

---

BUENOS AIRES – ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting

Sunday, June 21, 2015 – 13:30 to 17:30

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Let us get started now. This session was scheduled as an hour starting at 1:30, 13:30 for one hour, on the CCWG. We are obviously starting late. We have to finish early because we moved another item into the 14:15 slot. So we'll only have about a half an hour on this right now. But we have about four or five hours reserved for this on Tuesday. So this is the start of the process. It's not the final discussion.

In addition to that, one of the key members of the CCWG is Cheryl, and she cannot be here today, but she will be with us on Tuesday. So that means we have a little bit better composition. What I'd like to do today is introduce where we seem to be in the CCWG.

Now, there's a slide deck which we'll be presenting. If you could read it at the top, it says Draft for Discussion. This is a document that's been written by one or two people. It has not been vetted by the CCWG as a whole. It is still subject to revision. So don't take what is there as cast in concrete. It is the current proposal. It's current proposal which has a fair amount of support behind it, but it's still a work in progress.

Is there a way we can get that so that people could actually see it, perhaps on the right-hand screen? We need to keep it on Adobe Connect for remote people. Okay. Now, I will tell you that I have glanced over this, but to a large extent, this version of it, this is the first

---

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

---

time I'm seeing it, also. So I'm not going to be able to glibly describe what is there. Let me describe overall the process we've gone through.

There is strong support in the CCWG for what has been called enforceability. That is, not relying on the goodwill of the Board to follow what is in the bylaws, but essentially require them to. Now let me explain that. We have bylaws today which, for instance, say the At-Large selects a Board member. The GNSO selects two Board members. Those rules could be changed at will by the Board today.

There is nothing preventing the Board from updating the bylaws and removing those provisions, just like a lot of the other provisions in the bylaws, but they haven't. What we are looking at is trying to configure a scenario where, at some point in the future, the Board, for whatever reason, believes that some changes have to be made, and decide simply to make them.

Because as a Board running an organization, they have the right and the fiduciary responsibility to make changes that they believe are in the best interest of ICANN. There is a strong belief among many of the members of the CCWG, not shared by all and not shared by most of the ALAC representatives, that for the Board to not follow the wishes of the community in many of these issues, they would have to, essentially, act illegally and could, in theory, be taken to court to force them to comply with what the bylaws say.

No one really envisions it going to that point, but if we are to be able to compel the Board to take some action, then those are, in fact, the kinds of measures we need. There are a number of us who believe that

---

we do not need the ability to compel the Board to take all the individual actions, but we need the ability to remove directors if indeed some point in the future they decide to defy the community, that our solution is replace the Board or replace the directors who disagree.

There are some people who believe we don't even need that, and we have to rely on good will. Because if we ever get to the point where the Board is completely at odds with the community, ICANN is in such a shambles that it's not likely to be recoverable anyway.

So we have a range of positions, and at this stage I think it's safe to say that there's probably a majority of people on the CCWG who, given options, would opt for real enforceability. Within enforceability, there are two options. They are almost the same except one of them, called the designator model, does not give enforceability over budgets and things like that, but does give a lot of the other rights.

The stronger one is the membership model. In the last ALAC statement we made on the CCWG proposal, we said that if we had to pick between the two, we would take membership, not because it's stronger enforcement but just because it's a lot simpler to explain to somebody. Designator is a term relatively unique to California corporate law, whereas membership is a well-understood concept to everyone. And, ultimately, there's not a lot of difference.

Up until very recently, which specifically somewhere around middle of Friday afternoon, there was a belief, essentially, convinced – that we were convinced of by our legal advisors that if we were to have a

---

membership model or a designator model, it is only enforceable if the members or designators are legal people. That means an actual physical person or something with a corporate structure of one form or another.

The preferred form that they had recommended was something called an unincorporated association. So, essentially a bunch of people get together, they're not a company, but they say, "We're getting together and to act as a group." Unincorporated associations could only be composed of legal people – again, other entities or individuals.

Since ACs and SOs were not deemed to be legal entities in general, they were recommending – this is getting really complex, and I'm sorry for it – they were recommending that we be able to, that we form unincorporated associations, which were loosely affiliated with each AC and SO, and under control of them in a way that was not well-defined. And those unincorporated associations could be the legal entities that were the members or designators.

Now, I will point out that the ALAC today is probably, under California law, an unincorporated association. We have a very complete set of rules that we follow. That, effectively, makes us an unincorporated association. One that hasn't declared itself to be one, but nevertheless is one. And the courts may well find that we are a legal entity in its own right today.

Okay. Somewhere along in Friday, the proposal was made to have something called Empowered SO/ACs. Now, an Empowered SO/AC is a supporting organization or advisory committee of ICANN that declares

---

it intends to enforce – to avail itself of the enforceability statements in the bylaws. By nature of this statement, a simple motion of the ALAC, the GNSO, whatever, we effectively become something equivalent to an unincorporated association.

This has an interesting set of capabilities. It means there is no legal papers to be signed. We simply have to make that declaration. At that point, we could enforce, should we choose to – and by enforce, I don't mean take the Board to court, necessarily, I'm simply saying tell the Board that sorry, you have to listen to us because we are, in fact, members of the organization and we have the rights according to the bylaws.

It has the specific example, unlike the previous suggestions, that if we choose – we, the ALAC, or any of the groups – choose not to make such a declaration, the bylaw rules still apply to us. They are not technology enforceable, just like today's are not technology enforceable, but probably will be enforced.

If we choose to exercise the rights, we could. So it sounds like it's, at some level, the best of all possible worlds. There's a downside. The downside is we are changing the organization into a membership organization with a modestly small number of members, the ACs and SOs. That might have what the optics of that would be outside of ICANN probably not all that flattering.

The other thing is if most of the ACs and SOs choose not to make the declaration, then we have a very small number of ACs and SOs,

---

potentially only the GNSO, who are actually members controlling the organization. Really bad optics of that.

The GNSO almost surely would opt for that option. The ccNSO probably, we're not sure. The ALAC, I think, the general feeling is we don't want to, but we might well do it anyway. The SSAC and RSSAC have declared themselves not willing to do it at this point. But, of course, this model allows them to do it later. Should we ever go into crisis mode in ICANN, should the stability of the DNS be questioned because of the instability of ICANN, they could opt to become enforceable members of the group at that point.

Anyway, that's what's on the table. I'm going to go through the slides, but they say a lot of what I just said. And then I'd like to open up the discussion. We have about 15 minutes left, so I'm going to try to do this as quickly as possible. We're not going to have a lot of time for discussion today. We will have a lot of time on Tuesday to follow up.

To look at the overall timeline – I see you, Sebastien. To look at the overall timeline, if transition is to happen, it must happen by midyear next year. Period. Because past that, we're into the middle of the election period, and nobody has suggested good outcomes if this becomes a political football.

If you work back from that, it means the bylaws have to be passed by about the end of this calendar year. So we don't have a lot of time to come up with the methodology, draft bylaws, go through the approval mechanism, and go forward. So that's where we sit right now. I see several hands up. Would you prefer to be able to raise issues right now

---

or have me go through the slides? Consensus? No one cares. In that case, we'll hear the speakers. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Could I interrupt? Since we may not go through these slides, could I ask staff to forward them to the ALAC list, please? Anyone who is not on the ALAC list and is at this meeting, please include them, as well. The staff knows who you are. Go ahead, Sebastian.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. I'm a little bit surprised by what you have said. I think we need to separate two things. What is currently on the table and what is the position of ALAC? The position of some people and your position. And I got the impression that here, we have mixed a lot of those things, and it's difficult to understand, even for somebody who follow in depth this work.

And I really would like to say that we, for a presentation, we need to go through the slides. The slides are short, present one solution who now seems to be the one acceptable by a large part of the working group and, hopefully, by At-Large, also. But raise still a lot of question to answer because it's just the beginning of the work on this specific proposal.

---

And I am not sure that – to take just your last sentence, I heard Fadi saying that the transition will be done when I will left, and it's end of Marrakech, it's not middle of next year. Then if we take that as an input of our discussion, he may be wrong. But if he's not, we need to start by saying that it will be done in middle of next year in June, but in March. And then what is the schedule to do all that job, at least we need to try to do it to be ready to finish by Marrakech. And how we want to be participating to this work, it's also important.

Now I will give you, as a member of this CCWG on Accountability, give you my point of view. I think that last proposal put on the table with the Empowered SO/AC model is a good one because it allows some flexibility and it allow not too complex changes in the organization today. And it gives some power to the community.

We still have to define what is a community. Because it's a word we say, give that to the community. There are people who think that it's five representatives from SO, five from some ACs, and two from the other ACs. There are other people who think that it's another numbers. But we need to figure out what will be the community with this presentation, this proposal, and we have, also, to figure out what, as end user, we want – where we want to be involved and how we want to be involved.

I consider that this transition is important but the question of the accountability of the organization, it's one of major topic where end user must be involved and as far as I understand, end user is us. Thank you.



ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We'll go to Garth in a moment. I'll make two comments. First of all, in the timing. Yes, Fadi has said that, he has said privately that if it goes on for another two months, he will stay. So that's not what he's saying publicly, but he has said that. I would fully support having it done earlier. I think it, perhaps, puts it into a timeline which is essentially impossible.

Congress has said they need 30 legislature days. We don't know what their actual calendar is going to be in 2016, so we don't know how long it's going to be. We can guess two months. Probably a little bit longer than that, maybe.

NTIA has said they need about three months to do the preparatory work, and they can't start until we have the bylaws passed. But an interesting note is if we have to have the bylaws passed, even if the transition fails, we'll likely get the accountability, assuming we can come to closure on what we want. So just something to keep in mind.

Sebastien, you started off with leads saying we should go through the slides. At this point, we have seven more minutes left. I don't mind going to the speakers, but that means we will not go through the slides today, and you can read them on your own and we'll go over them on Tuesday. I'm happy with that. If so, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO Chair. Alan, I have a clarifying question in terms of the legal structure that you've been talking about.

---

Does that enforceability aspect fundamentally change ALAC in its advisory capacity into something else? Because if it's enforceable, are we simply no longer advising?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. Well, as Sebastien mentioned, the current proposal on the table, which has been radically changed in the last three days at this point, but is still the one that we commented on in the public comment that is being evaluated right now. So we've got multiple things going on at the same time. Parallel streams, as it were.

The current thing on the table says we are an advisory committee, but we also may have powers of enforcement should we choose to opt for them. So it does not change that. Now, I will tell you there are some people who say that should the GAC ever opt for these powers of enforcement, they would have to give up the terms in the bylaws which force the Board to consider their advice in a somewhat different way to our advice.

To be honest, for me, this is a non sequitur. They're two different issues that are worthy of debate, but not necessarily one following the other. But that applies to the GAC, it does not apply to us at all. So no, it would not change us, essentially, at all, other than give us the ability to kill part of the Board, should we choose to, at some point in the future, if that's one of the enforceability issues.

It's clear as mud, I'm sure. Yeah. Seun.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yeah, thank you, Alan. So Alan, I just want to get some clarification. Am I right to assume that the Empowered SO/AC model is just [inaudible] to the designator model? Because in designator model, you actually, you are designator if, just by adding a few lines in the group's charter and perhaps in the bylaw, as well. And I think that is just what explained in this model right now.

Because you said ALAC is already an unincorporated entity. And by the time we just add a few lines in an article, will become qualified to be part of this. [inaudible] empowered in this model. Perhaps that's the question. Who is the empowered [inaudible] model? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll say it, but it may not be believable because, as I pointed out, we are probably could be deemed by a court to be an unincorporated association, even though we've never said we are. But if someone ever wanted to sue us, for instance, sue the ALAC, they might use the fact that we have rules and membership rules and stuff like that, and rules of how we conduct our business, to demonstrate that we are a legal entity and can be sued.

So we probably have that status. It would require a court to decide that. The Empowered SO/AC says by making a statement with certain wording in it, that we choose to avail ourselves of certain privileges, we would become the equivalent of an unincorporated association. So yes, a court may decide we are, again, so it's similar to our current status, but it appears it is probably sufficient to have enforceability under the law.

---

So it's considered an equivalent of an unincorporated association. It doesn't make us designators. It applies both designators and members need to be legal people. So the Empowered SO/AC could become designators or members, depending on how the bylaws were written. It applies equally to both.

Vanda. Before we continue, do we have anyone else that's... I see Tijani is on the speaker list. You want me to stop. You can have ten seconds to say why you want to interrupt the speaker order.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Can you?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I would like to suggest that Alan, please don't answer each intervention and make them all at the end. Because there is no time.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, I've asked Olivier to come back for 2:15 so we can talk about the other issue that he needs an answer on by tomorrow. So I'd like to cut this short. We have many hours available tomorrow. But Vanda did want to speak, and I'll let you go ahead. Okay.

To the extent that you're simply confused and want clarification, find me or find one of the other people who pretend to understand, and I'll try to help you offline. I turn it over to Olivier, I think that's your name, I'm getting fuzzy, to raise another issue that he needs an answer on before tomorrow. So I think we have to give him that.

---

However, there's one other issue, which we need an answer on. I don't want to discuss it. There is a high-interest topic session tomorrow with two parts to it. The first part, the chairs of ACs and SOs will be talking about the use of their beliefs, of the use of auction funds from the new gTLD. We have \$50 million or so right now, may grow, that ICANN has said the community has to decide how to use it.

So there will be a discussion with AC and SO chairs, part one. Part two is the chairs of the various constituencies and subparts, which include the RALOs, so we have five chairs on a podium, which can be the ALAC chair, the RALO chairs, or their designate, or nobody. You can choose not to participate. It is in the main room. There is simultaneous interpretation. So no one should be prohibited or stopped from participating, either listening, asking questions, or being on the stage because of language.

Staff need to know within the next half hour or so who is representing each RALO. I don't want answers right now. Staff needs to know. If you don't come and tell us in the next half hour to 45 minutes, she's now told us anyway. If you don't tell staff, then we'll presume you don't want to be on the stage. That's all for that item. Olivier, it's yours.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. The matter that I wanted to speak to you about is about one of the GNSO Council motions that will be voted on later on this week. As you know, there are several motions, which Alan has spoken about. One is about a preliminary issue report on the new gTLD subsequent rounds. There is pressure in the GNSO to get the

---

work started to start looking at the first round of new gTLD applications and prepare for the next round of gTLD applications sooner rather than later.

The GNSO has convened a work party to start looking at the various issues that might need to be tackled by the PDP, the Policy Development Process, that will need to be launched at some point in order to make amendments to either the applicant guidebook or any of the other procedures that surround the new gTLD process, and in order to be able to not make the same mistakes in the next round of new gTLDs.

And that might include, also, looking at the possibility of having the second round of new gTLDs being solely restricted to developing countries and the parts of the world that might have not had the chance during the first round of gTLD applications to actually take advantage of that.

So it's a balanced point of view at the moment. The question is all about timing, though. Some are saying that it's too early to start the next round of new gTLDs before we actually have the results of the metrics, the AOC, Affirmation of Commitment, imposed metrics on the first round of new gTLDs. Some are saying that we could actually start work already before we actually get the results of those results for those metrics.

There is a friendly amendment that is proposed by the business constituency in the GNSO, so that the motion be adopted asking that a PDP should not be launched before the end of the assessment of the

---

metrics that are currently being taken by staff and by the program managers. Alan, you wanted to add something.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't want to add. I just want a question. Who made the original motion for the PDP? And is the amendment, do they consider the amendment friendly or the business constituency simply said it's friendly, but not accepted as friendly yet?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Right. Thank you very much, Alan. I think it might be that the BC has said... I think they might be saying that it's a friendly amendment but not everyone is seeing it as a friendly amendment. So it might be a significant amendment. And I'm not quite sure of the response of all the other groups in the GNSO. That hasn't been discussed yet. The discussion will take place in a session that will be devoted to this prior to the motion being voted on on Wednesday, I believe.

But we do need to make our positions and to discuss our position before we actually, before the motion goes before the Council. And, perhaps, even being able to have our point of view ready for tomorrow's discussion, I could then relay the ALAC's point of view, and that might actually influence some of the discussions that are taking place there.

So the motion was made by Bret Fausett and seconded by Avri Doria. And the amendments, proposed amendments, as I said, are as follows. The view of some is that if we delay the launch of the Policy

---

Development Process until we finish the period of analysis of the current round of gTLDs, we're looking at an information collection period between the 1<sup>st</sup> of January, 2015, and the 31<sup>st</sup> of December, 2015, plus an additional amount of time that will be required to do the analysis. So that might be anything between four to six months. And then start launching a PDP after that, which might take up to two years or more.

And so their concern is that the next round of new gTLD applications might not be accepted until 2020, around that sort of time, five years from now. The proposal of others is that, and this is the BC amendment, is that we cannot start looking at the issues and trying to resolve and discuss issues in a PDP before we have the full amount of information about how the first round went.

And before we have all of those details, metrics, etc., whether this has served the public interest, etc., all of the metrics which have been decided to gauge the success of the first round of new gTLDs, we cannot start a PDP before we have all of these in hand. And so the question here is whether we should go and support the model where the PDP can be started before the end of the metrics analysis with a proviso that the PDP cannot be ended before we have the results of the analysis, or situation number two, the PDP should wait, so should not start until all of the analysis of the first round has been done. And that's the simple A or B answer and which way is the ALAC... Well, what is the preference of the ALAC in this issue? Thank you.



---

I wasn't aware I was running the floor on this. Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. First of all, for those who aren't aware, the process in the GNSO, which is normally followed but not always, is not dissimilar from ours. If an amendment is deemed to be friendly by the person who moved it, it's incorporated. It's a done deal. If it's not deemed to be friendly, then it has to be voted on first before the amendment goes. And if it's a close issue like that, it probably will not be adopted. So no guarantee, probably.

A couple of things. The normal process within GNSO PDPs, there's no law, but the process often is once we've decided on something, let's not go back and reopen the floor. That tends to work to encourage us to support the BC motion, because although there are many, many aspects of the new gTLD process which may have nothing to do with consumer trust metrics and the results, there are some things that do. And there is a risk, potentially, that some issues could be quote "decided" before, and then make it more difficult to reopen.

So if it proceeds to start prior to the results – and by the way, the results will take longer. Because yes, it will take N months to analyze it, then you have to issue out the actual port, and then it goes out for public comment. Then the Board has to adopt it. The Board will often go out for public comment. It's going to take closer to a year, I would guess.

---

Remember, the Board has six months to respond to an AOC review.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: 2017, I guess, being the earliest, since we are in sort of halfway [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: We're going to be well into 2016, probably into '17, by the time we actually get something enacted. So if we were to say, "Yes, you can proceed before the end," because if nothing else, it takes several months for a PDP to actually start up. I would say that we have to build into the charter very, very clearly that nothing is locked in and decided that cannot be reopened after the AOC review is completed.

That doesn't guarantee everyone agrees at the time, but it makes it a little [inaudible]. I think this PDP is big. I think it may well be broken down into multiple PDPs because the GNSO has often taken big things and divided it into bite-size pieces, and there may well be parts that can clearly be delineated without that aren't referring to the GNSO.

So I'm somewhat divided. I think it's sort of pragmatic to say yes, start going, but you'd better not lock in anything. I wouldn't mind supporting the BC position, but if it loses, I won't be all that upset.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And just to remove further ambiguity, two further points. The first is, indeed, the amount of time that it's going to take is a long time. The number of

---

issues which have been identified by the working party exceed 100 issues. So that's a lot of work.

Secondly, when one speaks about a PDP, a Policy Development Process, in the GNSO, these are open to everyone for going to participating. So we will have the ability to send people from At-Large to take part in those PDPs, just in case the question arises. So that is an open process. Eduardo Diaz, you're next. Oh, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just one more thing that is somewhat relevant. There is a move amongst some registries to say, "Should we really be making changes at all?" Because if we make changes, then there will not be a level playing field between round one and round two. That may disadvantage the people who, one or the other, and, therefore, we shouldn't make changes at all, despite the fact that we know there's problems. Just an extra little thing to confuse it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. And in such a way, it's funny because a PDP would advantage us to be able to discuss this. Because I think this could be just a view from a small segment of the GNSO, as you said. Eduardo Diaz is next.

---

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Olivier. I am confused here and I'm looking for clarification, why there is need to be a PDP process for a second round? I mean, why is that happening? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. The reason for a PDP to be needed is that as soon as you change policy, and the applicant guidebook is a product of policy, then you need to go through a formal Policy Development Process in the GNSO.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So we're saying that we're changing the guidebook and that's why we need the PDP. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Alan, did you want to add? And then I'll go through the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: When you factor in what's come out of the policy and implementation PDP, or non-PDP, it's not a PDP, but assuming that one gets acted on, we are changing the definition of what the GNSO must get involved in to anything that has a real impact on various stakeholders, whether it's deemed to be capital policy or implementation, and the applicant guidebook is very much, at the very least, implementation, massive implementation.

---

So there's no question in today's world, this will require a PDP.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I see Vanda Scartezini. I also see Tijani Ben Jemaa's card being up, but I don't see Tijani. So let's go to Vanda. She's in the room. Vanda Scartezini.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, Olivier. Well, I do believe that there is no really difficulties to start. I do believe that the whole process will need to be interconnected during some time. And that if we wait, maybe things will take another way that is not capable to change. So if we start the PDP and we can get results from, because even in the new gTLDs, a lot didn't start. So the process is still longer to give us so many information.

So the process itself for the PDP, if it started, can also give feedback for the analysis that is being done for the whole process that is in place before you start a new one. So I do believe that we have nothing to lose in starting right now. Right now means in a while, because we need to organize [inaudible]. I'm with Alan, the PDP process will be [inaudible] process that goes in parallel and [inaudible].

So I do believe that it has no, really no problem in the starting and I do prefer to vote for start than to wait.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Vanda. Just to make sure, so the preliminary issues report by staff will start before all of this. It's just the start of the actual PDP that we're looking at. I saw Eduardo's card is still up. Eduardo, is that a new... no. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just very quickly, first, there needs to be a preliminary issue report. That will take at least a month, maybe longer. That has to go out for public comment. Then there's a final issue report. Then the GNSO starts the discussion and that could be quick. So we're talking several months at best, which means... it's June right now. The PDP is not going to start before September or so, at the very earliest. So just to put it in perspective.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks very much, Alan. And now that I have the document in front of me, I just wanted to read the amendment that the BC was proposing. And it's as follows. It's number 12 in the list of whereas. And number 12 says, "The affirmation of commitments requires a review of 2012 new gTLD round to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of A, the application and evaluation process, B, safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion.

This review will begin during 2015 and is likely to conclude during 2016. That's the additional clause and then, finally, the actual second

---

action, second motion of resolution, which is in addition to covering the required limits of an issue report. ICANN staff is also requested to provide options on how the subjects may be organized and worked through in a potential future PDP, and with the added text, with the understanding that this future PDP would begin after the affirmation of commitments review of the 2012 new gTLD round has been completed.

I think the issue is clear. If anybody has any questions or comments on this, then, please, [inaudible] now. But I still don't have a great view. I've got view from some that we should be going with the BC on this and others that we might not be that interested in this. So I would need more help from you. Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. That clears up one of the issues. So they're saying until the review is complete, not until it's accepted by the Board. So that cuts six months off of it. I don't feel very strongly, partly because, as indicated there, the PDP may be organized into different sections. So I would like to see that if it does start before the review is complete, that we organize it such that the parts of the review, parts of the PDP that clearly are going to be impacted by the review be deferred until it's done. In other words, start on the parts that don't affect it at all. There's whole big parts of the applicant guidebook.

I mean, just think of the section on community applications and how that abysmally failed and needs to be reworked. Not impacted by the study at all. We know it failed. We don't need a study to say it failed.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. With your experience on PDPs exceeding my experience on these, would you say that it's something that can be put into motion? I would have thought this would more of an operational procedure within the PDP itself that can't be acted on at motion level.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I were in your position, I'd go ask Marika.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any other...? Wow, you're all so excited by this. Who do we have? Somebody is pointing. Oh, Eduardo. Okay. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to support that Alan and what he said. If there's things there that they can start to be working on, we should start now. And if there are ones that needs to wait until the final review, then we do that, and we do it in pieces. So I will support something like that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. My inclination is to not to rush, not to do anything before we have all the previous round finished with all the requirements. Because as end users, we don't have any interest to start any new round very quickly or as quickly as some wants. At the contrary, perhaps we need more time to think more about how to make the underserved regions and underserved communities enter this industry and try to have something from this process of new gTLD applications. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. And, actually, this was actually mentioned by one of the registries that was presenting the motion, where they did say that this could open the door to a second round that would involve a bigger chunk of applicants from developing countries or underserved regions.

But I'm not sure that's, well, it's probably not part of the scope there at the moment. I saw Sebastien, I think, I put his hand up, and then to Alan Greenberg. So first, Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I agree with Tijani, but my conclusion will be a little bit different. We need time to convince on some issues we were working on on the first round about the community TLD, about the application support, and so on and so forth. And if we wait to the end of all the preliminary work, the risk is that the people who want to

---

rush will say, “Okay, now we don’t have time to do that, and let’s do it quickly.”

And I get your point, Tijani, but I would suggest that maybe the best way for us to go, it’s to start now on the topic [inaudible] so when we want to push to be sure that we are at least the time of the old review, who is done before the PDP starts, really. And then the PDP and so on.

And like that, we can push our idea. And maybe we need to start our own work on that, maybe with other people, but not just leaving GNSO running everything, but taking into account what we think is more important. And I take to the community TLD and the application support would be two things that we can launch at least with our group and maybe with some people from the GNSO, also. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. Alan Greenberg is next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two quick comments. Number one, I support everything Sebastien has said, and I’ll elaborate a little bit. I’ll point out that because it’s the GNSO, not only doesn’t mean we can’t participate, there’s lots of precedent for our chairing at parts of it and co-chairing things, and I think, certainly, if it is the divided into sections, and I think it almost must be divided into sections to make it into reasonable pieces, we should be very proactive on leading some of those.

---

So that's a little bit of future thought. I think my answer to your question is you're asking, do we want apples or oranges? And I say I want peaches and strawberries. I believe the answer is, as Sebastien said, yes, we should be starting soon, but we should be dividing the, and I'm not trying to word a motion, we should be dividing the task into reasonable relatively independent sections, and we should only start the ones that are completely unrelated to consumer trust and acceptance of the gTLDs prior to the report being done.

So things like community applications, applicant support, and there's probably a whole host of other things associated with the mechanics of how the application process worked, that there's no reason not to start them as soon as possible. But we need to divide it into chunks and we need to order them reasonably. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and I don't see any other cards up. And so if I may conduct a consensus call, then, from the ALAC members here, that we will not be supporting the BC amendment, and we will be proceeding, as you've just... We will be asking or recommending, as you said, that the work starts as soon as possible with work that is not related to the metrics and to the review, the formal review process, so as for us to have, us as in the PDP, to have enough time to be able to deal with all of those. Is that good?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll suggest that we are supporting the intent of the BC motion. That is, not to allow a PDP to consider things that the review is doing, but let's start the work that we can do as soon as possible.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. Are there any objections? No? Well, thank you very much. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Staff has noted another consensus call, which will go into our record of decisions. Thank you. We are now on a, what originally was a 45-minute session on ALS criteria. Unfortunately, it is 17 minutes to 3:00 and many of us are leaving for a 3:00 meeting with the Board, which I suspect is a mile or two away from here. That's the CCWG Board meeting, which I don't know to what extent everyone is going. I'm certainly going. I'm presuming not everyone.

There are things that are planned that will be going on past that, and that includes the fiscal year '16 budget and the new meeting strategy. I've asked Heidi to take responsibility for the fiscal year '16 budget part of the session, and Raf will be chairing the new meeting strategy session, and those of us who are leaving will be back at 4:00.

But I would like to start the discussion right now. I sent out a discussion paper or the start of the discussion paper on ALS criteria a week or so ago, and I apologize for the lateness. The first section, if you have it in front of you – and there were some paper copies, but

---

you should have e-mail versions of it – the first section simply extracted some bullets from the memorandum of agreement.

Now, it extracted it from the North American region one, which is why it makes reference to North American region. Thank Garth for noticing that. But there are very similar words in all five memoranda of understanding. And it outlines what the RALOs are supposed to do. If you read this, you'll see that, essentially, any rules that we now put in place for ALSs that support what the RALOs are doing apply retroactively.

So the concern that some people had that any new rules we make only apply to new applications is not an issue. So let's not worry about that. Now that doesn't mean we evaluate every ALS the day we pass this, and kick 90% of them out. Because the criteria we're adding are new, and it certainly in the best of worlds will take a bunch of months for people to meet them, to satisfy them.

I mean, if it says you must have something on your Website, well, in the real world, that doesn't happen overnight. So we're not looking at this as this is the mechanism by which we're going to kick a lot of ALSs out. Ultimately, there may be some reduction because of it, but that's not an immediate cause and effect.

I have outlined what I think is a reasonable list of criteria. And again, it's something I put together in an hour, I'm not pretending it's perfect. I think anything that comes out of our final project or our final work effort, we can't have a list of 423 requirements for every ALS. It's got to be a short, sweet list which is reasonable for an ALS as we know them

---

to do. So we have to use our knowledge of the real world to make it reasonable.

On the other hand, if the purpose of At-Large is to interact with people at the periphery of ICANN and at the user level, we do have to set some real rules for how we do that. And what I try to do is outline what I thought were a couple of reasonable ones. As nothing cast in concrete, so my first bullet says report annually. Maybe that means report every second year.

And by report, some people perceive that being you have to send in a 30-page glossy annual report. I envision us filling out a Web form. We have to be realistic. We have 200 ALSs. We're not going to get another three staff people to support this. So anything we put in place is going to have to be supportable by the RALOs and by the ICANN staff, who are supporting us. It's got to be pragmatic, and any rule we impose on the ALS has to be for a purpose. It has to make it better for us to be able to interact with the end users that we're trying to interact with.

So I'm not going to say a lot more on that. I also have a section on individual users. Individual users was one of the recommendations out of the first At-Large review. It's been implemented by four of the five RALOs. It has been implemented differently by each of them, according to their own decisions. We need to look at that and decide, do we need some commonality?

North America has had individual users from the very beginning, now close to eight years. It's been spectacularly unsuccessful. We have to look at why, and some of them are very pragmatic things. If I join as an

---

individual user, I'm a person. If I create a fictitious or almost fictitious ALS, which we know some people have done, then I may get some travel out of it. Which do you pick?

So we have to be pragmatic. On the other hand, we really don't want to be telling the world we have this ALS there when all of us really know it's one person. So I think we need to rework, rethink the concept of individual users to make it effective. And if we do, we may well have 50,000 individual users who are members of RALOs in a couple of years. It's not a particularly outrageous thing to have. But we have to structure it properly, and I don't have a clue how to do it. We obviously have not succeeded in North America. Although, to be honest, we haven't really put a lot of effort and thought into it.

So it's time, I think, to put effort and thought into it. I've said my piece. We have a few more minutes before I and a few others have to leave. I open the floor. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Sebastien Bachollet. Just a question. Do we have a wiki page where we have all those documents from the RALOs? Bylaw, MOU, whatever, to be able to compare quite easily what is in each and every region? And, if not, maybe we can try to have that as an action item for the future.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I wish you hadn't said those last couple of words so I could have said them. I think now we have...

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. I withdraw, you [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a staff action item now to create such a page in consultation with ALAC leadership. Because all that information is there now where you can find it, if the links work. If you can find the current version and if you can find it in the language you want, and if it's not a photocopy, a PDF, which is really a photocopy of something, which can't be scanned and copied. So there needs to be some work done, but it's a really good idea that we should put all of that in one place or at least easily accessible. Thank you for the idea. Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Alan. I will speak in Spanish. On this issue, I think I've spoken so much and so many times about this issue in the past that I'm afraid of boring you again. What I can say new about individual users, I'm really concerned about my region, which is the area I know the most.

Today, for instance, we have a meeting in the region. We have the same time zones, so there is no excuse not to participate. And in the Adobe Connect, there's nobody else but those of us here presenting the meeting from the region. I'm concerned about presenting to our region this issue of individual users considering that in the organizations of our region, we have so poor culture of accountability, so whom would an individual user be accountable to if there is no



---

organization behind him to say what the RALO is doing, what he is doing with the RALO?

So this is something that we should be discussing about individual users. Probably it doesn't work, it has been also unsuccessful in my region. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I half-agree with you. It has been unsuccessful. There are other models, however, if you look at things like the IEEE, Association of Engineers, where virtually everyone is an individual user, they do have chapters and things like that, but you can become an individual member very easily, and people do participate. They do things. So it can work. We're not doing it well enough.

But as you point out, we're not doing ALSs really well, either, so. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I agree with Fatima. Fatima can express her own view because she has the freedom to do so from our region, but I cannot do that, so my opinion is personal, as I haven't checked with my region. So I agree with her. Our region is very special in that respect, and I personally consider that the individual user, it is not that I do not want him to participate, but to participate with a different way than ALSs. I have individual users that have no voice and no vote power. Sorry, they do have a voice, but they do not travel, for instance.

---

So when those people who really want to participate become an ALS, they have different rights. If in LACRALO, and again, this is my personal view, if we open up the possibility for an individual user to become an ALS, we will have 50,000, not 5000, and the truth is that the only persons who will work will be those who are presently working in the ALS, and they are the ones who will be traveling. That's the unfortunate experience, an experience that I've had for many years. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'd like to try to delineate what we should be talking about today. If I have my preference, and I'm not clear I do, we will come to closure and be able to adopt some new measures by Dublin, either in or before Dublin. So we have several months to talk about this, and there will be plenty of opportunity for expressing our opinions of if we have more individual users, what are the rules associated with them? And the same thing for ALSs.

We may have made a mistake to say, just by becoming an ALS, you automatically travel to regional meetings, because then people create the ALS just for the travel in some cases. So I think we need to talk about this all and I don't think anything is given at this point. I put down on paper some things that I care about. That is not necessarily how it turns out, and there's going to be, I hope, a good amount of opportunity in a structured way to talk about each of these kind of things.

---

So I guess what I'm looking for today is confirmation that this is a good structure to start with. I can't remember, Heidi, have we actually struck the committee and decided who the members are? I think we did. So we need to go back. Unfortunately, we dropped the ball on this after Singapore because of the IANA and accountability issues, but we need to revisit it.

But I don't really want to talk a lot about the specifics today. There's going to be plenty of time to talk about them. Just I want comfort level that we should be having this discussion. I personally feel it's very important that we have the discussion before the external examiner comes in and looks at what we are doing right now. And I think by then, we have to have made some decisions. So that, I'd like confirmation that everyone feels comfortable going forward, but not settling the issues today. I have Dave and then Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's a point of order.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Point of order from Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Could we perhaps have that paper on the actual Adobe Connect rather than something which is from previous meeting? So that people can actually read it on their AC room rather than just seeing it, seeing the last three lines on the screen?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably a good suggestion to have made 15 minutes ago.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I was reading the thing, the document independently here, and I thought, “Oh, hang on. It’s not on there.” Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Pointed noted and next time, we’ll try to do it right. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I think this is, indeed, a good start, and I think it’s something that we have to do. And I think one of the concerns I have, I think that probably should be an under the RALO core responsibilities is really I noted there’s a disconnect between the At-Large working groups and the RALOs. And I base that observation on that there doesn’t seem to be any reporting, and maybe I’m just speaking from LACRALO’s perspective, of what happens in the various At-Large working groups.

And I think that perhaps one of the core RALO responsibility is to keep better track of who’s in the various working groups and actually ask those members in the various working groups who are in supposedly in the trenches, so to speak, and in the actual At-Large working groups to actually speak at the RALO monthly meetings and so forth.

---

Because I don't see that communication happening, and it's an unfortunate disconnect. And I think if we really want to be more effective, we have to be more better collaborating together.

ALAN GREENBERG:

One point I'll make, which was made at the ALT discussion, this we had earlier yesterday or Sunday, it's clear this is not just an ALAC discussion. It's not a RALO discussion. We want to get people from the ALSs in. We're not trying to impose rules purely top-down. That doesn't mean they're all going to like some of the rules we end up finally imposing, but this has to be a discussion of the community on a large scale. So it's not just us making a decision on their behalf.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Yeah. But just a quick follow-up. I mean, I think what's happening, though, is that they have a lot of individual ALS members joining the various working groups, but they're not really being recognized by the RALOs and [inaudible] the work they're doing or maybe not doing. But so I think that's part of the RALO core responsibilities, that it better needs to track what is happening in the At-Large working groups. And I guess maybe I should ask a question. How many people actually read the working group reports?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think there's a lot of work to be done across the board. Heidi asked, "Should they put what I wrote on a wiki page so people can comment?" And my answer was certainly, but we're going to be, once

---

this group is actually struck as a working group or whatever we decided to call it, we're going to do something a little bit more formal. But on the interim basis, yes, let's do that.

We are finishing this discussion. I'm turning it over to whoever is next. What is the next session? Fiscal year '16, which I believe I have asked Heidi to run, even. We normally do not have staff running meetings, but I think Heidi has participated enough in the fiscal year '16 issues that we can trust her to do this. Do we agree? Anyone object? If you object, you have to run the meeting instead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So thank you, everyone. I'm very happy to have 15 extra minutes. That's a relief. And I'm also very happy that we have Rob Hoggarth here just to answer any clarifying questions that you may have on any of the approved fiscal year '16 special requests. So in the 30 minutes or so that we have, I'd like to just go over, Ariel, if you could put up this... We have a new workspace [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG:

But before, I, of course, I have a number of pet peeves with the budget approval, budget situation, but Heidi is well aware of them, and although she may not agree with them all, I'm sure she'll present them on my behalf.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Well, yes, but I'll get to check [inaudible]...

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So I'm going to give you this. So to begin, we'll just go ahead and put the link to the fiscal year '16 special requests implementation workspace. And, again, I was asked to do this by Alan just to produce a strawman for this, and I decided to just go ahead and do all of the approved special requests. There were actually eight approved, so that's a very high number. Congratulations to everyone. So I'm going to just very quickly go over what that page looks like.

So I divided them into two parts. First, the ones that were more ALAC versus the RALO ones. And then I divided them into, I placed the description that all of you who were designing these requests put into the proposal, just describing what that request was for. Then, based on the staff follow-up of what was actually approved, some details of approval in the next column. Then I, again upon the request of Alan, I started just some initial thoughts on what sorts of materials might be required for the implementation of these special requests.

And then what I'd like to do, if we could get that far today, is to go identify who might wish to lead these requests, the implementation of these requests, and then as we go on to note the status of these requests. So before we begin, just to clarify that now that these have been approved, the implementation will be between 1<sup>st</sup> of July, 2015, through June 30, 2016. So there's a full year that you have to implement these requests.

So if we could, if everyone is just in agreement with all of that, then we'll go down these eight approved requests one by one. And if there's

---

any – now is your chance – if there are any questions that you have, clarifying these questions, we’re very fortunate to have Rob Hoggarth with us. Now for some of those requests, and I’ll note those as we go on, there are more meetings planned already during ICANN 53, for example, the captioning requests, the e-books request, we have meetings set up, informal meetings, formal meetings, etc. So things are slowly going in place for that.

So let’s go ahead and begin with the first one, the first ALAC one, since we’re all in agreement with that. The At-Large fiscal year ’16 special request for a strategic working session for ALAC and RALO leaders at ICANN public meetings 54 and 55. So what this is, this was a request by the ALAC for, basically, a Saturday, the previous Saturday, to have a full strategic day working for the ALAC and the RALO chairs.

So what was agreed was that this was going to be for additional travel support for ten members. But what’s happened in the meantime is that now the RALO chairs are already attending, there’s a session on Friday for ACSO and SG, and RALO chairs. So the RALO chairs are already coming in.

So just to make sure that everybody goes on the record, Alan was just pointing out that this money was now approved but it’s actually already now part of the core funding. So just to note that for the record. But my view was in the end is what was being proposed of that special extra day is already happening. It will happen, so that the end part is occurring.

So for meeting, okay. Glenn?



---

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Will this clash actually, by the date, with the Leadership Academy that will be for the RALO leaders?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Glenn. That's a good question. No. the Leadership Training Program will take place the week prior, Wednesday through Friday. So this takes place on Saturday. But, again, for those people who are chairs and also going through the Leadership Training Program, then you might have a conflict on that Friday afternoon when you have that chairs. Dev, do you have a question?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Clarifying question. So when you say the chairs, are you referring to the chair and the secretariat or just the chair alone?

HEIDI ULLRICH: The chair alone. Okay. So again, for this ten, up to ten people. I think it's exactly what we currently have. Or this would also include the, I'm looking at you, Rob. So the ten extra people, actually, this will now include the secretariats, as well, for that Saturday session?

ROB HOGGARTH: I'm trying to think how to answer that. I mean, this takes us back to a quick philosophical issue. The CFO. in setting up this special request capability. basically is looking to be able to provide the resources or

---

the capabilities that are requested by the community. So you want to be careful not to look at dollars or specific amounts, but look at the capability that's being provided.

And so, again, if we're talking about the first item on the list there, it's a work session for ALAC and RALO leaders, and an expectation, again, what is the capability on a pilot basis to see the model can be effectively applied to the ALAC leadership? And so the capability exists to provide that travel support, the extra night of hotel room, in addition to whatever meeting room support comes along with that.

However, that can be operated efficiently or effectively, I think, is the key. I mean, I wouldn't look at it as a particular number, necessarily. I mean, that number is certainly a guide for up to 20 people. If we start, then, saying, "Well, this person's is already funded and that person's not," I'm not sure that there's that level of detail in this request. That's what I'm getting to. So I wouldn't look at it and say, "Oh, well we have ten slots per meeting but so and so is already funded, so now we can fund 12 people." The grant was for ten people. So I think that's something, Heidi, for you and me talking with Xavier and others, to sort of work out.

I think the reason that you are raising these issue now, and I think it's fantastic that you are, is that it essentially provides an opportunity to place ahead. We're already looking to Dublin and then beyond, and so let's be having those conversations this week and into the future so that it can be a very efficient, effective process, and that we manage everyone's expectations. Did that answer your question?

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Rob. So Dev, let's get back to that on the numbers. But in terms of what was being hoped for today, in addition to the clarifying questions, was actually what materials and how the planning of the implementation might occur. So for this one, Alan and I had discussed that perhaps the ALT could be leading, that perhaps with the RALO chairs, could be leading the development of what that strategic day would look like in terms of the agendas and any session materials.

So Sandra, do you have a question?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. Yeah. Just a question for clarification. This is not for the whole ALAC, this is just ALAC leaders and RALO chairs, right? This additional meeting day.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Again, for the numbers, we need to clarify that. Because it was ten additional.

ROB HOGGARTH: This is Rob Hoggarth. Again, what you all asked for was an opportunity for your leadership to meet prior to the ICANN meeting, similar to what the GNSO does. And so the concept is, how do we fulfill that? Basically, the Board and senior staff leadership said, "That's an

---

excellent idea. You all should do that. So let's provide the necessary support to get the people that you need to the meetings.”

Based upon the work that they did, they said, “Oh, it looks like ten people per meeting,” based upon the fact that some people are already being funded and it's being taken care of. So I think that's part of the implementation conversation to ensure that you get what you asked for.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Rob. So, again, it might be the ALT or the ALAC to decide what the objectives of that day are. Maybe some more work on that. So any questions on that one? Any additional questions on that one? So for the lead, perhaps I'll put the ALT and other members of ALAC can also contribute to that, too.

So for the next one is the At-Large, there was a request. Sorry.

ARIEL LIANG:

This is Ariel Liang, for the record. We have a question from a remote participant, Beran Gillen. “Not clear on what Heidi said about 10 people instead of 15.”

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Thank you, Ariel. Beran, basically, we need to get back on that. There needs to be further discussion on exact numbers. And, again, the way you might wish to approach that or we might wish to approach that is to go back to the ALT and have further discussions on

---

what their objectives are, and then get back to you on the numbers on who best to reach, who best to attend to reach those objectives. I hope that will be clarifying, that will respond to your question there. Rob.

ROB HOGGARTH:

And one final point. Two important components, I think, to understand here just for context, to help you all appreciate this. A major part of in looking at this, I think, was the fact that it's meeting facilities, as well, and in some respects, that ends up being the bigger challenge, I think, from a resource perspective for the ICANN organization. So the organization has committed to that.

The other piece I want to point out is the use of the word, and some of you may smile, "pilot." We've been doing a lot of pilot efforts. An important component of the pilot effort is to be able to document the success. Did this achieve your goals? And so as you do go through this planning process with the understanding that a pilot effort is a learning experience to help us get better, please make an effort to be thinking, "What is not in here?"

I mean, I think there's already some good questions. Well, what do we mean about numbers? Maybe we need more people than this number. Maybe we need more time. We found this to be effective, we found it not to be effective. Those are the types of things to be thinking about throughout the implementation process because when we start to look at FY '17, those conversations are going to be taking place probably just after ICANN 55.

---

And so it'll be very important as just a part of your process to be thinking about how you're going to describe this so that there's a determination or that there's evidence to either continue or discontinue the pilot. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Thank you, Rob. So moving on to the next one. This one is more clear on the numbers, actually. This was a request for an ALAC development session at ICANN 54. So what that is is for the incoming ALAC, so it's not the current ALAC, the ones that will take their seat at the end of the Dublin meeting, to have a one-day session for a development. Alan has referred it as a development or a team-building type of exercise that GNSO has been doing for the last few years.

So it was requested 15 members of the incoming ALAC and the approval says it anticipates up to 20 travelers covering the meeting room expenses. Again, it's on that Friday, that last Friday. So there will be additional meeting room expenses as well as one night of hotel. So this, again, Alan had developed the thoughts on this that would include team building, a possible facilitator. At-Large staff will be preparing an onboarding document for incoming ALAC members, that's a new project that we'll be working on. And, also, do you need a facilitator for the full session?

And if so, those are additional costs that were not anticipated. So it might be that, perhaps, graduates of the Leadership Training Program

---

could facilitate. I mean, these are thoughts that need to be discussed as we go along.

So are there any questions there? Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Heidi. I don't fully understand what you have just said, how this relates to the ICANN Academy and Leaders Training or the introduction for those who are coming to take our position, and how this relates to what we are doing. I don't fully understand that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry for any confusion. Again, if there was going to be a facilitator for the team-building exercise for this last Friday development session, or a facilitator to lead the whole meeting. Okay. There are no funds for that facilitator if that person was to be an outside person like [inaudible], who facilitates the Leadership Training Program.

So a possible way around that is now that we have many graduates of the Leadership Training Program who are skilled, have learned facilitation skills, perhaps they could lead that for the ALAC. Just a thought. That clarify? Okay.

So any additional questions on that? So again, because this is an ALAC event, perhaps the ALT could take the lead on that one. Just not seeing any objections, so we'll go ahead with that. Okay. So let's move on to the next one. This one, I did put under ALAC, but basically, it was Judith has been leading this. So this one is a pilot program of

---

captioning. So Judith, did you want to just very, very briefly go over that and what was agreed on that?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. So what the proposal called for was that to do a pilot study, to do gather enough metrics on captioning, and what we were going to do is we were going to do three programs a month, either a RALO meeting, an ALAC meeting, or a working group, or a webinar.

And so we got funding and we got into the core budget. I am meeting later this week with Josh to get some more ideas on what ICANN plans to do, and then I had put a note out on the list looking for working group members, and so I have a bunch of people who are going to help us after we get the [inaudible] to try to create the structure, the pilot more on how do you choose which meetings get chosen for that month? How do you create a list? How do you find out priorities?

What we want to do is we want to get enough access and get ideas from all the RALOs to spread the news out that this is what's available so that then we could have robust ideas and participation. And, hopefully, we'll have a lot of competition for what gets chosen for the three for a month.

And so that's, and we're trying to build that. And if the idea is if we have a lot more engagement, then we can prove why this is needed to increase engagement of everyone. So [inaudible].



---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much, Judith. So, again, as we noted, Judith has really been taking the lead on this one, and we're already having informal meetings here and it's being discussed at NARALO. So would anyone have objections for Judith taking the lead on this one in consultation, in collaboration with the relevant staff? And that's going to include At-Large staff but also very much IT staff, as well.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Just for the record, APRALO is in full support of this program, and we are happy to participate as one of the RALOs. And I think that we have the person who is actively involved in the Accessibility Working Group. So Gunela, I think that she will be, overall, in charge on behalf of APRALO. We didn't ask her yet, but I think that she will have no objections.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Gunela already responded to my original call, saying she wants beyond the pilot. So we got several different members. Beran from AFRALO has also wanted to be on the pilot, and I forgot who from LACRALO or some other areas, but I put down the list of names and we have a bunch of people who have already said that they want to get involved in discussions.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So you have APRALO support.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you very much. So no further questions on that one. Good thumbs up. We have a thumbs up. Occur. Raf.

RAF FATANI: Thank you, Judith, for your efforts in this. I don't know if I am in the Accessibility Working Group. I'm not sure if I'm in the sub working group, if it is a sub working group, if you'd like to call that. But if not, then will you put me in that? My ex-employees used to do a lot of this, captioning, so I do have a lot of history and background with working with captioners and the industry as a whole. So I might be able to add some value there.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: So we have two people from APRALO. We have Raf and Gunela, and we are happy they will share with us all the results.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you very much. If staff could suggest, rather than a subgroup of the Accessibility Working Group, if we could just, for all of these, have just task forces being set up on these.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That was my plan, to have a task force, not a sub working group. But I think he does use the terminology not...

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. So it sounds like we're in agreement. Okay. Good. So I'm just conscious of the time. We have nine minutes left before the meeting staff get here, so I'm just going to speed up a little bit. So the next one, now, I have put this one, this is a fiscal year '16 request for e-books. So I've placed it under the ALAC requests, but you'll see in the description and in, actually, the staff comments, as well, on that, that it refers more to NARALO.

But if I could just ask Glenn to have a very brief update on that, and then if I might offer some [inaudible] suggestions for that one, too.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. As is pointed out here, the e-book is just a different modality of our material that just – it's an innovative way to handle the huge amount of content that we had. So I propose this idea as one of the platforms, and it fits quite in well within the Academy. So, again, it's another way for people to access the information in a form downloadable, and it has, also, voice or audio track capability, as well. Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Thank you, Glenn. It is a very good proposal, very detailed. You'll see that's already lots of outcomes already noted. Now, you'll see, also, that it notes in the staff details about the implementation that – I'm just going to read this for the record. For this particular request, the Communications Team of ICANN, out at ICANN, will consult with the NARALO leadership on developing the appropriate

---

materials to achieve the goals outlined in their proposal. And, also, continuing that they will be working staff members of the DPRD will also be involved to help strategize an effective implementation methodology as the e-book documents are likely to be housed on the ICANN online learning platform, which the DPRD houses.

So, again, there's going to be consultation with staff very much. But if I might suggest that since the e-books are going to be so useful for all RALOs, that rather than just consulting with NARALO leadership, that this be a cross-RALO activity. And, perhaps, the cross-RALO, the Chairs might want to, Glenn, if you want to work on this, but maybe have a small working group that includes members from the other RALOs, as well. Just so all the, perhaps, if there's a cultural issue that we want to make sure that this is put in there, that that's included in that. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, just a question, then. Sorry. Yeah. Just a question, then. I mean, shouldn't that be, well, I understand, yes, it has been a cross-RALO thing, but why not just not be a cross-RALO? Why not stick it to one of their existing working groups such as the Outreach and Engagement Working Group or the Capacity-Building Working Group? And lead the activity directly there. Just a thought.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So. If everyone decides to do that, that's fine. But, again, as we had noted earlier, it might be that small task forces can be formed to implement these.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                    Yeah. I think what Heidi is also saying is a small task force can be much more nimble. When it fits in with a larger group, it could be buried or may not... I know what you're saying is find a home for it, but I'm not sure if those two locations are the appropriate home. I'm not dictating the process, I'm just saying this is just a tool for across the board, not just those two.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Thank you, Glenn. Raf?

RAF FATANI:                        I think echoing in understanding what Glenn just said, and echoing what Dev was saying earlier. I think maybe a task force could be found within a working group already existing, where there's already interest in engaging in such topics already. So maybe that's a possible scenario.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                    Thank you, Raf. Another solution might be where we have this task force, have members that report regularly back to those two working groups so there's even a liaison to the groups. But either we can decide this today or we can continue this. Okay. We can just maybe question mark that one, but we can have, perhaps we'll have Glenn and a small team lead that discussion informally.

---

Okay, but again, just to confirm that there will be collaboration with the comms, with Communications Team, and with DPRD. And they're also going to be speaking to the Technology Task Force. So that might be another good time for discussing the way forward for that one.

Okay. Moving in five minutes, we have the RALO one, so I'll quickly go through this one. AFRALO, they put in for a request for an IGF workshop. Okay. And what was agreed from staff was that there would be pending MAG approval of the work panel, of the workshop, then they would have support for three travelers. But I've heard, unfortunately, there was a technical glitch when the proposal was submitted to the MAG workspace or site, and that panel was not considered.

So, right now, it might seem that that request will not be able to go forward because of that glitch. Raf.

RAF FATANI:

Just someone that has some experience with the MAG in the past. I think we do need to revisit the process in which we look at funding for RALOs that request slots to speak about the IGF. One of the main reasons is because, actually, the timescale in which these requests are made don't align with the time scale in which the [inaudible] evaluate the workshop process. And maybe a longer discussion needs to be had with regards to how we can do this to actually work in a better process. There's no point in, therefore, a slot to be allocated to a group of people when we don't know if that money is going to go to

---

them, and it would be, otherwise, wasted, that it could have gone to another group of people.

So if this is going to be the case, then maybe we should have a when a slot is, or a request is made for an IGF workshop request, maybe there should be a backup something. So if there is something that hasn't gone through on the basis of that, then we can go in something else.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Raf. Rob?

ROB HOGGARTH: I think those are some excellent comments. One thing that some of us have been trying to pursue is much more of an alignment in terms of overall ICANN/IGF planning. And I think that would go a long way towards solving some of these very issues, and I know members of our GSE team are examining that.

The concept of looking collectively as an organization as a community how to prepare for and participate in IGF is very important, rather than uncoordinated efforts. So I would encourage members of this group to talk that up as much as possible with your local regional teams to try to encourage that discussion to take place.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Rob. Okay. So we just have a few minutes to go through. Fatima.

---

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Heidi. I will speak in Spanish. Along the lines of Raf's comments, and as Rob said, in my view, I am presently a member of MAG. And in my view, there are two things here. One is the participation of ICANN as an organization, which is entitled to organize open fora, and other types of different proposals other than the workshops that can be organized by the ICANN community, as the case of the workshop, which you were telling the request that could not be moved forward.

When workshops are organized, individual members from the community individually, not as an organization for several years, it has been requested to have a confirmation of the people who are going to attend the workshops as speakers or as moderators. So we are requesting prior confirmation.

We do acknowledge that it is difficult to know if we are going to present in May who will attend in November or October the prior year. But if we do not get a confirmation, we can send someone else. It is difficult for us as a community to get a commitment so many months earlier so that the budget can be approved by ICANN to take a person to the IGF. I think we should find a way to have preset slots, even though we cannot give it a name of a person, we should have preset slots, predefined slots, if we want to continue participating in the IGF. Thank you.



---

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Actually, yes. This is Heidi again. In the APRALO's request for IGF participation was along those lines. So very quickly, Siranush, if you permit me just to quickly go through that, there were two parts to the APRALO request for IGF participation. One was for outreach and the other one was for two people to go to two panels. Okay. They did not specify which panels, they just said that there were some panels being planned. So two people.

So the results were no to the outreach, given in terms of the logic behind that was that outreach for APRALO in Latin America and Brazil might not be the most effective means of outreach for them. But the second part was yes to support the travelers for two panels. And, again, no reference to that. So that is a good model, perhaps, for the future.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

Yes, I agree, Heidi, because we had bad experience last year when we submitted the proposal and it didn't approved, was not approved by MAG. And we had a challenge even for those who had to run, really, a workshop there, had problems to go there. That's why we didn't specify this time, but I'm happy to share that there are two workshops approved where two members are already part of one, is panelist one, is remote moderator.

So, actually, this approach helped, at least, to save two people's participation there.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Siranush. So I'm assuming that you, as chair, will be leading that. That's a relatively easy item to implement. Correct? It's basically self-organizing now. That – your request. So who will take the lead on that?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. I will take the lead. I will take the lead on this and we will inform you who is going for the trip, who will be participating at the IGF, to let constituency travel staff, and ICANN staff to know it prior in advance.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you very much. Moving quickly on. So then there were requests from NARALO and EURALO for general assemblies, and AFRALO, as well. The requests, the results were that, basically, one general assembly from either EURALO or NARALO, not AFRALO, just because the costs for an AFRALO general assembly were over twice as much.

So what's happened, in the meantime, is that NARALO, after consultation with its members, has agreed for that EURALO will be able to hold its general assembly at ICANN 54 in Dublin. [Wulf] has already thanked them, everyone's starting to plan that. So the way forward is that EURALO will be holding a meeting here on Tuesday morning, and for their initial planning. We've already – staff has set up a workspace so the planning will start on that. Okay. Any questions on that?

---

Okay. LACRALO. So, Rob, there's a little bit of clarification needed on this one. This was a request for LACRALO for an outreach or outreach and engagement activities at the 8<sup>th</sup> [inaudible] Regional Forum. The results, the staff came back with yes, approved, but with limitations on travelers and training resources. And it would now take place in conjunction with the June 2006 ICANN meeting to be determined in Latin America, and only cover costs of one extra night for up to 25 additional, for 25 travelers.

So the question, Rob, is that those numbers sort of indicate, in a way, a general assembly. Because why were the 25, where did the 25 travelers? LACRALO has 47 ALSs but, again, there's no travel involved and it's only one night. So we're just wondering on what kind of events staff was thinking about.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you. One of the things I wanted to confirm, I'm here to help explain and interpret the request. These grants were made by the Board and the Board Finance Committee, so I just want to clarify that point of order. It's not staff evaluating your requests and saying yes or no.

My understanding of this proposal is that the view was this was an excellent idea. The concept of providing this sort of outreach and engagement training was a very good use of ICANN resources that has been successfully applied elsewhere. The challenge was, I think, from a resource perspective, having that take place a separate non-ICANN-related event where there was going to be an ICANN event scheduled

---

for that fiscal year in Latin America. And so that was the issue with respect to the location not being able to take place at the [inaudible] 8 event, but at the ICANN event, wherever it's located.

The second component of that was, I think, if I can recall some of the discussions correctly, is that it was a measure of, again, focusing on the training, not thinking at all about a general assembly, but noting the model that you had all used before with respect to leadership training, that this is a great opportunity. Yes, ICANN wants to support that training, and resources exist to provide that to up to 25 people.

As you will note, as part of that request dispensation, there was a recognition that the budget didn't exist to pay [inaudible] \$20,000, or whatever the amount is, to conduct that training. And so the suggestion was to use existing graduates of the Leadership Training to conduct that capability for folks. So I don't know if that answered the complete question, but I'm hopeful that it explains, at least, the background and my understanding of the reason for the approval.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Thank you very much, Rob. So I know we're just very limited on the time. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

Unfortunately, I won't be able to clarify this point, either. I won't be able to clarify this point, either, because Umberto was working on this, and unfortunately, Umberto could not come to Buenos Aires. [inaudible] is here in Buenos Aires and will be talking to her and I will,

---

afterwards, contact her to clarify it. But I think, in principle, this was not what was requested originally, but to take up an already ongoing event that has been held for several years, I think it's the eighth or ninth already, and integrate ICANN to it, meaning outreach, both for ICANN and also, and I think it was originally only support requested for translation, the attendance was to [inaudible] people from ICANN, not LACRALO, but ICANN, in order to integrate ICANN and not have a specific event, which would be better, because we're professionals from different areas.

And it was the number was high, 500 participants, and we were integrating ICANN to such congress. This was a two-day congress and we were able to get half a day, entirely, for ICANN. That was the original request. If any modification was done of this original request, I don't know, but I can tell you later. And the money was not so much. In principle, we will approve the support. I hope I can clarify the rest of it if I can meet Alina. Alina is the responsible person for the ALS, who submitted to the request, the project for the request. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

[Inaudible] much, Alberto. So perhaps going forward, we'll get some more clarification from the people involved in this. And, also, working with Rob. And I'm also thinking with Rodrigo de la Parra, who is the GSE Vice President for that region, and might be planning some sort of outreach event right prior to that meeting that might be able to, then, add some sort of training component.

---

So I think we'll be in touch. Fatima, perhaps, we can be, also, in touch with you just to help co-lead that. Okay? Great. Thank you very much. So we're now going to transfer. So, no, thank you. Rob. So I think that concludes that session. Thank you very much. We'll all be working forward with that.

So we're now going to turn it over to Raf Fatani, who will be chairing the session on the new meeting strategy, and we have the hardworking meetings team with us right now.

Raf? Do you want to come up here, Raf?

RAF FATANI:

First of all, I'd like to thank Nick, Nancy, and Tanzania for coming and sharing with us. I'd just like to remind everyone this is the Meeting Strategy Working Group and, as you all know, the output of the new strategy is we will be having a different format than what's traditionally we've been having with a much smaller, smaller meeting.

And with that, I'll leave it to Nick to tell us more about what's been on your minds.

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you very much, Rafid. I'm sure many of you are already aware of the new meeting strategy. Many of the authors of that strategy came from the At-Large community. Conceptually, they work very hard, very diligently to resolve some of the issues that we were facing that the community was advising us of. Most specifically, in many of the

---

conflicts that happen between sessions and ICANN meetings, and the need to begin to reduce some of that conflict, and design meetings that better suit our needs. In particular, meeting A of the year will look and feel very similar to a traditional ICANN meeting.

We're looking at the Board, the public forum, being broken into two sections early in the week and late in the week so that the Board can hear some of the concerns from the community, of the ideas from the community, and then react to them later in the week.

Meeting B is the one that has caused a lot of concern. And I'm going to skip over that and jump right to meeting C. So we'll circle back to meeting B at the end of this discussion because meeting C is a much easier discussion.

This meeting is extended by one day. It is the annual general conference for ICANN. And with it comes outreach, it comes media coverage, comes many of the things that we would like to see happen, and the Meeting Strategy Group would like to see happen at the annual general meeting. It, too, has a public forum that is broken into two days to accomplish what I said earlier.

Meeting B is the one that has created a lot of concern and consternation. Let me give you the Meeting Strategy Working Group's theory on this meeting. I'm beginning to call this the policy forum rather than ICANN meeting 50-X. And the reason I'm doing that is because I think it better explains what this meeting is. This is a four-day format that is focused almost exclusively on you being able to do your work, both within your own constituency, AC, SO, SG, but also

---

cross-constituency, where you'll have the opportunity to meet with the other SGs, SOs, and ACs to discuss your plans, to collaborate, to move the policy development forward.

So that's it conceptually. In it is also an element of outreach. If we think about this meeting and we think about it in terms of scale, I don't want to say that the attendance will be less, although I suspect it will naturally wind up there, but certainly the scale of the meeting, the scope of the meeting is less. We'll require fewer large meeting spaces, and because of that, we'll be able to put this meeting in some of those places that have traditionally been wanting to bring an ICANN meeting to their city, their country, and have been unable to because of the sheer size.

Predominantly focused on Latin America and Africa for the next five years or so. Now that's, nothing is – we do have a strategy, we do have dates that have been approved by the Board. But if there's a need to modify that, I'm happy to say that the Meeting Strategy Group gave staff the ability to move things around, as necessary, just so long as we maintain an equitable distribution of meetings throughout the five geographies that represent ICANN.

So with that, if we think about the first day, which on this slide is shown as outreach, there will be an element of outreach on that day. And we're working with the SO, AC, SG leaders to further define what that is, and to define what each of their requirements are. So I would turn to Rafid and the team to say, "Think about what outreach means



---

to you and think about what elements of outreach you would find valuable, and then come back to us with your concepts, your ideas.”

I don't think it's going to be a full day, frankly, in terms of the activities around outreach. Where it will be a full day, I believe, is after we do the outreach and engaging those people to join us for the rest of the day or the rest of the week, for that matter. Local people who you can mentor and train and welcome into the ICANN community.

So that's the concept of outreach. And we get into the two days. So perhaps that afternoon becomes the first working session, and you have at least two more days of working sessions. And perhaps the fourth day is also a half a day of intra-community working sessions. You're doing your own work. And then there will be some element of inter-community work where you'll have the opportunity to meet with the SOs, the ACs, the SGs, and I have omitted the Board.

The Board is one of the communities that will be there in full and engaged with the SOs, ACs, SGs. So that's the concept around it. And then what I know you have been working on is how to define those days, and what activities you will have under each of those headings. So with that, Rafid, I'll turn it back to you and answer any questions you may have.

RAF FATANI:

Thank you. Thank you for the update. Before I open up to the floor if any has questions, we, as you know, or if you don't know, we established a working group around these discussions within our own

---

communities to find out what these individual slots allocations mean to us, and you've mentioned the outreach, what that means, outreach to the At-Large community and what shape will that take.

So with that in mind, what sort of schedule did you have in mind for us to give you feedback? When would you like that sort of feedback?

NICK TOMASSO:

We have begun our discussions with the SO, AC, SG leads on Friday to talk about how we would get input from each group and how we would begin to assimilate that information, how we would create some online workspace where we can post all of the proposed schedules from each of the working groups.

And then we will need, somehow, to coalesce around a format. We can't do many, many, many different things at the same time. So if we can coalesce around the timeframes where those things would happen, then I believe we'll have, from that point, we'll have a model that we can use. I know that wasn't your question. But I just thought I, where we're heading with that, where we are today.

I would hope that, before we ever get to Dublin in October, we would have a very good idea of what the meeting B would look like, and perhaps in its entirety. Because it's your meeting, frankly. There's not going to be – and if I didn't say this, it'd warrant saying – there's no opening ceremony, there's no public forum, there's no Board meeting, there are no high-interest topics. There are no GDD topics. This is policy workshop. This is a policy forum.

---

RAF FATANI: Thank you, Nick. Open up questions to the floor. Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. So just a clarifying question, then, regarding this. So currently, in our current meeting structure, the At-Large community has 25 supported travelers that are scheduled to arrive by Saturday, for the most part, by Saturday so they could start a full session on Sunday. So is it that under the meeting B strategy, the 25 travelers would be scheduled to arrive on Sunday to start work on Monday?

NICK TOMASSO: I don't handle supported travelers, but I think I can answer very clearly that, yes, they would arrive the day before the start of the meeting. So they would arrive Sunday to begin work on Monday.

RAF FATANI: Thank you. Does that answer your question, Dev? Maureen, next in the line.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Nick. You mentioned that the smaller meetings are going to be held in Africa and Latin America. That's the plan at the moment. I'm from the Pacific and we're a very underdeveloped area, and 22 countries, very isolated, very small. So trying to find a venue, even for

---

a small meeting, the small meeting B, is going to be difficult. But I was actually sort of like we're having a little chat with Heidi last night.

Looking at it from the perspective for the Pacific, one of the things that's really difficult in our region is actually traveling for one island group to move to a travel to another island group. That's with great difficulty.

However, there are common bases, and one of them is New Zealand, and the other one is Australia. And in those areas, you'd actually probably get a venue, but you'd actually sort of be able to access a lot of those island groups. It's just that ICANN is, I mean, it's pretty well unknown within the 22 countries. We've got four ALSs in the region and they're, basically, focused on four of them probably, apart from Fiji, Cook Islands, and [Niue]. And Cook Islands and [Niue] are really, really tiny.

So, I think there does need to be some sort of, if any way, we can find some way of actually engaging those countries. But my feeling is, too, that we really need to be getting to the governments, and I think that that's... I know that, for example, in the GAC, very few of our government leaders are actually coming to those GAC meetings, and that's another reason we need to engage them more. Something to think about. Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you. I would like to respond. That's very insightful information regarding where you might be able to hold a meeting. That would, in

---

fact, engage people from those areas. I have talked with Xavier about this topic in particular. I have looked at some of the meeting facilities in those locations, and they are quite small, to your point.

As I mentioned earlier, the Meeting Strategy Working Group has given us some latitude to move things around a little bit, so even though the middle meetings are earmarked for Africa and Latin America right now, I think we have a lot of latitude in that if we want to put something in the South Pacific. I do like the idea of doing something in New Zealand or Australia in the right location, obviously, and I'll be asking you for advice on that. But thank you very much.

RAF FATANI:

Thank you, Nick, and I think, Ali, I'll get to you in a second. Thank you. Just building on that, I think we are a very widely diverse group, and I think it's worth formally inviting you and asking you, if you ever require advice and in sub-regions and smaller regions, and we're more than happy to help and advise, and you may take that advice, you may throw it in the sea.

But a lot of people are local to their communities and they have information and detail that is very difficult to access. So I would advise you and I would recommend that you reach out to and we would be happy to help in that matter, in reaching out to new locations. Ali had a comment.

---

ALI ALMESHAL:

My inquiry or question is outside this subject, but it's related to the Meeting Team. I'm [inaudible] when we are planning the dates, you are looking, take in consideration if there is any special occasion for any of the communities that are part of ICANN, which is the international. And, unfortunately, this time, for the Muslims, this is the Ramadan time, and it has put a lot of pressure, at least speaking on my behalf on myself, at least, just to come and participate while in Ramadan. Normally it's not a public holiday for us, it's a normal day, but it's a culture-wise that we normally don't travel, we normally don't go out, and we do not participate. I mean, to travel outside our countries.

And for me to come and participate, that was a tremendous pressure on me to do it or not to do, and this is my commitment to the team that I am part of in the APRALO. But I'm [inaudible] why this have not been take in consideration and to avoid a one week from Ramadan just bring it forward or delay it after that. Thank you.

NICK TOMASSO:

I'm going to respond and I'm going to let Tanzania also make some comments on this. We do extensive work on identifying national and religious holidays around the world to avoid. We also need to look at similar conferences, like IETF and APRICOT, and avoid those not just the week of, but leave a week in between. Otherwise, the attendance at one or the other is going to be minimized.

And we were aware of Ramadan, but when we looked at what options we had, we had little choice but to put the meeting where it is. I can't

---

promise you that it will never happen again. We will do everything within our power to avoid those major national and religious holidays. Of course, Ramadan is one of them. But we do an extensive piece of work, so when we placed this meeting here on these dates, we knew we took counsel from some people about it and we collectively made a decision that this was what we needed to do this time. Hopefully it won't happen again.

RAF FATANI:

Does it answer your...? Ali? I think it is worth noting that some of us are fasting for 15 to 16 hours in very long days, and it does make our life a little bit more difficult when we have to do it fasting, so it is, of course, there are other considerations, and I do appreciate that. As a community, we do appreciate that. But I think maybe a little bit more understanding on the specific matter.

Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you so much, Nick, for your presentation. I just want a clarification. What was the prime motivator to come up with this new strategy? Was it cost savings or was it community input to motivate you to make these modifications? And the other comment is just looking at the guiding principles. I'm curious, you said you intentionally avoided those big events like the IETF and IGF and other meetings. In some ways, I would think they would complement.

---

Rather than avoid, you would sort of either be before or during or after. So those are my two comments.

NICK TOMASSO:

The Meeting Strategy Working Group was told to take money off the decision process when deciding on what the new meeting strategy should look like. This is not a financial decision and there are a number of Meeting Strategy Working Group people right here in this room who can give you, perhaps, some more detail on that.

It was really designed to create the meetings for the future. It was based on a lot of community input about the clutter of ICANN meetings, how difficult it is to attend all of the meetings that you feel that you need to attend and yet still do your policy work here, etc.

So that was the genesis of it. We knew that the current meetings were not serving us well. We were told that often enough. And that's how the strategy was developed. I hope that helps.

RAF FATANI:

I'm going to close questions now for the sake of time. Before I thank Nick, I'd like to remind everyone that we have an AC/SO meeting on the Strategy Working Group, and that will be held on Wednesday morning from 7:30 to 8:30. Sorry, from 7:45 to 8:45 in Retreat OA. So I'll be there and I welcome you all to join us in the discussions.

And with that, I thank... Oh, Nick. Go ahead.



---

NICK TOMASSO:

I realized there was one thing I wanted to say that I didn't get to while answering the questions. One of the things we posed to Alan and the other SO, AC, SG leads on Friday was in light of everything that is going on with the IANA transition, does meeting B still serve us well in June of 2016? And the answer was a resounding yes, do not change the path, do not change your commitment, but be thinking about the possibility of an IANA transition forum for two days following the meeting.

So you may see that on the horizon and you may see it on some documents that we ultimately published, a placeholder for that just in case work needs to be done to complete that work in the June timeframe. Thank you.

RAF FATANI:

Thank you, Tomasso. I know Eduardo was chairing the Drafting Group. We are very pushed for time. But would you, in 30 seconds or less, kind of explain where we are with that?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes. I put a strawman proposal out there in a wiki that you're welcome to see, and I just did that to start the discussion on getting something that will work for us, so you can use it and see how we merge this with the rest, and there is another smaller group that is focusing their efforts to define what are we going to do during the outreach, which is a very good point and question.

---

The other one is just working with the, trying to put meetings according to the guidelines that we have there. And so we hopefully will have something way before Dublin to submit to your group on that. Thank you.

RAF FATANI:

Thank you, Eduardo. And I welcome and echo your invitation for everyone to join this working group and get involved in defining what our role is with these activities. I think for an action, could we have a call set up in July at some point for the working group? Thank you. Yes, with that, I thank you, Tomasso and your team, for coming and joining us. And hopefully, if I haven't missed anything out, see you in Dublin.

NICK TOMASSO:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you. I always find it enlightening.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you, Nick. Thank you, Nancy. And thank you, Tanzania. Just to announce that we now have a coffee break. Please be back at 4:15 to continue our discussions with the SSAC, Jim Galvin and Patrik Faltstrom are usually on time and Julie Hammer is already going to sit here at the table. Patrik's already here, so coffee break pronto. 4:15, no not canceled, it's in the schedule. And those coming with us to the newcomer session, I already have two standing here next to me. We're going to be going shortly. Thank you very much.

---

I'm not going to be here for the next session, so Julie, if you'd please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes, to speak at a reasonable speed, much appreciated. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not quite sure where the rest of our attendees went. I know, but some of us have just brought it back. There's a line now. I guess we'll start and hope that they'll populate the meeting pretty soon. SSAC meetings are always one of my fun meetings. I actually learn something, very often, and that's fun. I turn it over to Julie, who will run the rest of the meeting. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Alan. Julie Hammer speaking. In this meeting, can I please ask that everyone identify themselves when they speak and also speak slowly for the translators. So I would like to welcome Patrik Faltstrom, chairman of SSAC, and Jim Galvin, deputy chairman. And, also, I think we have a couple of our SSAC staff here and, I think, one SSAC member, [inaudible].

So before handing over to Patrik, what I thought I would ask to make best use of our time is which topic of interest you would like Patrik to focus on first. Most of you understand how SSAC works, so you don't need the background of who we are and how we operate. I think there are two topics of interest related to our two most recent SSAC reports.

---

One is a technical topic on public suffix lists, and the other is the SSAC's response to the CCWG Accountability.

So can I ask for an indication of which... Firstly, I'll ask for hands up on each of the topics. So who would like to hear Patrik speak on the public suffix list first? One, two, three. Who would like to... Oh, sorry, four. Was that Tijani? Who would like to hear Patrik speak on the CCWG Accountability SSAC response? One, two, three. It's about even... Four. Four, right. So accountability first... Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:

May I suggest that any discussion of the statement on accountability does not need to take a lot of time?

JULIE HAMMER:

Okay. So we will do that first, and then quickly move on to the public suffix list. So the first is slide 16, Ariel, and then back to slide 8 after we've been through those slides. Thank you. Over to you, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. And thank you for inviting SSAC to, once again, have a meeting with you. This is normally something that I find very interesting because you're one of the groups that actually do ask us questions. And because of that, I will try to not take up so much time on the actual presentations.

But let's start with the accountability enhancements. Next slide, please. What happened was that SSAC supported the creation of the

---

Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. We are, though, not a chartering organization. We decided, though, to respond to the open consultation that closed a few weeks ago, and what you see here is the response, what we sent in during that open consultation, and that was SSAC Report Number 71.

What is important, what I want to point out is that our charter says that the SSAC advice is the ICANN community board on matters relating to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation system. That is what we are doing; nothing more, nothing less.

Regarding the recommendations we give, SSAC has neither been given nor sought any standing for the advice other than it being of high quality. So whoever reads our reports can choose themselves what they are going to do with it.

Next slide, please. Regarding this open consultation itself, we do not have any comment at this point in time whether or not the structure proposed has an impact on the ability for ICANN or the Board to respond to our advice. It is coming based on the fact that, from our perspective, parties that we recommend doing things should actually do it based on the quality that there's something that we are living with at the moment, and we think that works fine, so we don't really need any other sort of mechanism.

That said, for advice that are given to the Board, there is already today some specific requirements on the Board to respond, and in HRT2, there is a specific recommendation that formal advice from the

---

Advisory Committees are... The Board should take advice from the formal advice from the Advisory Committees into account. That is something that we, in SSAC, support.

So on top of that, what is also proposed is that security and stability of the Internet, the Internet addressing system, is something that is moved to be a commitment to ICANN. So commitment number one is actually proposed to be security and stability of the addressing and parameters and domain names and such.

So for SSAC, it is sort of enough, if I can use those terms, and what is important for us is that there's a dotted line between us existing as an advisory committee, us giving advice, the advice living based on the quality of the advice, and ICANN Board taking those into account. And on top of that, having security and stability, which we have listed in the charter, also be listed as a commitment to ICANN. So that's where the connection is, and that is the main reason why we don't see, at this point in time, whether a legal structure is needed apart from that sort of dotted line.

The second thing is that we are actually concerned over the proposed model where we have an SO and AC membership model. Because the way SSAC operates, we don't have... The way we operate, we cannot participate in that kind of structure, which means that if it is the case that it is enforced that kind of membership structure in that case, we have to change out the way we operate.

That said, so we are a little bit reluctant to be involved in issues outside of our charter. And our charter, of course, also part of the

---

ICANN bylaws, which means that if it is the case that this kind of model is something that will be the endgame, we point out that in that case, we need to change the way we're operating. But, on the other hand, as I said just a few minutes ago, we don't really see any need for those kind of things at this point in time.

Next slide, please. So because of this commitment and the charter and the bylaws and the existence of SSAC, we do expect that the community, which means the CCWG Accountability Cross-Community Working Group, which once again, we are not chartering organization for that, we just expect, given those kind of goals, we expect the community to adopt an organization structure, which actually will adopt and recognizes these important issues.

The last thing we are saying is, of course, that it was the first round, the first open consultation, and, of course, like we reserve our ability to make more formal comments and make the judgment on the final recommendations from the CCWG Accountability, and they have already announced that they will have a second round of open consultation.

That's it. Is there any questions on that?

JULIE HAMMER:

I'm not seeing any... Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no question, but just a comment that everything is changed since last Friday. So everything is off the table. The current proposal, basically says you could ignore us as long as you want to ignore us, and someday, should you decide you want to be part of the club for whatever reason, you might be able to. You could be able to. Best of both worlds. So I think we have, even before having seen your comment, we have followed it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. But it's really important to read... People interested should actually read our report. But it's really important to see these two separate tracks. One is that we very explicitly point out how we connect our charter, our responsibility, our recommendations to the Board, and then to the commitments of the organization. That is really, really important.

Given that that exists, the other things are sort of not as important, or any need for anything else.

JULIE HAMMER: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Julie. I heard you, and when we discussed the model that was proposed, one of the main reasons that we didn't like it, it was because some parts of the community wouldn't be able to participate on the same footing because it doesn't permit all the community to



---

participate. So I think that this is now more or less over and, perhaps, we will have other kind of proposal that will be accessible for anyone.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yeah, that is absolutely true, and we hope so ourselves, as well. And we also hope that, for example, if you look at the first bullet there, we point out very explicitly what, given also our charter, what we are looking for. So when the, even though we are saying we don't really care, it might sound like the report is saying that, but let me assure you that regarding security and stability, we take that seriously because that's our responsibility, and that is what we will look at, also, in what is currently discussed in the outcome of that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just one follow-on comment. One of the reactions of the ALAC in some past issues has been the SSAC has issued a report, and it was, to a large extent, ignored. And one of the nice things about what we're talking about is we'll now be in a position, should we choose to exercise our rights, to say, "You should really be listening to the SSAC." So.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

One thing that is, we are working on [inaudible] back together with ALAC. We are both interacting with the Board in coming up with a better process of tracking our advice. And that is something that we have been doing together, and we do know that there is a new tool on its way too that we should test. What we have to remember, though, is

---

that from an SSAC perspective, I just want to point out that from our perspective, taking our advice into account does not mean that they have to follow our advice, just that they sort of explain why they are making a different decision. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Ariel, you wanted to say something.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel Liang, for the record. We have a remote participant, Murray McKercher, just raised his hand in the room. So Murray, can you speak and ask your question on the audio?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I am on audio. Can you hear me?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, we can hear you, Murray.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you very much. It's Murray McKercher, for the record, from NARALO. I posted a question in the chat. I'll just read it out. I'm curious on what instances, if any, would the SSAC or ICANN in general need legal powers to maintain the security and stability of the Internet?

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: From an SSAC perspective, as we said, we've given recommendations to other entities, for example, ICANN Board, to implement whatever we are recommending, which means that we don't feel that... And, as I said, from our perspective, our recommendations are based on the merits and the power of recommendation itself. That said, whoever we are recommending to act, they might, based on the content of the recommendation, might do some legal action or, for example, involve... It might be a contractual change regarding the relationship between ICANN and the contracted parties and whatnot. And [inaudible] might be the case that some legal advice is needed.

But from an SSAC perspective, no, we are standing by the view that our recommendations are based on its merits.

JULIE HAMMER: Ron, did you have a question?

RON SHERWOOD Yes. Can you tell me, historically, to what extent has your advice been followed through and your recommendations accepted? And what proportion of them have been rejected or ignored?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Our recommendations have, over time, become more and more crisp. So we have a couple of historical recommendations, I think. I'm looking at [inaudible] a little bit, but I would say that up until Document [SSAC] 50, the recommendations have not been really

---

clear. So it's not so easy to say whether they actually are implemented or not, because we were not very good at giving clear instructions, clear recommendations.

If I look at, for example, from [SSAC] 50 and later, which is the last 20 recommendations, I think that ICANN Board, if we look at the recommendation we gave to ICANN Board, they followed our recommendation in all cases but one, when they decided to go down a different path.

There are a couple of recommendations which are still hanging. For example, we have given a recommendation on actually to roll the key for DNSSEC in the root zone. That is a product that they're working on, so I would say that either they have followed our recommendations, they're working on implementing recommendations, and then, of course, the question is whether we believe it's fast enough. And then they have chosen a different path in one case.

RON SHERWOOD

Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

One other category, unless if you want to separate out from work-in-progress, there are also some that have not yet been acted on in any way. So there's a few in that category, too.

---

JULIE HAMMER: Okay. So seeing no further hands up, I'll ask Ariel to go to slide eight, and I think Patrik's got enough time to cover the SSAC report on public suffix list. Thanks, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Next slide, please. So the first question, of course, what is public suffix list? Let me start by saying that we, in SSAC, don't really like the word "suffix" everything on domain names. okay. But public suffix list, the three words together, is something that is used for this specific thing. And that is a list of sort of, or a database that talks about or informs where at what level in the domain name tree registrations can happen.

So if you look at the org top-level domain, you can do registrations directly under org. In UK, up until recently, you do registrations under co.uk, now you can also do registrations under uk. Or you can also do registrations, for example, under k12.pa.us.

So these lists talks about where can you do registrations? Where do you have what is technically called zone cuts? And, on top of that, also, what policies and other kind of information about what are the rules that level of the tree of the domain of the namespace. Because if you just use the DNS, there is no way, for example, to know where you have these zone cuts or where the boundaries between the administrative boundaries are.

Next slide. So why is this important? Well, it is important just because of cookies, certificates, and other kind of things, which have to do with

---

security issues so that people, for example, don't create a certificate for store.uk or store.us, when you know that they're actually registrations happened yet another level below that.

It might also have to do with navigation, whether a browser should allow the ability to actually go to that Webpage. We also see more and more browsers, as I will give an example on the next slide, some browsers only have one input field, and the question is, "Is this a domain name that people are typing in or is it a query that should be sent to search engine?"

It's also to make security or display better. It might be the case that a browser wants to display what is the domain name in a URL and what are other kind of things. And you see that on the rightmost column, you see that different applications use these lists for different things. And it's not even the case that Web browsers use this list the for one thing and e-mail clients for another one. It actually differ between manufacturers of browsers.

Next slide, please. So one example of these differences is if it is the case that you type in nic.allfinance. If you do it in Google Chrome 37.0, in that case, you actually end up on the webpage. If you do it same thing on Apple Safari 7.0.6, in that case, you end up at a Google search page. These two browsers, not the case that the Safari browser is a much older version than the Google Chrome, they're actually at the same point, the same date in time, these two browsers were the latest version from each one of the two parties.

---

Next slide, please. So we have a large number of findings that people, basically, people are using public suffix list for various different kind of things. There is no consensus on what they're going to use it for. There is no real accountability mechanism for ensuring that the lists themselves are produced in a fair, unbiased manner. There is a knowledge gap between people that set the policy and the registries and the maintainers of the public suffix list regarding processes.

There is no universal library and software that is used for the developers, which means the developers are using, for each developer is sort of implementing this their own way. Next slide, please.

It's also the case that, depending on what public suffix list, because there's more than one, that you want to have a change made in if you're a registry, the time it takes to get that change implemented varies a lot, and we have done some investigation that it was considered in the report.

It's also the case that, just because people use public suffix lists in multiple ways, some people say there should only be one public suffix list in the world. But what we identified is that that will not be possible. There will always be, we think, multiple of them, which means that for registries, it's pretty difficult to actually be able to communicate a change in policy to all of those public suffix lists.

On the other hand, we do think that, and one finding is that if new gTLDs use public suffixes in a similar like some ccTLDs, it might be the case that we might get some harmonization.

---

Next slide, please. So this is one of these cases when we've given recommendations to all different kind of organizations to sort of make the world better. We have recommended the IETF to standardize public suffix list syntax, and that is actually ongoing in the [inaudible] Working Group in the IETF.

Part of that work, it would be good if the IETF actually developed some consensus on various taxonomy and terminology issues. We recommend ICANN and the Mozilla Foundation because Mozilla Foundation is running the most widely used public suffix list. But, once again, it's not the only one. We recommend ICANN and the Mozilla Foundation to create informational materials so that people is aware of what public suffix lists actually are and what impact it has on the usability and acceptability of policies and policy changes.

We also recommend ICANN to encourage software development community to develop and distribute programming operating system libraries for public suffix lists.

Next slide, please. We, of course, want application developers to, for example, use canonical file formats and authentication protocols for the specifications themselves. So someone that have developed an application that use public suffix lists can consume not only one, but maybe multiple, of these suffix lists that exist out there, given sort of whatever the preference is for the end user.

We also recommend the IANA to host a public suffix list that contain information about the domain that IANA is the registry for, because, as we all know, all registries for TLDs do communicate with IANA already



---

about what are the names or records, when do they change their DS records for DNSSEC, etc. So IANA could actually, also, collect information at the same time about some of the parameters that we see in the public suffix list.

And if it is the case that IANA do have that, it is possible for Mozilla and other public suffix list producers to bootstrap their database and their public suffix lists with the content of this lists from IANA, and that, we think, would make it easier for TLD registries to update the public suffix lists in the world.

And that's it. Any questions on this?

HOLLY RAICHE: What's the [inaudible]...

JULIE HAMMER: Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: There are some pretty important recommendations in there. What kind of response have you had from any of the parties that against which recommendations have been made?

---

**PATRIK FALTSTROM:** We developed the report. During the development of the report, we were communicating quite a lot, specifically, with the Mozilla Foundation. And we also, actually, in this time, we had invited experts that are working and maintaining public suffix lists as part of the work party, which means that we do believe that the people running public suffix lists have been informed enough.

Neither those people, nor IANA, nor ICANN have been running for the hills yet. So I think we are pretty safe. That said, it was released pretty recently. So, for example, we expect during this ICANN meeting that sort of starts tomorrow to have more discussions on what the impact would be for each one of the organizations.

As we said, the IETF is already working on this, and so I think the reaction so far is positive. On the other hand, people have probably not yet been scoping what resources are needed to do all of these implementations, so we are still waiting for that judgment. Thank you.

**JULIE HAMMER:** Alan.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** I'm going to ask a question that I've asked about a number of other SSAC reports, modifying it, as appropriate, for this particular situation. How did we get to June 2015 and not have done this already?

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Partly because we, in SSAC, do have a long laundry list of things that we would like to look at. Okay. And we don't pick things up unless we see that things are not happening. We really would like the community to take care of this without us sort of pointing it out. So it's a combination of, like, that nothing has happened, that development is happening in silos, and no one is really gathering the community. And then, finally, we are trying to compile things. And then it takes some time for us to actually get the act together.

One of the things I can say that made us in SSAC talk about this, and also in the community, is the same reason why, for example, the whole program [inaudible] universal acceptance in ICANN, why did that start so late? Why was that not done all and finished already before the new gTLD program was launched? It's sort of a similar kind of question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear, I wasn't asking why it's taken SSAC so long to get to it. I was asking, why do we need SSAC to publish a report on something that should have been intuitively obvious, like universal acceptance and a few other areas of recent reports where one scratches your head and said, "We sort of knew about this a very long time ago. How come the world hasn't somehow adhered to it?" And it's a rhetorical question at some level, but it just totally amazes me that the level of maturity and use of the Internet has allowed some of these things to go not unanswered, but unaddressed for so long.

---

JULIE HAMMER:

If I could just add to what Patrick said. I think up until now, what some people may not recognize is that these public suffix lists have been produced voluntarily without any financial recompense by these organizations, basically doing a public service. But the second point is that the rate at which new gTLDs are entering the root zone has actually meant that they're becoming obsolete much more quickly.

So Edmon, you have a question.

EDMON CHUNG:

When I'm sitting here, it's from ISOC Hong Kong. So this is the first time I see this, and I think it's great. I guess, building on what Alan was saying, though, we, at least I, have been pushing for this for a very long time. So it's great to see this coming to fruition and, also, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group that is coming, getting up to speed, as well. And I think this is great input to that group, as well.

One question, I have to say I haven't read, obviously, I haven't read the report yet, but just a quick question on the IANA PSL is quite interesting. And I think we touched on the subject in maybe a few years ago when we were talking about universal acceptance. Is there any more information that you want to maybe highlight a little bit of how much of a specification is actually in the report on this?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

What we're saying is that IANA should host a PSL with some of the information, but we also, at the same time, say that the IETF should look at what should sort of the standardized minimum set of sort of

---

attributes be. We are not specifically saying exactly what IANA should... the IANA PSL should include because we still believe that there will be a multitude of these PSLs. And if we just create some kind of dotted line between the registries and the PSLs that people actually use in the world, that will make the situation much, much better. But I recommend you to read the report to see the actual wording.

EDMON CHUNG:

Can I just follow up quickly? So what are kind of the next steps you would envision, just, I guess, on Alan's point, as well. This is out and then we don't want to be in situation where, okay, this is out, and then no further action is taken. How do you envision this actually taking the next steps and being actionized?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

The only... Well, SSAC can, of course, repeat our recommendation if we don't see, implement it, and if we repeated things enough, maybe finally something is happening. On the other hand, the SSAC report number four talks about spoofing a source IP addressing, and so far no action has been taken in the world, even though it's probably the worst and most problematic issue we have, which is a really big issue.

The only place where SSAC can sort of push a little bit harder has to do with the recommendations that we do to the ICANN Board to act, because we can at least force them to specify why they are not acting. But otherwise, we don't have any ability to enforce anything. What we hope is that, for example, the work on universal acceptance, work

---

picked up by ALAC, work picked up by others, that's where the requirement should come and you should reference our report as sort of background material that people can look at why certain actions are needed.

JULIE HAMMER:

Julie Hammer speaking. We're already five minutes over time. Thank you for those questions. Sandra Hoferichter would like to present a very short presentation on the ICANN Academy. And Patrik needs to leave in five minutes' time. So over to you, Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you, Julie. I will make it very brief. Patrik is aware of the Leadership Training Program, which is going on for three years now. It will be the third edition. And we have been in contact already that it would be really great to have an SSAC community member participating in this program, as well. Can we have the next slide, please?

So the first pilot was in Buenos Aires in 2013, and the next one will be in Dublin prior to the Dublin meeting. Next slide, please. What it's actually going to be, it's three days meeting – or not meeting, let's say training program – from Wednesday to Friday for about 25 participants from all SO, AC, and the Board, and staff is actually included, as well, but they are, at the moment, more as an observer side.

---

The point is that this training program is meant for incoming and experienced community leaders, so this would include the chair of the SSAC, as well, and it would be really great because you promised you will, or your community will send someone, and if no one else will be available, I really like to invite you because the expertise you could bring to such a program would be tremendous and enormous. And I know it's challenging because of the timing, but we really hope that we can get one of your community to this training program.

Next slide, please. You will see, according to this list, which has been agreed within the Academy Working Group and with the ICANN community, we provide two seats for the SSAC. So I gave Heidi, already, those invitations where a link is published where community leaders should apply. The only important thing is we can only accept community leaders which have travel support, because this program does not provide extra travel support It provides hotel costs, but those people should be already on the travel list of ICANN or come on their own expenses.

Well, that's it from my side. I won't go through all the slides, taking the time into consideration. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much, Sandra. And as you might remember, as you pointed out, I've been speaking well about this and, personally, I think this is a very good initiative. And for the first training program, we did send two people. It's also in the second one, we didn't find anyone, and we now see, and I now have to see whether we find anyone here

---

for the third. We got really good feedback from the first round to SSAC. Unfortunately, that didn't help. I still couldn't find anyone for the second one.

So we'll see what's happening and yes, personally, I feel your interest in having me coming over there. So we'll see. But thank you very much, and yes, it's a very important program. And I also want to mention to you in ALAC because you're also very close to the Fellowship Program here in ICANN, and I just want to say that we, in SSAC, we are working close with the fellowships, and we really believe in those kind of processes. And this time, unfortunately, we, in SSAC, will not have a specific meeting with the fellows, but that is something we have had a couple of times, and we are already working on trying to arrange that for the next ICANN meeting.

JULIE HAMMER: On that note, I'll draw the meeting to a close and ask you to join me in thanking Patrik very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sure there will be some interesting discussion from it. Thank you, Byron.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will welcome the ccNSO to our ALAC room. And I'm going to turn it over to Byron because I've spoken enough today, I think.



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's what I thought.

ALAN GREENBERG: But the agenda is not too long. On the other hand, we are starting 15 minutes late. So as per our standard rules, everyone has to talk fast, but not so fast the interpreters cannot understand what you're saying. And when you start talking, please give your name so that the interpreters don't have to say a man is talking.

BYRON HOLLAND: Byron Holland, Chair of the ccNSO. Thank you for inviting us into your room today, late on Sunday afternoon. So I'll try to keep our comments brief. But the fundamental topics that we had thought would be of most value include the decision-making process around the CWG proposal.

In other words, how does the ccNSO intend to decide, and what would our process look like? And then, also, the subject had been raised around the potential risk if, what happens if one of the chartering organizations is not supportive of the proposal but the other chartering organizations are. What do we do? What does that look like?

And, of course, feel free to interject or ask questions or provide feedback or commentary. In terms of how the ccNSO is looking at the decision-making process, given that we are also a member-based organization that's voluntary, that each of our members, essentially, are beholden to the laws of their national jurisdiction and the cultural

---

norms of those jurisdictions, we have to have a process in place that will allow all of us in our community to have a voice to speak up, to provide input, but then find a path to decision that's as inclusive as possible but at the end of the day allows the ccNSO Council, which has been tasked by ICANN, to come to a decision.

So I would unpack that to say, in fact, there are two decisions for the ccNSO Council to be making at its Council meeting, Wednesday at 5:00. And the first decision is actually, are we even in a position to take a decision? Do we feel we have heard enough that we have a clear enough sense of the community to actually even engage in the debate of what that decision should be? So first is, are we in a position to even make a decision? And then the second is, what should that decision be? Support the CWG proposal or not?

Now, we have been engaged in this process of getting to the first decision, the one about are we actually even in a position to make this choice. We've been engaged in this for the better part of a year, I would say. I would encourage you to take a look at the ccNSO Website, where we catalog all of our outreach efforts. It does make for some dry reading, I will grant you that, but it is nine pages. Nine pages long of all of the activities that we have engaged in to try to communicate to the entire ccTLD community.

And just to be clear, the ccTLD community is the full community of all ccTLD managers and operators. The ccNSO is a segment of that, a significant majority, but not... the two aren't entirely overlapping. So part of the ccNSO's responsibility has to engage the fully community,

---

whether or not they're a ccNSO member. And in our efforts to do that, we have worked with all of the regional organizations that represent ccTLD managers in their respective regions.

We have worked with them in supporting their own outreach and education information efforts, as well as the fact that we have been doing it for all of our CC members. So whether it's blogs, face-to-face meetings, webinars, other online activities, multiple surveys in an attempt to get statistically significant results from our community, tweets and other forms of social media, we have a long, long list of activity that has informed and educated the community, as well as sought feedback along the way.

Over the course of our two days of meeting here, we have six separate sessions in our two days' worth of ccNSO meetings that try to put the entire puzzle together to make it accessible for all the participants, regardless of how closely they've paid attention. So we start with a broad sweep of the CWG's work, the CCWGs' work, what the interrelationships are there, what the timelines look like, as well as a reminder of the work of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group, which has done critical work around the various policies relating to delegation, redelegation transfer of ccTLDs.

That forms critical foundational work that we view as sort of the basis or the foundation upon which the work of the CWG and beyond will be based. So our two days' worth of session, six separate sessions, we'll take a look at the high level, the timelines, drill down into the specifics, the contentious issues, and towards the end of Wednesday,

---

day two, bring it back around for the community to, essentially, have one – ideally, if it goes according to plan – final opportunity to provide the Council with essentially a temperature check of the community.

And having gone through a year's worth of activities, four sets of ICANN face-to-face meetings, webinars, all of the various lists, etc., that is the point where the Council will come to a conclusion on, do we feel that we have clarity or consensus in a consensus opinion within the community as we see it? And then, at that stage, the Council will look to take a decision during our Council meeting.

So that's a little bit of a longwinded tour of how do we expect to get there. The short answer is, it is still a work in progress. I think it actually was Bill Clinton who said it in San Francisco. We are, in a sense, stumbling forward on uncharted terrain. And, to a great degree, we are doing new and novel things here, and some of the processes are a work in process. But that is how we intend to come to a decision from a process and timing perspective this week.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Byron. I think the ALAC, right now, and I will say, almost, perhaps, uncharacteristically, is in a very strong position on the CWG report. We occasionally are subject to quite valid criticism that, although we are here to represent the interests of end users around the world, we often have to, to be blunt, wing it because a lot of the issues that we're talking about are so complex that it's pretty hard to get engagement from large numbers of people.

---

For reasons that I'm not sure, this particular subject has sparked the interest of people, maybe because the concept was easy to understand even if the details aren't. And we have been working on a week-by-week basis for the last six, seven months with a pretty large group of people [inaudible] weekly teleconferences averaging an hour to two hours, in many cases, going over the tos and fros, the details of the CWG experience. I say that carefully.

So from the community that we have, I think they have been pretty well informed all along. And the ALAC itself has been probably over half of the people are very actively involved, and the rest of them have been brought up to speed on a regular basis on our teleconferences and face-to-face meetings. So I think the decision is not formally taken, but we have informally discussed, already, that we are very likely to ratify the proposal with some comments.

We understand that, barring some unusual circumstances such as someone not ratifying it, or the [inaudible] thing being tossed back by the ICG to the CWG, the comments may well not be acted on at this point, but we feel it's necessary to go on record with any parts that we're willing to live with, but are not quite the way we believe it should have come out. And that's not just we didn't get our way, but we think that it should have been done somewhat differently and we'll go on record. But we are very likely to ratify with that conditional statement.

We are in the process and will be drafting the statement over the next day or two, and we will ratify or not on our meeting on Thursday

---

morning. But I have some level of confidence that we will not have any surprises coming out of, I can't say nearly as much in confidence on the CCWG.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Can I just pick up on a comment you made there to make sure I understand it? You indicated that you're likely to make some comments along with potential support. Is your support, would it be subject to action on those comments? No? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The largest single comment is we believe there are [inaudible] stages in the overall process, particularly the problem resolution process, that we believe should have involved more of a multi-stakeholder component than they have in the end. There are a number of places where the ccNSO, the GNSO have to pass judgment or ratify things, and on the ccNSO side, that makes complete sense. On the GNSO side, it is, essentially, the gTLD registries and a number of friends, but not all of the friends.

So, for instance, we think that if somewhere along the way, the SSAC should have a larger say in this kind of thing, and the ALAC, too, because we all love power, but to say that the stakeholders that happen to be part of the GNSO get to participate in certain decisions but others, which were not deemed to be part of the GNSO, do not, we think will not likely change any outcomes, which is why we're willing to ratify.

---

But it changes the optics of how it looks, that we call ourselves multi-stakeholder, we go around the world preaching, and then some stakeholders are treated differently than others. So we feel it sends a bad message, but it's not likely to influence the outcome sufficiently that we would not ratify because of it. But we think it's worth going on record [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND:

There are certainly some issues that we've seen in the proposal that would probably give us pause for thought, too. And we are in the process of thinking through how we would register that, whether it be in comments, whether it be in some kind of request for some editorial change, although our understanding is that's not possible at this point.

I guess we also have to recognize that this is a waypoint on a longer journey. It's not the absolute end stage. It will go to the ICG, who will presumably synthesize and stitch together the different proposals, and there will be opportunity, again, for full public comment. So there are other steps along the way, but certainly one of the things that we've also been talking about is, in sending our response, including some of our own commentary, as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The real deciding point on our point is if the changes were magically made that we would want to see, would the future unfold differently? And it probably wouldn't, which is why we're willing to live with it. But

---

we think it sends some bad messages if we're trying to recommend that the multi-stakeholder model be used in a more general way than just within our [inaudible]. On to the next.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any other feedback or comment on that issue? Or it's late on Sunday afternoon, everybody's commented out. On to the next, which is the, I guess, in a sense to some degree, the follow-on of what we've already been talking about, is given there are a number of chartering organizations, what if one of them either can't get to a decision or their decision is not supportive of the CWG proposal? Where does that leave the rest of the chartering organizations?

And probably what we may be talking about is the GAC and what happens if the GAC is not in a position to actually take a decision, supportive or otherwise. What, then, for the rest of us? And just gaming it out, if the rest of the chartering organizations were supportive, what happens if the GAC, for example, cannot be supportive?

ALAN GREENBERG:

My recollection of the charter says, if any of the chartering organizations do not ratify, then they have to explain why. And that has to be considered by the CWG. So, obviously, it would not be submitted to the ICG this Thursday, but the CWG would have to be reconvened, as it would, for instance, if the ICG itself has any



---

questions or requires any changes. So that would certainly delay the process.

I don't think the charter is explicit, but I would like to think that no single organization has a veto, which means the CWG would have to try to satisfy the organization, but maybe it couldn't. And I would suspect as long as it's only one of the chartering organizations, then it would probably go forward, I'm guessing, but I have no basis on this.

I think it would also make a difference if we rejected it rather than if we were silent. And the GAC, I suspect, if the GAC is not in a position to say, "Yes, we support it," are they, at the same time, saying, "No, don't do it" or just not getting around it at that point. And I guess that would make a difference, although I don't think the charter provides a lot of detailed guidance for how to handle it.

BYRON HOLLAND: For how to handle a non-objection outcome. Agreed. Are you meeting with the GAC? Have you met with the GAC?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are meeting with the GAC, I believe, on Tuesday. It was actually supposed to be this afternoon, but the schedule got juggled. So yes, we are meeting with the GAC. That is one of the items on the agenda.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: And it's likely to be one of the agenda items for us at the GAC, as well. So perhaps, also, if they hear a moderately consistent message, it will start to get through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Byron. Just a quick one. I want to know, does the ccNSO, or better put, the ccTLDs, intend to provide their response before Thursday? Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Our goal, at this point, is to come to conclusion at our Council meeting, which is Wednesday late afternoon. But, as I said, there's two decision points. One, are we in a position to actually take a decision? And then, two, what is the actual decision? But, certainly, the goal at this juncture is to get to that point. That said, there is a proviso that we have all-day meetings Tuesday and Wednesday where this subject will be the key subject, and it will depend, to some degree, on what we see and hear during those two days of discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? And we're on to any other business? Leadership training? I'm presuming Sandra's going to talk on that.

---

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Alan. I've seen Byron, you and your colleagues have been in the room and I submitted the invitation to the next Leadership Training Program to Patrik Faltstrom already. And I would also like to invite the ccNSO to identify up to two participants or reach out to up to two participants to participate in the next training program, which is taking place before the ICANN meeting in Dublin from Wednesday to Friday. And I see Jordi is in the room. He was participant of the first pilot program, which took place right here in this room in Buenos Aires in 2013.

Meanwhile, the program has a little bit evolved. We are getting better in terms of facilitating or combining facilitation sessions with ICANN topic matter sessions, and it would be really great because last year, unfortunately, there were no ccNSO participants in this group. It would be really important and great to have either incoming or experienced leaders to participate in that one.

Important is that those people should have travel support already because this program cannot provide travel support, but they will provide the hotel cost, the additional hotel costs. And maybe I just give the floor quickly to Jordi because he was the one who participated in the first one. And since he is quite a strong supporter of this concept from the Leadership Training Program and of the ICANN Academy and their work in general, maybe it's better if Jordi shares some of his experiences with you.

And then I would also like to give you or your colleagues those cards, which have the basic information and also a link to the online

---

application form, and I would kindly ask you to hand this out to your colleagues so that they have the chance to think about it and to apply. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, and we'll certainly take those cards and announce it at the ccNSO session. Absolutely. And I would be very curious to hear Jordi's experiences.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Hi. Well, just to agree on what Sandra has said. I mean, I think that there is really a value on spending those days together, meeting and knowing people from different constituencies, breaking the silos that we have in ICANN because we are the whole week meeting except those exceptional occasions, maybe a dinner, maybe whatever, but we are amongst our own colleagues.

So this is a way that, even if the representatives had experience, had been coming to ICANN for long. Really, it's worth for that.

Not only you learn from the others what the other constituencies do, how do they work, you get to know the people, get to know the people, and there is a human value there that really helps quite a lot to establish bridges of communication between different constituencies, not just among the chairs, but also other [inaudible]. So at least those two concepts.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I attended the last session, and I must admit – I won't say I entered it with any cynicism for anything, but I got far more out of it than I expected to, and the contacts that I made there, despite the fact I've spent eight years in ICANN, have paid off in spades. So it was a good couple of days spent.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. We look forward to filling our two spots with worthy candidates. Any other-other business?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Tijani, who is standing between us and the first meeting ending early that we've had all week. Tijani, it's all yours.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I have a question for which I don't see any experience before, and I don't think there is a text that can answer it. Suppose one of the chartering organizations don't ratify the proposal. What will happen? Is it sufficient for the proposal not to be accepted or not to pass?

BYRON HOLLAND: I've actually just been handed some wording that would speak to, yeah, that would speak to it. So it's probably worth actually reading. It's, as I quickly scan it, only a couple of sentences, but it is from the charter itself. And it says, and I quote, "In the event one or more of the chartering organizations does or does not support the final proposal,

---

the final proposal should clearly indicate which parts are fully supported and which parts are not, and which chartering organization dissents from the CWG view.”

So it does go on from that. It is contemplated within the charter specifically, but it does provide for the opportunity for the proposal to carry on, even if one of the SO/AC chartering organizations does not support it fully.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I do know this text because I was in the chartering under the drafting team. But this text doesn't say if all the chartering organization don't agree on this proposal, if you read this text, it may pass. So this is something I am worried about it. What is the limit? When we can say, “No, we have to reconsider the proposal?”

ALAN GREENBERG:

I could mention that Tijani is one of the drafters of the charter. But the charter is what it is right now, and if one organization dissents and says exactly why, then I think the charter provides guidance for what to do. If all of the organizations reject it, I think we would not have a lot of credibility in forwarding it to the ICG. If it's somewhere in between, it's a judgment call.

I don't think we can be more definitive than that today. Thursday may be another matter altogether. We are done. Thank you, all, for coming.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wish you a good rest of the week. The week hasn't officially started yet, I point out.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What is it? It's a meeting. That's what it is. We do try and have face-to-face meetings at ICANN meetings. And I do want to thank each and every one of you who have made the time and taken a fair [work] of time, I would think, in case of preparing for what is some pretty exciting stuff we're going to be talking about today in a hugely busy and packed schedule, to come and continue with us what we are clearly, I think, and successfully starting to do, and that is assist ICANN to have an accessibility culture, which is baked in to its DNA, eventually, which allows this organization that we all serve as volunteers and staff for to be, basically, a best practice model wherever possible.

There are limitations. There are lots of issues that will be challenging us in each of these turns. But right now, we're at the data collection, data gathering, and foundational aspects of where the organization is with things like staff understanding of accessibility issues, how and why and when we can put particular resources and which priority these resources should go to.

I want to, and it may or may not be on the agenda, it's a very lean agenda, but that's okay. We can be flexible. Apart from going through

---

this fabulous set of results from the Accessibility Working Group survey, I do want to give Laura a couple of moments just to bring everyone up to speed on the webpage story, because that's a carryover. That's a piece of business from previous meetings. So those of you who are slavishly controlled by agendas, tough. I'm not. But take out a pen and dot in an update from Laura, if you feel it has to be annotated.

So just before we go into the [stock takes] survey, which as I say, I am thrilled and excited about. I do want to pass over to Laura. But I wanted to ask, first of all, is there anybody in the room – and that includes those hiding behind me, and there is hiding from me, if someone is there. I will turn around [inaudible] Mary. Come on. No hiding. No, no, no hiding. Not allowed.

Please come sit forward, join us at the table. Come, come, come, come, more, forward, Mr. Twomey, could you stop doing your banking and sit up at the table? Thank you very much. Is there anybody who is a new person to either this group or to ICANN who would care to make a brief introduction? Over to you, [Jorge].

[JORGE CACABALO]:

Hi, my name is [Jorge Cacabalo]. Is my first time with you and very happy coming back to my pro activities after 15 years in the investigation around the world in the software areas. In the base of the base of the base of the social [pyramid] after working with artificial intelligence, blah, blah, blah. So I'm very happy, I would like to be helpful for your work.



---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Jorge], Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you're going to hear me say my name a lot. Thank you for joining us and welcome. One piece of exciting information, of course, is we are blessed with facilitation, which includes real-time interpreters. And so if you feel that you would like to talk in any of the languages listed behind – Portuguese, Español, French, or English – please feel free to do so.

[JORGE CACABALO]: [Inaudible]. Gracias.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And because we offer these, I think, essential services, if we're going to bring few if, hopefully, no barriers to entry in participation in our near future, I will ask you to do two things. And that is something I just neglected to do, which is when you start to speak, say your name for the record. So, Cheryl speaking. Although I must say, at this stage, I suspect Sylvia and Gisella that people who type up the transcripts just know my dulcet tone and so they just type my name in. Perhaps even when I haven't said something.

But please do say your name. Remember to speak relatively slowly. It's my habit to speak at this speed, but even I try and modulate and slow it down a little bit because it makes a huge difference and [inaudible] in the first half of our meeting instead of the second half of our meeting. Surprise.

---

So that's pretty much the only basic rule. Is there anyone else who wish to make an introduction of themselves? Please, of course, go ahead.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Hi. My name is Alfredo Calderon. I come from Puerto Rico. This is my first time in ICANN meeting. And also, I participated as an ISOC Fellow the last couple of days, so I'm new to that, too.

I'm very interested in the topic of accessibility because in Puerto Rico, there's a great, huge population that needs to get involved in how Internet can be accessible for them. Not only in terms of the websites or webpages, but they have other sort of impairment that needs to be taken care of. So I'm interested in this topic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Welcome, and in particular, of course, with the Internet Society connection, there is what's called a disability chapter. And you might want to encourage, perhaps, a subject, a chapter, or a group within country that could liaise with that, as well. Is there anyone else who wishes to make an introduction?

We don't force people to do so, but feel free to do so. Come on, come on. Got to be somebody here. There's some new faces around the table. Just not the wife, will you, please, Ron? Please give us a brief introduction. Come on. Push the button. Talk to me.

---

[LUCIA SOLOMON-CHERUT]: Okay. My name is [Lucia Solomon-Cherut]. I work in a small village in Western Panama with a foundation called the Fundacion Pro Integracion. And I work with handicapped people, adults, children, everything. I'm very interested in hearing what you have to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And you're very welcome, even though I know Ron literally, I think, went and grabbed you from your room or somewhere quiet when he discovered what the topic is. The history here, for those of you who wonder, Ron and I served at the same time as liaisons between the ccNSO and the ALAC. So when he discovered what the topic was [inaudible], "Can I bring my wife?" You most certainly can bring your wife.

So that's pretty much taken up our five minutes of introductions. And, as I say, a little addition to the agenda, I'd very much have Laura give us an update on where we are with the website.

LAURA BENGFORD: Very good. Thank you, Cheryl. This is Laura Bengford speaking for the record. What you see up here is just a couple slides I wanted to give everyone a very quick update on where we are with the web accessibility program that we've been talking about for the past couple meetings or so.

So if you go on to the next slide, I'm just going to spend a couple of minutes going through, as we know, trying to move ICANN.org as well

---

as the other sites into a program where they're adhering to the W3C standards there.

So I'm going to go through just a quick status update on where we are with the RFP and vendor selection that's going to be helping us with this.

So, as you know, we issued an RFP the last part of the year, and what the goal of the RFP was, was to look at vendors that could bring us some expertise and what we needed to do to remediate our websites, and have a program and endorse a culture of accessibility in all of our development efforts.

So out of that RFP, we received six responses back in January. We finalized it down to three, and Gunela, I'm not sure if she's here at the meeting yet. She was very much part of that, and I want to just give her a big acknowledgement for helping out with that process.

We did three demos that were very, very detailed with three vendors. They were all very, very good. It was a very hard process to kind of go through them, but we did finalize it down to one vendor. And what we've been working on over the past month or so is going through the vendor negotiations with our procurement process at ICANN. We had the budget allotment already kind of carved out for that so that worked very well. And we just finished our contract process with them on June 12. So this is very, very kind of recent news. So I'm able to kind of announce the vendor that we selected.

---

Their name is Simply Accessible. Some or, probably, many of you are probably familiar with them. They have a very good background. I just pulled their introduction and I have a handout that I think Gisella can upload on so you can learn more about them. But just a very quick introduction.

They focus and self-describe themselves as a very inclusive experience design agency. They focus on digital experiences that are accessible to everybody. And they put a team together that not only excels in design and the development of the content, but they put the user first. And most importantly, and I know it was very important to this group, to select somebody that incorporated people with disabilities on the projects.

Another key highlight and something that Gunela and the Evaluation Team really liked about Simply Accessible is their core approach and methodology was not only having designers, but they really considered themselves teachers. And not only at ICANN in our Web Development Team do we need to learn how to engrain that thinking into our development and testing efforts. We really like their approach on being teachers for all of us here.

So I think they're going to really help provide this. They're very strong advocates that care deeply. We got a very good sense that they cared very deeply about what we were trying to do, and they were also very interested in the section of the RFP that talked about the goal of being in the domain space and possibly having impact on others in the

---

domain space. And at the same time, they're very pragmatic and they were very real.

So I have listed some of their memberships that they're involved in. They're very heavy contributors and many professional organizations that are around accessibility and they're very well-known in this space. So we're very happy that we were able to make this selection and announce it here today.

Hey!

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I've got to do this. [Come on].

LAURA BENGTFORD: So just onto the next slide, I'm just going to tell you what our next phase as we move in to this engagement with Simply Accessible. We have a kickoff meeting in mid-July. I'm hoping to bring Gunela and some of the others that are interested, maybe Judith, into this process. And it is open. If anyone's interested in attending the kickoff, we are really focused on using this as a training vehicle for this group, for ICANN, and anyone who wants to join.

August and September, we'll be actually rolling up our sleeves, doing the training and testing to start the remediation on ICANN.org. And since we're also very much in the midst of developing the At-Large website, that fits very nicely into those efforts, as well. And I know

---

we'll be talking about that a little bit later I think on Tuesday with Ariel and Alan and Olivier, who've been helping us out with that.

And then after that time period, we're going to go into the remediation and continuous measurement. The way that we put this program together is to allow us to kind of measure our progress with the goal of kind of doing a one year later and sharing what we've improved and what our progress benchmarks were.

And finally, just to end this off, we do have a Digital Services wiki now. I'm not sure if any of you have seen that, but all of our projects in Digital Services are up on the community wiki. I think it's the far tab on the right, and I have the link there. It's a little hard to see on the screen. But feel free to click on there and we'll be putting progress updates on the project there.

So with that, I want to thank you everyone who is involved in helping us get to this point. And I think that's it for me. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well I'm going to give you a round of applause again. Laura, I suspect that many around this table appreciate what it takes to do that in a short amount of time. And it has been an astonishingly short amount of time. And I, for one, if I was wearing a hat, would be doffing it to you and the people who've worked with you on this.

Because we can only what we need, want, and desire with the heartfelt and serious support of those that are empowered to do this. And you are a shining example of the day I first met you taking this all

---

seriously. So on behalf of I think everyone here, but also many, many more outside of this room, seriously, thank you. This is a great first step. You need foundation on the web to start with, and you inherited a disaster. So we really appreciate taking this to a sensible, analytical, controlled approach with predictable outcomes. So thank you very much. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREEBERG:

Thank you. Given the first time that I was involved in discussion about accessibility issues on the ICANN website, and the answer, at that point, was, “We don’t really have any problems. If we do, it was probably because of a clerical error or someone not following some specific instructions we already had, and I’m sure we can fix it in five minutes’ work.” Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Before we make it far too emotional because I don’t think she was expecting such serious thanks, but we’ve been working under great difficulties, and you have made a great difference to all of our lives, and will continue to do so in the future.

Is there any questions for Laura on the presentation? It will be uploaded to this meeting space. It will also be uploaded to our own wiki for the working group, and as you’ve been told, there’s now the new wiki space, follow the links, ask questions. Laura’s e-mail, I believe, is attached to the front of all of this. You’ll get back to us



---

eventually. In fact, she'll get back to us really, really quickly because she's good at that, too.

And I think anything we can do to help you with the kickoff, just let us know. And indeed, if you want to explore a kickoff in any particular region, I'd be suspicious there wouldn't be very many parts of the world that we couldn't find someone to assist with local and regional outreach. And I think, [Vandy], you want to just support that?

[VANDY]: No. Just because the Secretariat of Accessibility for people with disabilities in Sao Paulo is doing a lot of research. And certainly, he'll be very helpful if you want to use their facilities or something like that. I can put together to talk.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl, for the record again. So I think what you're hearing here, Laura, is whilst we have been somewhat shamelessly using you and your resources to get what we want, we're willing, and able, to help you take all of this to the next step. So just let us know. If we don't have on tap, I bet you we can find it. Any more questions for Laura on this? If not, ladies and gentlemen, good news does not stop here. It gets better.

Those of you who have been on the mailing list, and if you aren't on the mailing list, just give staff your e-mail address and we will sort that out. Get on the mailing list, utilize our wiki. It's the standard fare that you'll find elsewhere in ICANN. We're here to interact. We even have a

---

space where you can just upload really helpful resources you found. So there's a sort of a sharing and caring part. Or we can do a question-and-answer part. Basically, their wiki, we can take it in any direction we want.

This has been another team, the Accessibility Working Group and staff team effort. And I believe Diane, I'm getting you to be presenting this, and the slides already loaded. Again, I'm assuming that the slides will be available in the same place as I mentioned earlier. But the members of the work group have had a digital copy of this. And I've got to say, it did my heart a power of good, but also an awful lot of shock to see all of those 100% yeses across so many of these questions.

So I'm going to hand over to Diane, and I would like to also just give the group, because we're not all up to speed, a little bit of background, as well. Over to you, Diane.

DIANE SCHROEDER:

So thank you for inviting me. I've only recently gotten engaged with you, so to speak. Suzanne asked me to take us on when she was approached about the survey and I'm very happy to do it. I've known Cheryl for just a couple of weeks. But it's an important area for ICANN.

We talk about accessibility in many, many ways, and this focus is really good for us. But just to give you a little bit of background, I've been with ICANN for 15 years. I started in 2000. Yeah, 2000. And over the years, I've had a number of staff positions, mostly around the

---

administrative space, support positions. I actually ran our Meetings Team for quite a long time. I did 28 meetings.

And we have come a long ways, but we certainly have a long way to go. Currently, I have the pleasure of actually heading up our internal HR effort, and am concerned about it not just from a community perspective, but it's something that's important for us to encourage diverse work staff, also.

When I was presented with the survey, the one thing that we asked whether or not it would be helpful for us to change this a little bit, and it's somewhat why you see 100% is because the questions were very specific to certain areas. So we actually divided them up. Instead of having everybody try to answer things they really didn't know about, we went to the people who had responsibilities in the areas.

So you really have one person responding to the questions, not like 20 different people responding. That way, we can get you facts rather than guess from people. So does anybody have any questions about that little bit of a change in a survey method?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Yeah. For me, looks more significant because the result, of course, if you respond, you have no experience in that area. You just don't know, and this distorts everything that you were specifically you go behind technical issues that the [inaudible] is statistically valid.

---

DIANE SCHROEDER: I'm not clear, Cheryl, if you want me to read every question. I mean, how do you want to take this next?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The high points and holidays, I think, will be fine. Thank you.

DIANE SCHROEDER: So basically, we tried to split this up into sections about policy and administration, meetings, the digital services, some of the policy work, and the communications team. And we're all at different levels. I would just like to say that I look forward to trying to put a plan together, prioritize, and pick what we can do quickly. Some of the things may take a little bit longer term.

So in that vein, I will tell you that we've accommodated accessibility forever. So for those of you that haven't been around and may not know, our second Chairman of the Board was profoundly deaf, and that was a real learning experience for me about how to deal with [inaudible] who wear very heavy hearing aids at that point that weren't as sophisticated as they are nowadays, but had trouble with noise behind him. Vanda was with us in those days.

We've also had accessibility issues from a respect that we had a Board member who had a severe accident and was not personally mobile for a long time, and we had to do both remote with her. But, also, when she was finally able to return to the meetings, I had to be very conscious of where we put her in a hotel room and how she got around the meetings.

---

One of the things that was fascinating to me is after the Cape Town meeting, our local host there organized a day for local people with some of the ICANN staff and Board members that had to do with blind access, people's accessibility to the Internet. And that was a fascinating day.

I won't begin to say, "Wow, this is all wonderful and it's all we ever need to do." But there's been a thread through the years about needing to move more forward, and I think this helps us do that. I don't question support in any way, shape, or form. We're a very diverse organization and we continue to be diverse and look at other ways that we can support diversity. Accessibility is just one of them.

I think that in terms of having considerations in the policymaking process was a little challenging for me to answer. There is no one disability. There is no one way to be accessible. So certain disabilities probably are easily accommodated, and others are more challenging. That's part of where I think the next step has to come is we've got to get a little bit better definitions of not which accessibilities we want to do, but where we can actually take steps now and do research and move to other things in the near future.

I think that our industry and our groups welcome everybody. We've always had people in all of our different areas that have had challenges in some way. So I don't think the questions that come of is there support or would we do. I don't think anybody's ever going to say no to that. It's just a matter of how do we do it and when do we do it. What resources do we put to it to get to where we want to go?

---

The web is just a great example of that. There are challenges in meeting spaces. Cheryl and I can tell you we shared a freight elevator in [inaudible] because we couldn't get around the space. You got it. And this is a wonderful venue but it is huge. It's very large and I have some knee problems that are not real fond of the marble floors.

There's more work we can do in that respect, certainly. So I'm not sure how much further, Cheryl, I should go deep.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think you possibly got an opportunity to go a little bit deeper. Perhaps take something from each of the sections the question on disability, where does the training come to mind? You covered a little bit with meetings, too, but we might want to open that up for a discussion. So go back to that last. And some of the remote participation questions, which was, I think, teased up with the Skype/Google stuff, at the very least. Because we do have a little bit of time to do all of this.

DIANE SCHROEDER:

Well, on the training question, I will say that no, we have not done specific awareness training. Could we? Yes. We're in the process of really actually upping our training programs. We've recently hired a training specialist in house. Part of her job is to develop programs for us. This is certainly a direction that we can go with, with staff. It's certainly a direction we can go with leadership training, also. There's no reason we can't incorporate that, is what I want to say.

---

With regards to meeting venues, Nancy has done this for us. She is part of the current team that selects meeting venues, and they do examine them for access. They have to balance, sometimes, how the hotels are built, where we want to be for other political reasons with the accessibility.

So her comments on they check elevators, wheelchair ramps, rail access. Some regions are further ahead in having facilities that have ramps, that are accessible. I keep using the same word, accessible, for the disabled. Some regions are further ahead than others in that, but it is something that they at least do as part of their assessment.

I cannot even begin to sit here and pretend that all of the venues meet our requirements. But there's an awareness, at least, there. I'm happy to take questions on that at all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. My question is, I guess, in looking at the survey, maybe you can also talk about there was a couple of questions that we're talking about people nominated, and so if someone nominated as an accessibility champion about training on disability awareness, on some of those issues, and they all seem to [inaudible] several of these issues were either [inaudible] "I don't know" or "Maybe we can talk about that."

---

DIANE SCHROEDER: Well, we certainly don't have any formal program in place. I can't even begin to spin that in any way. So we don't have a champion, we don't have awareness training. Are they things that are good for us to move forward on and do? I think that's something that we're all in agreement on. And by asking the question, you raised our awareness of should we train on it? Should we have a champion? Should this be part of our internal processes?

But when we say no, I really wanted to be very honest. We don't at the moment.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. And there's also I don't know. There's a lot of issues on that. And so I was just curious if you [can drill] down on some of those issues.

DIANE SCHROEDER: So let me take half a second and let me find a do not know so I can come back to it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, at the beginning [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Number of six.



---

DIANE SCHROEDER: This is because this was my question to answer, and I don't get daily involved in the policymaking process. So in discussing building in, I really don't know. I mean, I know that part of the policy-making process comes through the website, and we have things we're doing on the website. But it's a big area to have just the one question, and it's something that certainly we can explore further.

Chris, did you want to...?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Chris is going to pick up on this, too.

CHRIS GIFT: On question six, I would say that's a no, in all fairness. But that is something we're actively remediating through this process with Simply Accessible. And so we're going to have training on it. But yeah, it's a no.

DIANE SCHROEDER: I think it does depend on which disability you have, though, also. It may be easier for certain types of people than others. We actually, in the domain name one, I have no way of knowing what for-profit corporations do. I mean, it's just we have, what, 1,700 registrars? I have no idea. That's an honest-to-God truth.

What I think that they have this – probably not at this point. Is it something they'd move to in the future? You have some ability to

---

discuss that with your colleagues here in the other areas. See where else I can go with that.

So the staff awareness question, no. unless they have a personal interest in it. Many staff have their own issues, their own families, their own friends. They may have it from that perspective but without our having the training, I cannot say to you, “Yes, staff has that.”

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just before you move on. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I’m slow on the trigger. On question three on policy development processes, I think the answer is very, very clearly, no. Ignoring the minor fact of [language] issues, which is an accessibility issue to a large percentage of the world. But ignoring that one, we use teleconferences to a very large degree, which are unforgiving processes.

They are hard, often, for some of us in very developed countries with very sophisticated phone and Internet systems. They are far less so. And, by the way, Olivier, who typically lives in the UK, France, or Switzerland, has significant problems. We won’t comment on whether they are developing countries or not.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or disabilities to live there or not.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, he may have a disability for living there, but that's a different issue.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, that's another issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are processes which work. When they work, they work only in optimal situations. And I don't think this is a simple answer, but there are many, many people who cannot participate in our policy development processes for very practical reasons that are not only disability-related, but certainly are also disability-related.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that note remember to say who you are as you start back. Because the transcript will have me speaking all the time instead of Diane Speaking.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was Alan Greenberg who was speaking, and I would want to be careful about saying that not speaking English is a disability.

DIANE SCHROEDER: Alan, your point is well taken. Communications can give you a different type of disability and prevent you from accessing something

---

that you ought to be able to without a major problem other than the communication tools. So I totally agree with that assessment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If staff could just roll to question 12, which was one I particularly wanted you to have a look at. And it follows on I think very nicely from Alan's question in linking that to question three. And that's the one, which was looking at the productivity tools, etc. So you're sitting far too close to me, oh boy.

We are very aware that in this area, changes happen very, very quickly. And we're certainly not looking for anything bespoke. We're certainly not looking for designers, the most specific ICANN-based tool. Because that would never be up-to-date. What we would like to do is have a relationship whereby if someone has a good idea and experience, that through probably the vector of our Technology Task Force – and I'll recognize Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I can't even speak at this end of the day. Sorry, Dev. Is Chair of that, and both we have a strong presence from the Accessibility Task Force in that Technology Task Force.

And their job is to put some technology rigor through it. They actually beta test these things. They talk to the tech guys. They see whether this is just one person's good experience or whether this is a tool well worthwhile looking at. And if such a suggestion was to come up through that community-based pathway, I suspect we [won't] like to think that that would be looked at seriously, as even a stopgap measure.

---

And we recognize that it's probably going to be a toolkit that we need, and that will, perhaps, allow us to work with different bandwidths and different situations. But we're not suggesting that everybody who has had a good experience with a piece of technology should be able to come and knock on your door and say, "I want the licensing for one of those, please, Chris." But we do have a mechanism. We do have a Technology Task Force that is a cross-community task force.

So I think there's ways that ICANN can show we would like this and this does it pretty well can come up, and it saves this business of having to go out for RFPs and build bigger and better models. I don't know whether either of the Chris's wanted to respond on any of that.

CHRIS GIFT:

Sure. Yes. Thank you, Cheryl. I absolutely agree and I'm starting to attend those meetings. I'm trying to attend on a regular basis because we do have some very interesting conversations around tools and technologies that Dev and others are testing. And, at the same time, we have begun a process of when we're looking at new collaboration tools, before we even come close to selecting anything, we are working with different community groups.

So for instance, I know Dev is going to start testing a tool on working group collaboration. And then SSAC has just finished testing another tool on document collaboration, document co-authoring.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Not just SSAC. One of the GNSO [inaudible], as well.

---

CHRIS GIFT: That's true. And yes, DMPM is testing that, as well. So we have switch our mode of testing things first with you guys. I will say, though, again, that, in the past, have not done a good job of baking in requirements for accessibility. And I think, again, that is changing. Again, that is part of this process. We're, right now, as part of the purchasing process, will have accessibility requirements baked into the RFP process going forward for new software and for any kind of services acquisition, as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Diane, back to you.

DIANE SCHROEDER: I'm sorry. So Cheryl, which direction would you like me to go in and trying to take questions or...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you what you wanted to [inaudible] holidays, that's great. Now we're going to open the floor for general questions. And first person is Judith. Over to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I wanted to go back to the question 12, and also was talking to Laura on that. And some of the issues of it being in, it says, ICANN productivity tools. And we list some of them. [Working assessment] for

---

person with disability, and he checked yes, and it's not necessarily true in some of the cases here. And also, as Dev and the Task Force has tested, some of these work fine on desktops, do not work well on mobile apps.

And, also, [inaudible] some of these are looking at Google Sheets historically has not been accessible with people's screen readers. So [inaudible] and I think maybe something like you would think that they were accessible, but maybe echoes back to the question of not having enough awareness to know, and thinking it is. And so you check yes when the answer is not necessarily yes. And that's sort of maybe goes back to the question that I don't know if we put it on a survey or not of does ICANN have someone on staff who has a blind or deaf so that they will know the HR people then would know, okay, yes, on this can ask this person and see and have someone really testing it.

DIANE SCHROEDER:

We certainly don't have somebody on staff looking at those issues at this point. I'm happy to hear that Chris is taking some steps on the acquisition sides of things, where we are making a lot of changes and tools. But no, it's certainly a gap for us at this point. Not one that we're talking about. And so raising it, for us, is a really good step forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Judith, do you have a follow-up question?

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [Inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm looking around the room and I think I can see Jimmy in the distance over there. Mr. Schulz?

JIMMY SCHULZ: Thank you very much. I don't know if you've discussed that ever before, but for any reasons, I do have, really, problems running, for example, Adobe Connect under Linux. And for whatever reason you use Linux for security reasons, religious reasons, whatever, I don't use any other system. I just bought that to connect myself to the ALAC.

And now, I'm running Linux on it, and it doesn't work. And I really think that I don't want to be dependent on any company, which is spying on my data. And we are the Internet and we should take privacy and security issues real serious. I really, really, really like to have me connected to the ICANN without having them force me to use unsecured systems, especially Flash.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: You'll be happy to know I heard from that the WC3 has now finished the standard and HTML5 has been out. And so, hopefully, many of these programs are going to update software and we won't have that systems that we have. Also, besides the Flash, there's a lot of problems with accessibility on apps and captioning and other stuff does not



---

work. And a lot of these screen readers do not work on apps. They work on computers but not on apps.

But hopefully, with HTML5 coming out, our group will be testing them again to make sure that we won't have those problems anymore.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that, Judith, because it's, as you know, a [bug bear] of a number of us who are Linux or Ubuntu users, or who work in the Android world in our mobile world.

But we also need to realize a perfectly system, which was working one week may not. In my Ubuntu update did it itself recently. Cannot get any of my Adobe rooms working on my laptop. That's it. Gone. I'm just so furious and Dev is going to have to duck because I'm going to give him my computer and say, "Fix it."

But no, it really is, even when you've got the patch is done and the system is going. And that's something that maybe, when vendors are talking to you as potential purchasers. Just remind them that don't ditch perfectly good systems at the cost of an upgrade that is going to lose some of the facilities and features. And particularly with things like the non-app-based screen readers, etc. that [inaudible].

They're expensive things, and one can't change the customer-facing piece of equipment very regularly. So breaking it in the middle doesn't do any of us good. But believe me, Jimmy, we hear you, and we need to work on that. And that said, we could get someone from Adobe to

---

come and talk to us. If we raise their awareness, that might help. Because it often only needs awareness-raising to make a difference.

We've got very little time left, but I do want to take two or three minutes to go to question ten. So that's just a small rollback. In fact, questions nine and ten. And I wanted to compliment the team who put together the registration system for this meeting and the next one in Dublin. The last Accessibility Working Group meeting did a [yay] team, even though none of them were there, but I did a [yay] team.

Because for the first time ever, the question was asked: do I have any sort of accessibility issues? And when I said yes, someone, in the [little messages], someone will get back to you to look at your requirements. Yeah, well you got the question but you didn't follow through, so oops. Don't promise me something and then not deliver. Come on.

So my [yay] team has gone to, "Well, we're getting there." But when you're getting some of your right, but someone also has to do a little bit of diligence to make sure that it continues to be right.

And interestingly enough, the new gTLD world is bringing more of us into this space. More of us that want to be engaged. And that's fully engaged across policy development, at meetings, and everywhere else.

And to that end, I wanted to continue to say, "Please with the changes that are being made but we do actually have to do the follow-through." Has anyone got any questions or statements they'd like to make now in the last couple of minutes of today's meeting that is

---

specifically to do with any of the topics that are being covered in the survey first?

So perhaps something about meetings, perhaps something about Global Stakeholder Engagement. I think we're pretty settled on the website stuff, we've had all the good news about that. Tools. This is sort of a call for last drinks, ladies and gentlemen. In which case, I'm going to ask a question, and that is, what happens next with this data?

First of all, there's one or two points where you've been annotating going, "Well, this should be a no, and this should be a maybe." I think we would like to recommend, along with our thanks, that this has a little sanity check now and some things that even based from today's discussion, "Oh, well perhaps we should have said this."

This is good baseline, but then we need to have the next level of conversation about how we prioritize what can be done in reasonable time and with reasonable cost and all of those sorts of things. And I'm not asking for answers on to when, how, and why on that, Diane, but I would like to see that there's a reasonable assurity or some commitment that as we stand ready to work and serve with you and your staff, that you will take up that opportunity in the not-too-distant future.

DIANE SCHROEDER:

Cheryl, I will take up the opportunity. I am a little bit of a limitation only because I've come into it so recently. I don't really know [inaudible] what you've done leading up to this point other than with

---

this. I didn't have any background before I saw this one. Heidi and Silvia had approached me. So in terms of making this [our] [inaudible] next steps, I don't have a plan off my head. But it is certainly something that I will talk to the people that have been involved with you before with the staff and come back to you on the areas that I know I can help in and/or with direction to who can help us with the additional areas.

And I think Chris wants to.

CHRIS GIFT: While this is a great survey, it's great survey. It is digital, right? It's yes or no, and some of these...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Binary.

CHRIS GIFT: It's binary, right? And they're not all [inaudible] in the same, I don't feel – some of these, we could have said, "It's maybe a three out of ten," or something like that. So it'd be a great baseline if we could maybe [inaudible] change it into that kind of survey. Because then we could more readily see progress. Because otherwise, some of these are stay no, no, no until all of a sudden they're going to flip to a yes.

And I don't know how we'll – I'm just wondering if we can just change it in a way that we could really track progress over time.

---

DIANE SCHROEDER: So Cheryl, if I could just, for a moment. My reaction a little bit was some of the questions weren't really survey questions. They were really kind of directions she wanted us to go into.

And so one thing I think would be really helpful is to take the ones that are really directions of not should ICANN have or does ICANN have, but how can we get into ICANN? And shift the focus that way, which I think will get us closer to [inaudible] Chris' measurement.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think those are great suggestions. We originally weren't really sure when we designed the survey. There was a couple of us on our survey team – mostly me, Glenn, Gunela – who were working together to try to figure out from a large survey to try to get down to a certain number of questions that would be able to be answered because you can have many detailed questions, but then no one is going to answer them, and no one has time.

And so trying to distill and combine them into certain things and, of course, then you get too broad a question.

DIANE SCHROEDER: So I think it's a really good first step, and I think that we all see where we can go with the next step to make it more of an action plan. Aspirational document rather than a quiz survey type of document.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. And it was originally called a stock take. So I think we need to treat it very much as that, and now we've got to look at, okay, we've got a very inaccurate, in some cases, stock take. Let's look behind the boxes and find what is the answers, and move on with this.

I now have less than 180 seconds to ask any of you, do you have any reports you'd like to bring to the table? Is there anyone who has a burning desire to update us on, have something that you've discovered or done locally? Speak now or forever... Yes, please. Go ahead, please, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: My name is Mary, for the record. Mary Uduma, and I'm from Nigeria. And I just want to say that for the program we run in IGF, we run in our country, always have the inclusive program. One of the sessions, when we say openness and inclusiveness in IGF, the moderator is always a physically challenged person. Cannot see, but he moderates the session very well.

And they have groups that they're already working, they are doing some work and making sure that they are not left behind. Sometimes, we're challenged by being able to get them on, being able to have enough resources for them, and they would love to be. So I'm excited about what is going on there.

And the West African IGF is actually being coordinated by Judy. I don't know how many people know Judy here. She is physically challenged. We just finished our program in Abuja and we had to look for a hotel

---

that she could be able to. This is why I came into this to listen to you know what is going on here and [clinging] to it, and I'm very much excited. And I want to thank everybody, especially this [top] [inaudible] taking into [consideration] with that accessibility.

My husband works with the deaf. He signs the deaf language and one of the things I asked [Vin] the first time I attended ICANN meeting. I said, "How will the deaf participate? How will those with accessibility participate?" Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Don't turn me off, Mary. You and I are going to have a chat later, sweetheart. We work a better team than that, normally. Come on. At that, we have a short amount of time, but I think we've learnt, shared, and, I would like to think, achieved a great deal in less than 60 minutes today. I want to really thank the staff. This is not me being cute. This is me being serious. I only give compliments when and if I so desire, and that doesn't happen often.

The staff from ICANN, since we started this project, whether it's our own At-Large team or beyond, filtered all the way up, have been very committed, very, very available, and make extraordinary efforts. Point in case, Mr. [inaudible], to get to these tables when they're around. So do not think we do not appreciate it. We do. But let's take this partnership to the next level of that. I'm not sure we're up to tango yet, but let's, perhaps, get this slow waltz going.

---

Thank you, one and all, and thank you so much to our amazing team at the back. Tech guys. They can't hear me without you. Bless you, one and all. And that brings this meeting to a close.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**