come up. Essentially it allows you to tag a post as long as you prefix a certain set of words with the hash symbol. When you tag something with the hash tag it allows someone to search for any post with that actual tag.
	So if we all posted something on Twitter and we all put #ICANN_At-Large we can just click that, or a user can click that and find every post related to that. So how are hash tags useful? There's that instance and there's also trending. If a lot of users around the world put a post and then put this hash tag, it'll increase its global popularity. It doesn't increase based on the number of times that hash tag is used; it's a point system for the value of the post. So if we all just copied each other's post and just kept copy/paste it wouldn't increase. There would have to be changes and new information used there.
	So with that said, I wanted to ask the group how do you want to use Facebook? How do you want to use Twitter? Should it just be

when an announcement is made? Should it just be general information? Is this even useful for the group if we have one follower? I'll leave it there, I'll leave it up to you guys to discuss.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Matt, and I notice also you don't mention LinkedIn but there is also an At-Large LinkedIn group as well that exists. I wanted to ask how many of us use Facebook just by a show of hands please. So it's not everyone but there's a fair number of people, I guess the majority are using Facebook. And what about Twitter? How many use Twitter? I see it's the same people that… Yes and no but the same people as Facebook I guess. So there is a demand.

Evan do you use Facebook or Twitter?

Evan Leibovitch: Both.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You use both of them but your hands were down.

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Basically yes, there is use, and it's now really down to how we want to use it. We're open for suggestions. Fatima Cambronero.

Fatima Cambronero: I'm going to speak in Spanish. Thank you, Olivier. I am a Facebook user and a Twitter user as well. I can say that I am ICANN follower #2 or #3. I think it's not the same people. I mean the people who use Facebook and Twitter, it's not the same number of people. It's like a different public. Twitter, I am more interested in Twitter for something that's faster, that provides me more abbreviated information that takes me to a link where I can deepen into the information that I need. And then Facebook is broader. You can post photographs or information that is more important.

I think one suggestion is that the hash tag is very long. I would like Twitter to be used more because it's what I use more to share information, to share events, news – basically that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Fatima. Matt?

Matt Ashtiani: So I actually spoke with Olivier about the hash tag. It is long, I can admit that because it's #ICANN_At-Large. It would take you at least a minute while you're on your mobile phone. The one thing about our hash tags that I should be clear on is you can't own a hash tag, anybody can use it. So I actually looked at #At-Large just to see what that was like and it was people going out clubbing,

EN

people saying "I'm going out at large," so it's something to consider.

The other thing is one of the standards at ICANN that most groups use is it'll have the #ICANN and their associated group. If the group doesn't like that hash tag that's fine, we can always change it and make it more user friendly and make it quicker. It can be something maybe #ICANNAL, whatever everyone decides to use as a group but we all have to make a decision so that way we're all not using various hash tags and all the posts will actually be in one spot.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Matt. I would recommend against #ICANNAL. If you write it down you'll find out why. Any suggestions perhaps for…?

Fatima Cambronero: You mean regarding the hash tag?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Fatima, we're going to follow up.

Fatima Cambronero: My question is if the suggestion is about the hash tag.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Are there any suggestions?

Fatima Cambronero: Only #At-Large then?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Olivier for the record. #At-Large has already been used by people who go out clubbing. Perhaps this is something we want to do but clubbing, nightclubs, dance. So perhaps that is not available.

What I do suggest is instead of having a discussion on this is that we all submit, we all do a bit of homework and submit maybe a preferred hash tag, and then we'll crosscheck those and we'll find out which one is the most popular.

Next on the list we have Tijani, and we are going to have to cut this discussion short so Tijani and also Sylvia after Tijani. Tijani, please.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Olivier.   To increase the number of channels, communication channels, that's a good thing. But why are we increasing the number?   What are we going to do with this? Sometimes it spreads out things too thin. If there's a special interest to use Facebook, I have Facebook but if it's different from other communication channels, okay, but this must be explained clearly.

Personally I like the communication means at my disposal right now. It works very well. We are concentrated on communication

means that for the time being are satisfactory. If we have to add some others we need to understand why.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani. Matt, would you like to reply or shall we just take this on record?

Matt Ashtiani: Matt Ashtiani again. It wasn't my idea to come up with the Twitter account; I was told that it was an AI established in San Francisco. So I was just trying to fulfill what the group had requested. So if you all decide that it's something that you don't want to do that's fine with me. I'm here to work for you and make sure that you get what you want and what you need. So I'll leave it at that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Matt, and yes, it was an action item, Tijani, that we did have. So we're just following up on the process. Next is Sylvia Herlein-Leitte. Sylvia?

Sylvia Herlein-Leitte: I'm going to speak in Spanish. My doubt is why are we going to choose or why do we have to choose? The idea is to have a communication means that's faster so that the staff or the community can have a faster response. Why do we need to choose those means and not to continue the way we are or to communicate

through the Wiki? I can't understand why we need to choose these now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. Maybe we don't. Okay, well we can work this out with time, yeah, it's just adding tools. Dave, you're on afterwards. We first have Darlene, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Dave and I'm sorry, Sergio, we're going to have to cut this because the interpreters are really working overtime now so that doesn't set a good start. So next is Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson. I just looked up – don't leave your headphones on when you talk, it's stereo. I just looked up our Facebook page. It was used twice in 2009, once in 2010, and that's it – there are a total of three entries. Why are we using this? I cannot see a point in us using this at all, and I am a Facebook user. But frankly if we're going to put announcements out it comes out through email, we have the Wikis – I just can't see a point in using it. I'm not a Twitter user so I won't say that, but if people aren't using it for ICANN business then why do we need a multiplicity of tools to do the same job that we're doing adequately in other ways?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Next on the list is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm sorry, Tijani, the line is closed. Thank you.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Chair; Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Well, I think the reason why we want to try to use multiple tools is because we want to reach all available users that are interested in the internet and get them involved in the At-Large policy advice and so forth. And the key thing is well, why have it on Twitter and why have it on Facebook, is because the ability of social media to rebroadcast that to your followers. So I think that is really the key reason for having these multiple tools.

So for example, once something's posted on Facebook, if that user is following he can immediately follow that. And it's potentially a viral message; depending on the message it can then be picked up by somebody who was not even involved and say "Whoa, what's all this?" and get involved. And it's a matter of allowing the information to by syndicated among people within the At-Large Structures, so it's not just the emails that just go to the At-Large representatives.   Members of the ALS can also receive this information. So that's it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Dev, and last is Dave Kissoondoyal and then afterwards the line is cut. And you do have to remember that Matt is not going to run away. He's hopefully going to remain with us for a while which means that we'll obviously be able to ask a lot of questions of him in the future as well. Dave Kissoondoyal.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Yes, I would like to add to what Dev says. I do propose that okay, we take these new means of communication because we need tools that are instant. We need information that is passed to our users instantly. Let's say for example in Africa we have more mobile users than fixed line. I take the example of myself. Rarely I go to the ICANN Wiki. I'm frank – rarely I go to the ICANN Wiki whereas through my mobile phone I get all my tweets, even the Facebook updates – I receive it on mobile phones.

And then since we are trying to reach the maximum users, take the African example: we have more mobile users so they can get the message very quickly rather than waiting and going to the Wiki page. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dave, and I see a lot of nodding heads around the table. I also see people nodding off but that's another thing. It's been a very long day. I think we need to release our interpreters. The next part is just going to be assigning of reports for non-At-Large meetings, so the first thing I wanted to ask everyone is to thank our interpreters for the fantastic work they've done today!

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	And to say that this finishes the interpretation. We can just quickly move on to the next part of the meeting, which is just the assignment of the work for all of us.
	We should be about five, ten minutes and then we'll have a drink after that. I think that's what we've all been waiting for.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Are we ready for this? Okay, right, this is the last thing that we need to deal with today. There is one thing which I wanted to convey. Last time in San Francisco we did have two means of going to report from meetings that we all went to, and we could put our name down on a sheet of paper that was on the wall and we could also go on the Wiki and put our name down next to the Wiki.
	You're not supposed to unplug yourself. You're supposed to continue work. Right, so basically what happened is several people did put their name down and that was not all of the ALAC and all of the participants – some of the participants did not put their name down for anything.
	And then what happened is of the people who put their name down, only a subset of them actually wrote reports, and that doesn't look too good because some – and I'm not saying anyone in the room here, but some are saying that ALAC members are just here to go and visit places and have a great holiday at ICANN's

expense; which is obviously something that we don't do and we thus have to prove to the rest of ICANN or at least show some kind of reports of the fact that we have gone to those meetings.

And certainly it is something that we owe to our own constituents because they do not have the chance to be part of those meetings. So without rambling, which is what I'm starting to do at this time, perhaps we should go through some of the list there. And I was hoping that either Evan or maybe Gisella or Seth would be able to point us to what the key meetings were in there. Do we have a list or…

Perhaps yes? Or well, not go into the sub things, that's not possible. Obviously there are a lot of meetings there; some of them take place in the large rooms, some of them take place in small workshops. How do we do this? Beau, I'm looking for help here so Beau Brendler.

Beau Brendler: Yeah, it's Beau. I'll volunteer for the DNS Abuse Forum.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll list each one of them and I'll wait for people to put their hands up and I'll call your names. Is that okay?

So Welcome Ceremony, I gather everyone is going to be there. No, well maybe not.

ccNSO Tech Day we're going to have Eric Brunner-Williams and Mohamed El Bashir.

Board Session: New gTLD Program. There's going to be Cintra, Carlton, Dave.

Right, next one: Joint ccNSO/GNSO Council Meeting. We've got Alan, okay perfect.

Next: Forum on DNS Abuse. Beau, and we also have Sergio, Sylvia please… to put the pressure. Okay, Sylvia as well is on there and Andres, did you put your hand up for this? No? Great, so next…and Charles as well, yes.

FY '12 Draft Operating Plan and Budget. We have Darlene, we have Dave Kissoondoyal, we have Cintra, Sergio…no? Okay.

Right. New gTLD Update, it is, okay so maybe no one will be going to that.

Right, next: GAC Meeting with the SSAC that is 1500 to 1600. Is this also at the same time as the APRALO Showcase? Nope, okay, anyone for that? It is? Okay, so for the last half hour of that session, is anyone willing to… GAC Meeting with SSAC. Dave and Dev Anand.

DNSSEC For Everybody: A Beginner's Guide. Darlene? Fantastic.

IDN Variant TLD. We have… Yes, that might be 1300 to 1430 that's correct. That's good? So we have Oksana, we have Mohamed El Bashir. Who else? Edmon?

Next: Joint ccNSO/GNSO IDN Working Group – JIG. We have Oksana. Who else do we have? Okay.

So Tuesday: Registrar Stakeholder Group Meeting. Is it? Okay, okay, so take that out.

Non-Commercial Users Constituency Working Session. We have Oksana, Cintra, no one else.

Registry Stakeholder… Yes, these are constituency working groups, yes okay, so that's out.

ccNSO Members Meeting Day, that's also a full day.

Commercial Stakeholder Group Meeting – that's half a day.

Board Meeting with Commercial Stakeholders Group, yes, that's short. That's one hour. Carlton, anyone else? Cintra. Dave Kissoondoyal.

We do have a Policy Discussion but what time is that at? 1:00 to 2:00, that is tomorrow. So if I can ask you to announce it publicly please? You don't have a mic.

Gisella Gruber-White: I do have a mic. Tomorrow from 1:00 to 2:00 in Morrison which is straight across from here, we're going to have the ALAC Policy

Discussion Meeting. There will not be interpretation – English only unfortunately, because it was last minute. We'll send an email out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's a meeting for everyone to be involved. Ultimately it's not only ALAC; we're not… Yep, At-Large, 1:00 to 2:00, yes, and this is in response to the criticism that we only do process and not enough policy. Unfortunately we just don't have enough time, there's only 24 hours. Thankfully Gisella has managed to wrestle a room somehow and so we'll be able to work there and discuss just policy, no process.

Okay, so next, the Board Meeting, we've done that.

GAC/GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group, 11:00 to 12:00. I don't see anyone queuing up for this one. GAC/GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group. Anyone? It doesn't look like anybody. Come on. No? Right, we'll leave this one open.

Board Meeting with gTLD Registries, 1300 to 1400. No, 26 we've already done. That's a full day.

Gisella Gruber-White: We've got 9:30 to 11:00 ALAC Policy Discussion Part 1, 11:00 to 12:30 ALAC Policy Discussion 2. So we can take meetings from 1300 onwards.

Male: (in Spanish)

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, the ones which are – and I'm sorry, I can only answer in English but I understood the question. The ones which are taking place with ALAC are going to be translated. The Policy Discussion I believe will not be translated because the interpreters are somewhere else and we do not have… The Policy Discussion that we will have, the additional Policy Discussion that we will have, yes. But all of our meetings will be fully…

Gisella Gruber-White: No, no – let's get our ducks back in a row. On Monday, 1:00 to 2:00 – ALAC Pure Policy Discussion. This is an ad-hoc meeting that's been added in Morrison Room, no interpretation. Tuesday morning we start 9:30 with ALAC Policy Discussion Part 1 – we're going to be dealing with compliance and IDN. That is interpreted in this room, and Policy Discussion Part 2 in this room interpreted as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's correct.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I may say this will be a policy discussion. There will be no voting taking place, there will be nothing that will be decided then. It is just a discussion that will take place. If there are any issues that come out of that perhaps at that point we will present them again during our next session, the session afterwards that will be interpreted; and then at that point those who have not been able to participate in the discussion itself would be able to participate in their native language.

Okay? So we'll continue down the list, and I've forgotten, I've lost track now. We are on – everyone's speaking at the same time. Thank you, Eric, at least somebody counts where we are, somebody's paying attention.

So 29, Board Meeting with gTLD Registries, and we have Eric Brunner-Williams and Cintra, and I see Sylvia and Beau and Sergio.

Beau Brendler: No, I was volunteering for a later one.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sorry, Beau you were volunteering for…

Beau Brendler: One further down.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, okay. 30 – Commercial and Business Users Constituency.

Beau Brendler: I was volunteering for 31.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: 31, that's two down. Okay Beau. Anyone for 30 – Commercial and Business Users Constituency? That's an afternoon. Yes, Dev Anand Teelucksingh 31. Oksana, 31? Did I see Angela put her hand up? No.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Moving on – Intellectual Property Constituency Meeting, 1400 to 1600 on Tuesday, #32. Any takers? None.

33 – Internet and Service Providers Constituency Meeting. That's also a full afternoon concurrent with 32. Cintra on 32, okay.

33 – Internet and Service Providers Constituency, ISPCP Meeting. Any takers for that? Andres for 33, Cintra for 32.

Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group, NCSG Face-to-Face Meeting. We have Sylvia, Dave K. We have Sergio Salinas and Evan, and Dave K., yes.

Board Meeting with Registrars Constituency. We have Eric Brunner-Williams. Any other takers? No?

Board Meeting with NCSG. That takes place immediately after the Board meeting with the Registrars Constituency. Evan tentatively.

Okay, next 37 – WHOIS Review Team Interaction with ALAC. Oksana, Eric Brunner-Williams…oh that's it, isn't it? I don't think everyone is going to be there. I think some people have to go in other places as well. Okay, let's just say that everyone is going.

Carlton Samuels: Just to give you, I went to the meeting, the planning meeting and they asked the question what did ALAC expect of them. So I'm for the other persons, they wanted to know what ALAC was about so I gave them a little intro to what the ALAC mandate was and I told them that they should look at our comments on the Review Team to begin with. I told them that our issues had to do with privacy, consumer confidence, security of transaction on the internet and all that affects end users. Those were the main issues but primarily we want to hear from the rest of…

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay, thank you, Carlton, and I gather you've got that in hand. Okay, super. Right, we're down to Wednesday already?

Board/GAC Meeting New gTLDs and Board/GAC Communication. Is this an open or closed meeting? #38? That is taking place partly at the same… No, it's not taking place at the same time, I can't really see. That is taking place afterwards. Board/GAC Meeting New gTLDs and Board/GAC Communication. Anyone for this? Eric Brunner-Williams, right? Aziz? Charles, Dave Kissoondoyal, Eric Brunner-Williams and Aziz.

39 – ICANN Security, Stability and Resiliency Briefing. Beau, Charles. Wednesday.

The Current State of the UDRP, ah, so we have the ALAC Interaction with the Board so I'm afraid no one will go to that one. 9:00 to 10:00, so we can really scrap anything that's 9:00 to 10:00. So scrap 40 or at least put a cross there or something so we know that we're not going to fill it. So sorry, Sergio, no 42 for you.

Carlton Samuels:	I will go for the last hour of the WHOIS Interaction.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Done? So Current State of the UDRP also needs to have a cross next to it except if someone wants to go for the first half an hour.

Right, ccNSO Members Meeting Day 2, that's a whole day, right.

45 – Constituent and Stakeholder Travel Support. We have Sylvia, we have Sergio and Sylvia for that for the time being.

And Cintra has put her hand up for what, 45? 47, so we've moved to 47. Cintra, Darlene, Evan, Beau. Yes, that's correct, you are – so Beau and Evan, you both are on the panel for this. That takes place at the same time as the Preparatory Meeting on ICANN Summit on Developing Countries, which will show Carlton, Michele, Tijani, Dave Kissoondoyal, Oksana and Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Jean-Jacques as well – Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Which Jean-Jacques? He's not here.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: May I borrow your bottle, please, that I'm going to throw in a certain direction? Please let's get through this and then we can have a drink after that.

Right. SO/AC Workshop on IP Addressing Activities. Eric?

GNSO Council Public Meeting, I gather there'll be plenty of people. We have Alan, yes definitely, and others of course.

GAC/SSR RT Session. We all know what the SSR is. Yeah, we've been through most of the discussion that took place there so maybe we don't really need that.

WHOIS Review Team Interaction with Community, and we have Cintra, we have Dave Kissoondoyal. Evan tentative.

Next, ccNSO Council Meeting. Oh, plus Carlton on 52, WHOIS Review Team; and afterwards 53, we have Sergio, we have Cintra, no we don't have Cintra. Sylvia. Sergio?

Right, next one – WHOIS Review Team Internal Debriefing. Will you be part of it Carlton, or not, the WHOIS Review Team Internal Debriefing? But he is on the WHOIE Review Team, isn't he? Oh, you're not, I thought you were. Ah, okay. I don't think anyone is. It's an internal thing, it's for the…

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: May we put a question mark there and find out by Wednesday whether it's possible to attend this in case? So put a question mark by Carlton's name, thank you.

Then IDN Practical Experiences, we have Oksana.

Okay, next Thursday 23rd of June, SSAC Public Meeting at 8:30. Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I 'm scanning the horizon; no one else for the time being.

SSR Review Team Interaction with the Community, 9:00 to 10:00. We have Cintra, no one else.

GAC/WHOIS Review Team? Carlton? Okay.

59 – The Need for IPv6 Development in the Domain Name Business. 9;00 to 10:30, yes, I didn't even know that existed. Yep, so we also do have to be where? Yep, although Cintra is neither part of the ALAC nor the regional leadership so she can actually go, but Dev unfortunately cannot go. But Cintra, you're welcome to go there. Yeah, zap the first one, 56.

Right, The Need for IPv6 Development in the Domain Name Business, perhaps that's something that we can see whoever wants to go – not essential, yep.

Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Update on Activities. No, Carlton cannot make it. He is a leadership, it clashes with the leadership meeting.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. 60 – Internationalized Registration Data Working Group Update on Activities. We have Sylvia, we have Sergio. Ah, until 10:30. So anyone who is not in the Regional Leadership Wrap-Up.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. Next, Public Participation Committee Community Update. We have had some discussions today, yes, but well the Public Participation Committee is a broader thing, isn't it? Cannot, cannot. Public Participation Committee Community Update – well, we'll see who can go to this.

SSR Review Team Face-to-Face Meeting. That's a long day, we've had some discussion.

Best Practices to Address the Abusive Registration of Domains. Beau?

Gisella Gruber-White: I'm sure everyone can hear me. At 11:00 we've got the JAS meeting, Geographic Regions, the DSSA Work Group and… I'm not sure if they're on there. So just for the members of the JAS and the Geographic Regions, from 11:00 to 12:30 we've got meetings on Thursday.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well look, I just think we'll-

Gisella Gruber-White: Cheryl's on the JAS, the Geo Regions and the DSSA, so she's in three meetings at once. I know, no.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. Geographic Regions, Cheryl will obviously be there.

IGF Workshop – Darlene.

Geo Regions for Oksana, 65 for Oksana, IGF Workshop and also Michele and Dave K. Okay, and Aziz? Yep, perfect.

66 – Getting Ready: Understanding the Applicant Guidebook Questions. I think that, I'm not quite sure really you need this.

Gisella Gruber-White: The JAS is from 11:00 to 12:30 so no.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: 66, yeah?

Okay 67 – GNSO Wrap-Up Session. Cintra is also going for 66. Then 67, GNSO Wrap-Up Session, Sergio? 64, okay.

Gisella Gruber-White: Oh, are the twins going? Sergio and Sylvia?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Si. Alright, 67.

Gisella Gruber-White: GNSO Wrap-Up Session, who's taking it?   Going once, going twice.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It doesn't look like anyone is interested.

Gisella Gruber-White: Alan will be there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Alan will be there, yes.   Framework of Interpretation Working Group.

Gisella Gruber-White: That's a closed working group; that's Cheryl.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That is closed, okay, so Cheryl is in there, fine.   And then the ICANN Public Forum also taking place simultaneously, I guess we have everyone.   We can just leave it at that.

Next?   Oh, bless there's only five left.   Board Committee Reports, I'll be there.   Chair Reports, ICANN Board Meeting, Trademark Clearinghouse Implementation Discussion and ICANN Board Meeting.   I guess all of that is all of us really, so that's it.

Thank you very much to everybody!   This has been a very, very long day.

[Applause]

EN

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry! One last thing about Thursday night. There's going to be a meeting together with ALAC and the NCUC and we need to make reservations for anybody that wants to go for dinner afterwards.

[End of Transcript]