

SAN JUAN – ALAC & Regional Leaders: Work Session, Part 3
Saturday, March 10, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

MAUREEN HILYARD: Introducing themselves. Good. Good idea.

DAVID CONRAD: I'm David Conrad, ICANN CTO.

DUNCAN BURNS: Duncan Burns, head of Communications and the D.C. office.

JANA JUGINOVIC: Jana Juginovic, Communications

MIKE TAKAHASHI: Mike Takahashi, Communications.

MARK SEGALL: Mark Segall, Engineering and IT.

MAUREEN HILYARD: All right. This team of people are here to actually talk about this
new information system that they're organizing, and, of course,

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.

we're all very interested in that, because we all know that information on the ICANN website has always been a bit of a mystery to us. And for end-users who try to sort of access information, it's, you know, something that we have asked for quite a while now to be addressed, and we're very grateful that you're going to come along and tell us how it's going to be so much easier for us. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD:

Yes, the Information Transparency Initiative is a project that is sort of jointly owned, between myself, as the CTO, and Duncan, the head of Comms. And the intent of this project is to actually address one of the common concerns that has been made pretty much ever since ICANN, I think, was created, which is actually being able to find information from ICANN's sort of voluminous stores of information, wherever they might be. I will actually hand it over to Jana, I guess, to give a set of slides on ITI, and then, I guess, we'll be able to answer any -- hopefully, answer any questions anyone might have on the project. So, Jana.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Jana Juginovic for the record. Thanks, David. And if you want to put up the third slide -- advance to the third slide. There you go. So, ICANN has, as you know, commitments to accountability and

transparency, and one of the ways we demonstrate that is through the availability of our content. And, as Duncan mentioned -- sorry, as David mentioned -- there's some challenges with locating that information on ICANN.org. and our public sites.

So, one of the main goals of ITI is to make that content more easily findable on ICANN.org and our other public sites, in all the six U.N. languages. Can you advance to the next slide?

And the next slide, How can we increase transparency of our public information? So, through a consistent and coherent content strategy. What ITI is doing is making and creating a comprehensive taxonomy, which we don't have right now. That means, tagging all of our content; and establishing an information architecture; and content governance applied to all of our external content; and the implementation of a new document-management system.

This is at the heart of what ITI is about. We don't currently have a document-management system, which doesn't enable us to enforce that content governance -- which, with the establishment of a document-management system, we'll be able to enforce that content governance through that consistent tagging and apply that DMS, eventually, to all our public sites and our content.

DUNCAN BURNS: Can we move on to slide 5, please?

JANA JUGINOVIC: Slide 5.

DUNCAN BURNS: Slide 5, one after that. There we go.

JANA JUGINOVIC: So, these are the goals that are in the board resolution because, as you know, ITI was approved by the board in September 2017, and we had a set of goals that we wanted to adhere to for ITI, which are outlined here. Mark, did you want to tackle the goals and discuss some of the goals?

MARK SEGALL: So, create an integrated, ongoing, and operation process. So, this is our internal mechanisms for how we get the content from authoring, all the way to publication. I mean, we want to get more consistency around how we approach that. The multilingual, we want to give them, also, the same thing, consistency being a theme here with how we handle translations.

DMS, as Jana was saying, there's a -- we don't have one today, so being able to -- we surface and we put a styling around it, but we don't really have a mechanism for getting more granular with how we search, and being able to do that -- the DMS is a requirement for that.

Workflows, again, it comes back to more consistency in our processes, establishing who all needs to be reviewing, what are all the steps that need to happen before it actually goes to the website, and a future-proof technology landscape.

Again, no DMS was a key part of this, but there's other pieces of the website, today, require my team of -- if anybody's familiar with development methodologies, you have to -- there's a lot of rigor that goes into a development step, and if you want to add a comment to a page, some of our pages actually require a development team, which means you have to go through development, QA, the progression testing -- all these things to just add that one comment to a page, so getting our landscape to a point where it's much more fluid -- and user-friendly is a key part of it.

And, of course, again, also being able to better -- not only improve our content, the consistency of the content, but also be able to surface it -- we need the technology landscape improved to be able to handle -- if we want to have a fully translatable site

-- like being able to do a global setting for language or some of the other -- accessibility is also a concern. Next page, please.

Also, of course, publishing speed, like I just was talking about -- the development cycle slows things down. Mobile first -- we understand that the site is not a very mobile-friendly site right now. We want to make sure that mobile is baked into the designs going forward. And, again, surfacing through a new content-management system is part of that whole technology landscape.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

I'll go through really quickly some of -- oh, Jana Juginovic for the record -- some of the benefits that will be available to the ICANN community and the organization after ITI is over. I'll go through that really quickly; because I know we want to get to your questions. So, we have laid out six benefits. One is improving the findability, transparency, and the security, and the quality of the content.

No. 2, it decreases the yearly maintenance costs that we have to maintain all of our sites. We're consolidating 15 separate, external content properties in ITI, and eventually, all the rest of our external content properties. Ensures all of our content is future-proofed through that consist tagging. This is particularly

important for At-Large. It lays the foundation for our technical infrastructure, so that will benefit all our future sites, including the SO/AC sites, including At-Large. It improves accessibility in all the six U.N. languages. And it helps us meet our commitments and reduce our financial risks.

Now, in terms of what we've started so far, the project launched in January, and we started to tag our content. We have 104,000 pieces on ICANN.org, so it's a lot. And we've done that through a combination of an eyes-on audit, and machine-learning. We've tagged 9,000 pieces, so far, and we'll be able to complete the rest of the tagging by the end of June of this year.

So, that's something that we've already started. We've started to build the two technical platforms that we'll be using, which is Alfresco and dotCMS -- and the two platforms have been integrated. We've started to conduct interviews with various members of the ICANN community. We've talked to chairs of the SO/ACs. We've talked to the APRALO chair, NextGen, and fellows, registrants, registry operators, and other stakeholders to help us figure out what are their pain-points with the current ICANN website, and what are the things that they'd like to see on the new website.

We're launching a platform for the community to provide feedback on the content in the features that we'll be unveiling,

which we'll be launching this week, which is feedback.ICANN.org -- which we'll be, hopefully, putting out in the next couple of days. And this is where you'll be able to provide input directly in ITI. And this is kind of what the site looks like, show you, if you can skip ahead to the next site, or next page?

Yeah. This is kind of what the site will look like, the feedback site, where you can provide feedback into ITI. Now, I think that concludes our presentation, because I know we don't have a lot of time left for questions, so 15 minutes for questions.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hadia, first one up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the record. You mentioned that this system is for public info, so I was wondering, how do you decide in what is public and what's not? And, thus, what goes into this initiative and what does not?

MARK SEGALL: So, the information that we're focusing on in the initial phases of the ITI project are -- stuff, which is currently found on the ICANN.org website. So, it's information that has been, specifically, constructed to be made available on the ICANN.org

website, and the associated websites that are still within the ICANN.org administrative domain -- that's not the websites that are sort of separate sites.

So, in the initial phases, that's -- the question is quite easy, right, because it's stuff that's, specifically, designed to be published, externally. Subsequent phases, when we start integrating the DMS into the organization, as a whole, and all the documents that are produced within ICANN, the internal and external documents will be stored within the DMS.

Then, the question gets a little more complicated, because we, then, need to identify, as we're developing the document, as we're incorporating it into the DMS, whether that document is intended for internal use or whether it's available for public use. So, it would be based on a case-by-case basis, as we're reviewing the documents that already exist, or as the documents are created. I don't know if Jana or any of my team would like to correct me where I got things wrong.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Duncan Burns. I think we're focused on ICANN.org for the moment. I think the taxonomy, then, allows other sites that aren't being tackled in this phase to use that and start to be ready, but also help with their findability and search. We are

going to be, as part of building out the plan, we identified 14 websites of the 35 ICANN currently runs will collapse into this effort, to the new site that will include all that data, as well. So, it's not everything, but it's a start.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Maybe rephrasing. So, what the nature of the content that will not be on this site, or initiative.

DUNCAN BURNS: Duncan Burns. So, whatever's not currently on ICANN.org or the other 13 sites, like the meeting site, the fellows' site, I think -- that aren't public already. So, whatever's already public will be included, and then, additional materials, blogs, announcements, other content that gets posted. It won't include the community Wiki, for example, at this stage, or most of the SO/AC sites.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just one question before I move on to our next intervention -- does it mean the Wiki will still exist, as is, and just as --? Okay. John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. John Laprise for the record. So, when I, after this meeting, and I return back to my day job -- we're also coincidentally going through a website redesign for a large international nonprofit -- I'm concerned -- well, I'm not concerned, but I'm wondering, have you made provisions, going forward, that since website redesign is an iterative process, so this will be an ongoing -- budget item, going forward for new content, for ongoing website redesign, so is this something that's already been figured in? Thank you.

DUNCAN BURNS: Great question. Duncan Burns. I think we've seen this in two parts. One is part of the reason the current site isn't as good as it should be is because we didn't go all the way in and really install a document-management system last time. And I think we're seeing the DMS as the sort of -- the perpetual foundation.

And then to your point about, you know, how it then gets presented -- sort of the website aspect is one where, out looking three, four years -- technology will have moved on even further, and it may be that a new CMS is needed to meet whatever the needs are at the time.

That's much easier to do if you've got that core foundation already set. I think part of the rationale for doing this, and one

of the goals is to try and decrease the financial impact of running 35 web properties, of the development costs that were needed on the current website -- so, the more we can sunset those, the more that we have an automated system that federates out responsibility across our organization for publishing and posting, the real hope is that we will -- there will always be maintenance costs -- I mean in one way, you're never really done with a site, so they'll always be things to improve, but they should be much more realistic and feasible, given our financial situation.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Maureen. Satish Babu for the record. I have two comments. The first is that -- this is something that I already talked to you while we had the call -- is that the ICANN website means multiple things to multiple people. For example, there is newcomers. There are experts. There is a general public. So, is there anything that could be done to ease these journeys of different groups of people on the ICANN site?

That’s a comment and a question, especially since our websites tend to be, perpetually, in vita -- meaning there is never a time that you closes a website. It’s always kind of changing.

The second comment is regarding the document-management system that you’re proposing. We also have an interest in this, meaning APRALO has a history project, and one of the things that we discovered early on, is that we did have a repository, but the repository would only stow the links. They wouldn’t stow the documents, per se. What this meant was that, if the link is broken for some reason, then the documents are lost.

So, do you really have a document-management system where we insert these documents rather than links, and is it possible for the RALOs, for example, or ALAC to use such a thing when it becomes available? Thank you.

MIKE TAKAHASHI:

Mike Takahashi here. So, I’ll answer the first question. Yes, we will be addressing the need for different audiences, and we are currently, right now, finalizing personas based on the interviews that Jana mentioned, which we’ve gotten feedback from many people about the need for personalization of content and how that content is delivered. So, we are aware of that need and are working on it, so that will be part of this project.

MARK SEGALL: This is Mark Segall. Just to make sure I understand the second question -- you're asking if the links will be -- in the situation where a link gets broken, you were asking about concerns about that -- how it would be --?

SATISH BABU: Satish again. If I may, now the thing is -- the ALAC site, for example, has undergone many revisions. Some of them are technology revisions, other website redesigns, and many documents have not survived this process. So, link shorteners have been used, which have broken, so we lose these things, you know? Thank you.

MARK SEGALL: Yeah. This is Mark again. Thank you for the clarity. Yes, the -- at the heart of this whole project is content strategy. It's not about the website, at all, it's really about what are we doing to keep the -- to get a handle of our content, to properly tag it, make sure that we have just so many vectors of being able to slice and dice that content when we surface it in the future.

And, yes, the plan is to incorporate the SO/AC sites into this model in the future. The taxonomy that we're establishing is

intended to evolve. And also, there's a lot of other benefits, more technical in nature, of having everything in a shared, multisite model but, absolutely, at the core, we also plan to incorporate the At-Large site at a later point.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. We've got Olivier, Holly, Sébastien, Judith, and Tijani. And we've got five minutes. So, can you keep your interventions really short, please? We'll start off with Olivier, who I know will have a great trouble keeping short.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, which takes 30 seconds out of my introduction, or my speaking time -- right -- two questions -- very short ones. The first one, in developing the taxonomy, did you make use of the At-Large taxonomy that was already developed in past years?

And the second question, so you can prepare yourself for that is, does this ITI initiative, also, include the content of the Wikis, and the -- yeah, the content of the Wikis, effectively? Because the content of the Wikis is really where we work, and I'm not sure how that integrates with ITI. Thank you.

JANA JUGINOVIC:

Jana Juginovic. I'll tackle the first question on the taxonomy. So, as I mentioned, we don't have -- currently, have a consistent ICANN taxonomy, either on the SO/AC sites or on ICANN.org. Most of the content is not tagged. So, what we've done is take the content, each one of them, and we've -- between ICANN staff that are experts in their content -- so, we know what -- at least what function it belongs to.

So, if it belongs to GDD, we've done the content of it by department, per se, and so, by function. So, GDD content first. We've done, then, legal content. We've gone through all the content with each department and come up with a taxonomy based on how we think people would find it. So, if you were looking for a reconsideration request in legal, you would basically type in, "reconsideration request," if you were looking for it, perhaps.

So, we tag it that way. We tag it by -- if there was a mention of an SO/AC, if it belongs to the Board, so there's a series of what we would call attributes, like categories, that would allow you to do multifaceted search. So, if you wanted to look for something by SO/AC;, by Board committee, if it related to a Board committee; if it related to a particular working group; if it related to a particular topic; date range; by language -- so, a whole

bunch of categories that help focus your search if you were looking for something on ICANN.org.

And then, we would apply that taxonomy to, then, future SO/AC sites. And it's also, I should mention, it also allows you to -- if you are interested in particular issues around a gTLD, filter content by a gTLD; if you're interested in a ccTLD -- so, it's a lot of work and that's why we had a machine-learning tool, as well, to help tag some of that consistent content. So, basically, if it would see ALAC or At-Large on the piece of content, it would tag it that.

So, that's kind of how we've developed the taxonomy. Once we have this big taxonomy, then we start to narrow down the terms and see which ones were most used, and build what's called a controlled vocabulary. Do you want to [CROSSTALK] -- yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier. Just for the taxonomy side. We have developed, or in past years, the ALAC had developed a taxonomy, so we already had a taxonomy and a filing system, as well. So, I wondered was that taken into account, or are we going to end up with a double taxonomy?

JANA JUGINOVIC:

We don't have on ICANN.org. So, we looked at the taxonomies that are on the other SO/AC sites, but they're not complete enough to tackle all the content that's on ICANN.org, and absolutely, you're absolutely right, so we looked at what was there, but because there's so much more content on ICANN.org, we needed to develop a larger one.

As you know, a taxonomy is never over, right? As new terms come in, it lives, it grows -- you may deprecate some terms or replace it with others, but yeah, we did take into account -- we don't want to duplicate efforts that you guys have done -- taken into account the work that you guys have already done and build upon that; absolutely.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Just [inaudible] we discussed there were seven different glossaries, for example, on ICANN.org. Well, I mean, that's fairly unhelpful to have seven different glossaries. I've been part of this exercise, and you'll see it when we launch the feedback site in the next day or so, is also to look at standardizing the glossaries. That thread, then, goes all the way through into language services, how they're using it, how we're using the content -- so, that official record should touch everything and, again, sort of foundational work.

MARK SEGALL: And as for the Wiki, no, it's not in-scope for this effort, but when we start looking into SO/AC sites, after ITI, we have to take that into consideration. I agree; it's where all the work's happening, and we got to figure out how best to approach it.

DAVID CONRAD: One thing I might add on that, on the Wiki, one of the challenges there is because of the dynamic nature of content on a Wiki. It's going to be a little -- we'll need to think quite hard about how exactly we want to incorporate that into the ITI system, particularly, since it's DMS-backed. So, that's something that we'll, undoubtedly, need to do a bunch of thought and consultation to try to determine what the right way of dealing with the content that's developed within the Wiki.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you, Holly, for jumping off the queue. We'll have Sébastien, and can we keep it short, please? We're going to have the next lot of people in soon.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien speaking. This is the third or fourth time I've had these kind of presentation, and I'm surprised to see that you're

always trying to do something great, to achieve something great, and then, in general, it becomes nothing. We end up at nothing. I'm not sure what the website for ICANN is today, and how it works, but we have to find a way to manage documents properly, so why not start by something simply, which is complicated, I know, but document-management, within ICANN should first be tackled.

Once we've done that, we will see if we can work on a user-interface and see if we have the proper website or not to reflect that. But four, five, seven years ago, we were told, "Yes, we're going to do -- we're going to develop a new web system that should be done for each of the people who access our website."

Us, personally, as users and future users, at the time, took a lot of time expressing our needs, and we have to start over today -- but when ICANN no longer has funds. So, I think it's a pity we would start over and over and over. I think we've already had this kind of study done a few years ago, and I don't think the system has entirely changed -- well, the website changed -- I'm sorry. Thank you.

DAVID CONRAD:

Thank you for that question. So, in fact, this project started, what, a couple of years ago -- and I will say that when the initial

proposal came up, I objected quite strenuously to the approach that was being suggested, because it was, essentially, just a re-skinning, in my view, I should clarify -- my view was that it was simply a re-skinning of the existing website -- not addressing sort of the under -- the fundamental, underlying issue, which is the idea of document-management, of a rational content management.

So, we went back to the drawing board, to some extent, and spent quite a bit of time analyzing what it was that we actually needed to address to ensure that in the future, we don't sort of repeat the same mistakes we made in the past. Part of the solution to that was to rely entirely upon the creation of a true document-management system, and then, building a UI as, essentially, a completely system on top of the DMS to allow for the information that is curated via the DMS to be exposed publicly. Initially, at least in my view, the primary focus was to deploy the DMS, and then expose, through small portions, that DMS via some web interface.

But after quite a bit of discussion and particular discussion with folks who are public-facing within the ICANN organization, we decided to do a -- essentially, a vertical integration of the DMS and the public side of ICANN.org, so that people within the community could gain benefit more quickly than if we focused

specifically on the DMS first. And populating the DMS with the various -- entirety of the various documents that ICANN has developed.

So, we definitely recognize that in the past when we have attempted to improve the usability and functionality of the ICANN website, we sort of missed the target and have definitely taken steps this time to address the sort of fundamental, underlying infrastructure, atop of which, the web interface can be tuned to deal with both the demands and requirements of the community and, also, the technology that's available -- because one thing that we have noticed through time, since we have done this on a couple of occasions, is that the web-interface technology changes with some rapidity, whereas as the document-management technology actually remains relatively constant.

So, we've made a very clear separation between those two parts. There's a content-management system that makes the documents available, and then there's a document-management system that records and stores that information. So, I don't know if anyone else wants to comment on that.

DUNCAN BURNS: David sums it up well. There are trade-offs, you know, one level [inaudible] because all I'm using is we could have spent a long time and a lot of money organizing our filing cabinet really well. But that doesn't necessarily benefit the community, and if you can't get access to it, you can't see the documents, and I think finding that trade-off between putting in a DMS on the publicly-facing content first was the answer.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Two very, very quick interventions, Judith and Tijani, and two short responses, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. I wanted to pick up on what Olivier said -- on the At-Large site, some stuff starts on the website, moves to the Wiki, links onto the Wiki, and then back to the website. And so, that's also what makes things harder to find, and if we're excluding the Wiki from the document-management system, we're going to have, also, issues because things link there and then link back. And then information will get lost; we won't be able to find the information.

And I think a lot of the items that we're looking at are in the Wiki or started out in the Wiki and end up on the website or vice

versa, in the middle, and that's what makes, I think -- the Wiki needs to be included because it's so much -- a lot of information is harder and it seems like the person I know who can find anything is my colleague Dev, who can find anything, anywhere, but he seems to be the only one who knows where anything is. I know, I have difficult time, and I was looking for the simple things, like the PowerPoint template, which should be easier to find, but --

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Judith. Tijani. Yeah. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. I think that the data-management work was started with Ashley, a few years ago. He always said to us that he's progressing. I don't know if you are continuing on the work he did, or if you are starting from zero. Data management.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [inaudible]?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ashley.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Ashman.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Ashman.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ashman. Ashman. Excuse me.

DUNCAN BURNS: I'll be quick. So, on the Wiki, you know, there are choices being made about getting the scope funding, budget, what time -- I think, you know, a lot of -- even on the current website, there are six, seven redirects. A lot of links are hard-coded in formal documents, so all of that is part of what we're having to do, is part of the audit. The end result needs to be, and will be that if you go on the site, you should be able to find what you're looking for.

And I think that is a principle that we need to try and hold to, even if we aren't able to incorporate, in this phase, the Wiki. And I think, Tijani, to your point, so Mark works for Ash, and I think how we're looking at our documents, our data, cybersecurity -- all of that is part of this. And I think the processes and methods

and experience we now have in the team is greatly improved over the last few years. So, yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, team. I'm sorry we have to rush you away, but we could have gone on for quite a lot longer I'm sure. But, of course, come back. And we can appreciate the difficulties that you're having. And we understand, you know, with all the websites that we've got and trying to incorporate them all into one will be a challenge. And we're looking forward to seeing the results.

Thank you. Oh, yes, and just before you go, Duncan, we'd like to formally thank you for all the contributions that you've made to our meetings in the past and wish you well with Fannie Mae.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you so much [inaudible].

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Okay. Immediately, straight on the next group of guests that have arrived, I can see. Something completely different. Or maybe not. I'd like to welcome Sally Costerton and her team from Global Stakeholder Engagement. Just give them -- any

colleagues that also want to join the table? There is plenty of space here. Okay.

Well, Global Stakeholder Engagement is responsible for leading engagement and outreach with stakeholders on ICANN and its mission around the world. That's a big assignment. So, I'm very much looking forward to an update, receive an update from the team, and everyone pay attention and any questions you might have, I'm sure you know they'll be able to facilitate and looking forward to respond to that. So, Sally, go ahead, please.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Great to be back again with you. I think I say every time I come to see you, this is always how I mentally kickoff the ICANN meetings, is coming to see this group. What we've been asked to do today is a little different to our normal engagements with you. So, usually, what we do is give you an update on the region that we're in, and specifically focus on the engagement activities, and we are -- we can do that. I have -- we have an interesting -- this is, obviously, North America meeting, officially, so I have Chris Mondini here with me. Where's Chris?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Do you want to come up here?

SALLY COSTERTON:

I think, Chris, you should come up -- who is our head of engagement for North America. It also has a flavor of the Caribbean, so we also have quite a lot of input from our Latin American and Caribbean RVP, who probably should also come up here. Rodrigo -- waving at you now. So, any questions that you have for them, specifically, about this region and the activities going on in this region, happy to take them.

We're not going to give you a slide deck and a presentation today, because we've been asked to --- we've haven't been asked not to give you a presentation -- I hasten to add. But we have been asked to really facilitate a discussion with you about, or rather, not really that, I suppose -- answer questions, brainstorm -- specifically, the question around the CROP program.

And I think if I may, perhaps I would widen the [inaudible] slightly, so I completely understand the concern that's been fed back to me by Heidi -- is that this group would like to discuss with my team, with me and my team, you know, how can we -- you know, what impact will the proposed reduction in that program have, as far as your concerned in your own regional areas.

And what do you feel we could do differently to protect and to encourage -- continuing with engagement activities but without necessarily having access to that pot of money. And it isn't just the CROP budget, actually, in my view. I think it goes more broadly, and I wouldn't want to just narrow the conversation to that specific program. I think I would rather frame the question as, you know, in a time of flattening revenues and, therefore, some budget reductions across the organization, including to the staff budgets by the way.

And so, this is not just -- as I said, there are various different pockets that are affected and you have seen the budget numbers, and you know where they're coming. It is quite obvious to me and to my team, and we've a lot of time on this. We had a meeting two days ago, here, and focused largely on this question -- is how can we continue to deliver the engagement and, particularly, the capacity building that is so important to helping you to bring more participants to ICANN. Not just people who'd show up, or join groups, or turn up on lists, but people who can participate meaningfully.

And those of you who've been working with me for the many years now that I've been at ICANN, and some of you have, we've been on this journey together. You came from when are primary task was, frankly, recruitment, raising awareness, holler we're

here, come and be part of ICANN. And we've really -- we're not done with that, but we've built systems and processes and platforms, globally and regionally, through programs and through many, many initiatives, which you're all involved with, and many of your colleagues in other SO/ACs are involved with -- facilitated by the guys on my team, and some of which are done independently by you -- not always facilitated by them.

And as Duncan -- I came in on the tail end of the previous session -- a big driver of the ITI project is to really help with that side of things. It's making it very, very easy for people to come to our website, easily find what they need, and engage with us at a high-level. So, awareness-raising isn't gone, but we're focusing more of our energies and, again, this has been more of the theme of the last sort of year or so, when we've been working with you, on building the skills of the people that we have, so that we don't lose people.

Because we realize, and I think I've said this in this group before, we actually got quite good at recruiting people -- now, it can always be better -- but we hadn't really -- we still probably haven't really cracked the problem of turning those interested parties into productive, engaged participants in the ICANN processes -- and that doesn't mean just coming to ICANN meetings.

It goes way beyond newcomer programs -- and even joining SO/AC structures, it's broader than that. It's making sure that actually we are fulfilling our mission. It's as simple as that. Our mission includes a commitment to bring -- and forgive my -- the Sally version -- lawyers in the room, please don't blame me. But there is a commitment in our mission to bring the world's internet users to ICANN, who are affected by our work, and to inform -- make sure they are informed and able to participate in our processes.

So, there's two steps there. Bring them and make sure they can participate. So, we are all here to listen, to debate, to brainstorm for as long as we are indulged in that process by you guys.

So, I'm just going -- if that's okay with you, I'm going to open the floor and take your comments, your suggestions, your ideas -- the one thing I would say before we kick off the discussion, just for clarification -- and I've just come from a Board session where we've been discussing the budget -- the budget is draft.

I'm sorry, I know that sounds -- I've not meant to be patronizing, but I just want to remind you all the budget is in a draft form. It's not fixed, and I've literally just come from a meeting where Göran has been, you know, reiterating this point to the Board, as well, saying, "We need to remember to explain to the

community that this is a draft budget. It is not a fixed budget. And if the community feels,” as he said, and you’ve heard him say it, “I have to throw the first stone.”

This is his expression. “It’s my job as the CEO to throw the first stone, and now, I want the input from the community through the public comment, but not just through the public comment, through meetings like this, to understand if you think my priorities are wrong, or not priorities, but my recommendations are wrong, tell me how to do it differently. But recognize that if you want to increase a program, we have to do less of something else.”

I hope that’s helpful. If it’s okay with you -- to open the floor? Oh, you’re going to open the floor. I’m not going to open the floor. Okay.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: This is my part. Bastiaan speaking. Well, thank you very much for that, Sally. I see already a number of cards being put up, so that’s good news. I’m looking forward to an interesting discussion. Just personally speaking, I’m glad to hear, you know, you’re emphasizing that the budget is a draft, in draft version, so it’s open to debate.

This morning, we've been talked about that, and we certainly have a number of opinions on elements of it. You touched up on a couple of them, but we did say that we'd prefer to be constructive, you know, when having a debate about this, and there is, at least from our perspective, rationale lacking when it comes to certain proposed cuts. What is the reasoning behind it?

So then, we can have a proper debate -- but anyway, we were going to be looking forward, you know, to continuing discussion. But now, I want to open up the floor, and the first one is Holly. So, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Holly Raiche for the record. So, a few things. First, about Asia Pacific, APAC's been really helpful and we've been holding seminars on topics -- not, surprisingly, on privacy, but on other issues, as well, which have been useful. So, in terms of the sort of overall mission of ICANN, it's been very helpful for us to actually contribute to the policy process and bring back those views, but if you want to recruit, that's not enough.

And sometimes, we do have to actually go out with the messages that we've got, and tend -- I mean, if you actually look at the review document and well, "Why aren't you part of Istar?"

or “Why aren’t you part of APD?” and stuff. Part of my answer is, “Well, we already are,” and the other part is -- well, some support, not only the support that we get in APAC, in terms of just some of the webinars that are held and we participate in, but also the outreach.

So, I think it’s a two-way street. We’ve been grateful for, at least, the street that you’ve started with us, and we’ve started back, so I’d like to say that’s the constructive bit. I hope that that continues. Thank you.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you, Holly. Next in line is John. Just in case Holly was not aware. There is a timer being put up for the At-Large interventions. Please try and keep them within a minute. Thank you. John, you’re next.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. I guess I would like to challenge the Global stakeholder team to think about what’s the key content you have? And when many people come to the website and they see the pages of minutes and the documents, it’s not sticky. It’s not going to keep people there and, in terms of building engagement on an ongoing basis, we need some sticky content.

And I don't know what that is, at this point, because one of our problems is that we have a global reach, and different things are sticky in different ways in different parts of the world. But we need to think about and identify sticky content and put that out in the front. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, John. Yes, this is a big discussion. And we've had a big focus -- and, now, I'm doing Duncan's job for him, which I really don't think I should, but our Comms team has expanded and developed. We've expanded our language capability, online and offline. We have tried -- a long way to go -- to focus, particularly, on more plain English. That is a real problem with stickiness at ICANN. I mean the language can make it positively slippery content, less alone, not sticky content.

So, we focused on that as an important lever that would make a very big impact, and it's getting there. Findability on the website is the other issue. I think a more logically structured taxonomy -- and I know the team have just been talking about that -- is absolutely key, because great content that nobody can find, is not a lot of good to anybody. But your point is a very well-made point, and it's well-understood and heard.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: You want to respond to that, John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yes. John Laprise for the record again. If there's any one thing that I can raise a hand and say, "Can we please get it?" it's a single webpage with all the PDPs and their state of process, and a one-click join kind of called action, because right now, I have to go to staff to make sure that I'm signed up for everything for a particular set of discussions I want to get involved in. Thank you.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you, John. Yesim, you can.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry. Thank you. It's a question in the chat room from Olawale Bakare. He asks, "What is the topic of this presentation? ICANN budget cut or At-Large cut?"

SALLY COSTERTON: I'm not aware that there's an At-Large cut. Don't know. The topic of this presentation -- well, it's not a presentation; it's a discussion. The goal of this session is to listen to what you want us to prioritize, in terms of continuing to achieve our mission

around the world within a more restrained budget environment. I don't know how to frame it better than that. I hope that's helpful.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Next in line is Tijani, and the timer, by the way, has been changed to two minutes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If it is not my order, I want to make a point of order, first, and I have an intervention. So, my point of order, I know there is a lot of intervention, a lot of questions, and I know it will be very long, so the best is to have all the -- first round of questions and then she respond, and then we can take another round. This is a point of order. Okay? I can continue for my point?
[CROSSTALK]

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: You can continue. I'm fine, by the way, with your suggestion. Is there anyone that opposes it? And you're fine with it, Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON: Fine with that. [Inaudible].

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. So, Sally, I liked the tone of your statement. It is very good. And I like people who are frank and who things directly. The budget is a draft. That's clear. The priorities are discussed because we don't agree with all the priorities. We can discuss with you and with the staff. But the problem is the approach. The approach.

I think the approach of making the activities of the community lower will, and may, impact the multistakeholder model. I think that, yes, we may drop a little bit the budget for the community, but it must be done in -- how to say -- in a harmonious way. It shouldn't be the easy thing to do, so that we solve the problem of the budget. Thank you.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you, Tijani. Next in line is Humberto.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I'm Humberto Carrasco for the record. They ask me to speak slowly, so I will try and do it. Sally, first of all, thank you very much for being here. You already know my analogy, because I say that -- this is a issue all families have

when one of the parents has -- when both parents work -- I'm not going to repeat this because I mentioned it yesterday over dinner -- when you have a family issue, when there are scarce resources, the parents also set the example.

So, if I'm going to take resources from my kids, I, myself, are going to reduce my resources to set the example. Point one. Point two -- I'd like to point out that we have worked very well with the Rodrigo de la Parra and his team, and with Silvia Vivanco. I thank you very much for your outreach activities in the region.

I'd also like to highlight Alberto Soto, Maritza, and myself, and some other LACRALO members have put money of our own pockets. We didn't even ask ICANN for reimbursement, and we did these outreach activities, so I do think it is fair -- we have to do personal sacrifices, in order to come into ICANN, because there are two ways of participating in ICANN -- coming to meetings, this has a limited income.

The other ways and it's going to where they find where the end-users are, and this is very important. If you limit our resources there, if ICANN reduces our resources there, this will be a big issue, because we won't be able to reach out to the end-users. Thank you very much.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Next in line is --

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet. Thank you very much. Thank you for this exchange of opinion. First of all, I'd like to come back to the question about the participation of people. Not only with the word that you and your team are doing, but also, this is linked to how we organize ourselves, and why we organize in such way.

A little bit of history, in 2000, we had elections, which were direct elections. Some people have participated and voted in each region to elect a member in the Board. Five members were elected -- some people were in disagreement, so we had to find a new solution. And this is how, now, we have this complex structure that is called At-Large, ALS, and regional structure, etc., etc. ALAC. And we don't even really know what ALAC is. Most people do not know what ALAC At-Large is. They think it's a whole mix of things.

Today, we are being told that we have to go towards the individual. There will never be 7 billion users in this room. It's impossible. Therefore, we should find a way of representation and this means, which should be chosen, could be changed, but we were talking about local structures that have -- that are

entrusted by the questions that are relevant to the internet governance and linked to ICANN.

Now, we have to find individuals, but the individuals that can be here will be people that can afford it; therefore, they will be the rich. So, we will only have the participation of one part of the population. When I talk about rich people, I'm thinking about people who don't have to go to their work or to go to their job, or they can stop working to come to the meeting, because these are not just physical meeting, but when I hear some of my colleagues say, "Oh, I just came back from a phone call, or I'm going to have another phone call meeting."

You know, we all need time. We need to be rich in time and in money. And it doesn't represent, honestly, the users in the world. This is why there is a need for a representation of -- a delegation of representation, and we need the means to do so, because if we do not have the means to do so, then if we don't give the means people like us, we will go and do something else. We will go and do other jobs, and we will go in our life somewhere else, and we won't be here. And the people who will be here will be people who have the means to be here.

So, this brings me to the second part of my idea. We were talking about the budget. Yes, we know it's a preliminary draft of a budget, but how many people with the right capacities and

skills worked on it, and how many without skills can work on it. We don't have the skills to put the budget together. If we did, we would be CFOs, accountants -- we are not these people, so we are in a debate that is completely biased. It's skewed and it's not up to what we need -- we need a really deep work with a proposition -- a proposal -- say like go around, "Oh, excuse, I threw my stone, so manage and tell me what doesn't work."

No, because what doesn't work is really complicated to find out. So, if you want my opinion, we have to kick out 100 people in the staff, and then you're going to tell me, "Oh, you told me to do so many things, and now I can't do it anymore," so things don't work. So, on the other hand, you told us, "We stop this, we stop that," and all this is linked to the work that we do to represent the end-users. So, there is a need to do something that will allow us to have the skills, the collective skills, and not just to say, "Oh, I did my thing. Well, now, if you can find a problem, let me know." I'm sorry. I was a little lengthy.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Lengthy, but I thought -- "I'm going to go interrupt him," no, I didn't. I let you, but -- next time, please, you know, try to keep it concise and to the point. But thank you very much for that. We have Satisfish.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you. Satish Babu for the record. I'd like to first thank Sally and her team for being here and talking to us. I'd like to start off by quoting Holly's comment on the support that APRALO has been receiving from the ICANN APAC team. It's been extremely useful for carrying out our outreach engagement activities.

Now, building a community on behalf of end-users is a kind of slow process, in contrast with, for example, the fellowship program, where we pick up people. But the footprint and the kind of contact that we achieve when one person goes and meets a community is much more. Last week, a couple of weeks back, we were in Kathmandu for APRICOT, where we had a very productive community meeting. And to be, the point to be noted is that, at least one of us did travel with our own funding. Not from ICANN's funding.

So, we do that kind of a thing, but the concern that I have here is that maybe there is a case for refining CROP, making it sharper, more result-oriented, but if you're going to cut it down or dismantling it, we need some other alternative mechanism to cover what we have to do, that is build a community in this very large region that Asia Pacific, for instance, but I'm not saying

other regions are smaller, but the challenges is kind of roughly same everywhere. Thank you very much

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto. Thank you, Sally, and your team. You are always very productive, year after year. I'm going to try and be pragmatic. I'm not going to ask for money or changes in the decisions you're making. I'm quickly going to read what an ALS has done in one country. Its activities. "We have divided the country into four regions, with over 300 volunteers with a technical office, working on the internet data. They do this year after year.

The internet users over 12,000 citizens have been involved in this event, digital inclusion, [inaudible] work with schools, universities, in public places to promote the use of internet -- work on inclusion of handicap people, elderly people -- over 300 people have been digitally included -- leadership project -- a permanent program for the training on technicians, in projects related to internet schools, ICANN, IETF, etc. -- over 92 universities, over 18 associations of technicians.

Many students, nationally, have been involved. This is one ALS in one country. Not all of them have been as productive, but it's going to be very difficult to tell these people there won't be a GE in our region. There hasn't been one for many years. It won't be held here. It will be held there. It will be very tough to tell them CROP has been done away with, but you will have to keep on working anyway.

In Chile, for example, they are distributing, digitally, information on ICANN, information for end-users with their own resources, so I believe that the activities we are carrying out, at least, in our region, are plenty, and we are reaching many end-users. I believe ICANN is not aware of how many end-users we reach. So, people won't feel motivated if we don't give them at least something. Thank you.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: And someone on the chat? So, can I propose, for now, to close it, in order to give Sally a moment to digest all of this and to respond? So, next we have Hadia. Oh [CROSSTALK] -- first, the remote?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry. Actually, not a question in the chat -- just a reminder to everyone to please speak slowly for the interpreters [CROSSTALK] -- at a reasonable pace. Thank you very much.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Okay. Thank you for reminding us. Now, Hadia, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the record. This is not a question but just a quick intervention -- I just wanted to remind us all not to change the ICANN meetings into meetings that only -- the ones with the resources can attend, in which case, we can end up only with the contracted parties registries, certain registrars, and the governments with the resources. And I think this is something that we all don't want to see happen. Thank you.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Last one for now is Glenn. Please.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi, my name is Glenn McKnight, and I'm the secretary out of NARALO. A couple of things come to mind -- one, is it's not entirely a bad thing there's budget cutbacks. I hate to sound like anarchist, but, in many ways, we need to be accountable, and

we need to have metrics, and that was a bit of a problem, if you all recall reading the reports that were done on CROP -- that it lacked that kind of accountability and transparency and metrics, and it was nice.

We get out there and we talk about ICANN and At-Large, but what are the results? How many ALSs were signed up, or affiliated, and so, we didn't have real tangible stuff to say, "Here it is. We did great stuff; don't cut it." I mean, you know, I'm not sure who's at fault there, but maybe if that was done, it'd be a little more difficult to say, throw the baby out with the wash.

Some of the things that are innovative that have gone to the wayside, which I don't think was successful, is some of the hubs. Remember those hubs? Almost nobody was there. What recently we did in Ottawa and, I believe, Susannah with ISOC San Francisco, we did a readout. And we invited people to prepare for these type of things and it's been done afterwards, too. Those area cost-effective ways to do it, to engage our community. We have to think innovatively. I think we have to be aware we have responsibility. But I think it'd be a bit of a disaster to get rid of the entire thing. I think we need to think holistically.

One of the things that we did just recently, and many of the people in this room participated with it, was our first school of

North America School of Internet Governance -- very exciting stuff. We all know what Larry Strickland's trying to do. We all know how ISOC's committed to this process. We know all the other players and ecosystem. I think this is an opportunity with other schools -- and the gentleman beside me has probably one of the best schools of internet governance in India, and it'll be your third year in New Delhi.

So, I think we have to go outside the box. We have to see where we can get other monies, as well, to go with this. And you know, because it was an outreach and engagement, some people just focused on engagement -- because I'm having coffee with different people, that's engagement -- not necessarily. You know, how are you reaching out and getting those organizations -- and look at doing a proper survey and finding out where the gaps in your capacity is. So, I think we need to reassess this, in terms of -- and maybe put some deliverables, you know?

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you, Glenn. Sally, please go ahead.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sally Costerton. Wow! Thank you all. Great inputs. So, you raise a lot of interesting things and what I'm hearing -- trying to summarize a couple of key points, and then I'll share some

activities that we are looking at, internally, which I hope that we will, you know, we'll be able to give you some ideas of what's coming down the track to try and -- because we're trying to solve the same problem really, Glenn, in the light of some of the things you've just be saying, but I'll come back to that in a minute. Sorry.

You talked about, especially, over here, some important philosophical issues, if you like. This question of, how do we protect the health of the multistakeholder model? This came up several times. We have this discussion internally. We spend a lot of time talking about it, worrying about it, protecting it -- and my team here in this room, but also the wider team -- maybe this is obvious, but if it isn't I want to restate it -- they come to ICANN for the same reasons that everybody else in this rooms to ICANN. It's the passion for the mission. I mean, it really is.

And that exists, absolutely, as much -- it runs through the veins of the staff at ICANN -- ICANN.org -- just as much as it does everywhere else in the community. You find people who care very, very much about exactly this issue: How do we make sure that we are being very fair, and that we are being very balanced? And the way we set up the function, the engagement function in the first place, was done on a very equitable basis -- not on the size of the regions, or how money they spent with ICANN

through the contracted parties, you know, it's always been designed to be very equitable, in terms of how the resources are spread around the world.

And I think you're right; I think it's a very good, "watch out," to say if we just let things wash over us, if we just focus only on process, we will end up somewhere, where people who come to ICANN are retired -- to your point, Sébastien, they don't need to go to work. They are able to fund themselves to participate in ICANN.

I think you made a good point, also, Sébastien, which is a very real issue about being time-poor. I mean, the amount of hours the volunteer communities -- not everybody -- but many people in the volunteer communities choose to put in to the work of ICANN, is really very significant.

And that doesn't work for me. If that's the threshold that means you can only be successful; you can only be contributive to the ICANN community because you get on phone calls for 30 or 40 hours a week, on top of what you do the rest of your time; and you are, in most cases, doing that in a time zone that doesn't suit you; and, in many cases, in a language that it is not your first language. We are making barriers, worryingly, high.

So, the focus on projects like ITI, on plain English -- on readouts, for example, which somebody mentioned over here -- is designed to help us to overcome some of those barriers, and to take ICANN to the stakeholders, not just to expect stakeholders to come to us. Does that get more challenging in a resource-constrained environment? Yeah. I mean, it just does. And I think it would quite naïve to say that it doesn't. What it's forcing us to do, as the organization, is to be more creative. You can't just throw more money at the problem or, frankly, more people, which is the same thing.

So, recruiting new staff into ICANN, now, is extremely difficult. I don't know if this is known, but it's not a secret -- even if we want to fill a backfill, if somebody leaves, now, we have to go and -- you have to go through many hoops, including have a, potentially, very lengthy discussion with Göran, personally. Doesn't matter how junior that person is, how little they're earning, that is where we are, and that is right in my view.

That is about being a responsible steward, and it is about sharing the impact of the flattening budget, you know, around not just in the community, but in the organization, as well. But, of course, that has an impact on the communities -- a tough one. Because part of helping you is often bringing more people into the regional teams to help you to do better outreach, to help you

to produce more content, to help you to do more readouts -- these actually -- it's all very well us saying, "Let's do readouts."

But there's quite a lot of mechanics involved with doing a readout. You need a location, you need to invite people, you need content, you have to get to that city, you have to set up an Adobe room. You may need translations. You, then, need somebody to run that meeting. You want to follow-up with that meeting.

So, there's some content that needs to be created -- all these things cost money -- somebody, money and time. So, I think you make extremely thoughtful and helpful points about reminding me not to forget that if we don't pay attention to that even-handedness about the resource allocation, we will end up in a place that none of us wants to be -- where we do not see a true multistakeholder contribution to ICANN, and that is not what is our mission -- that is not our mission. The mission is very clear.

And it's clearly spelled out, which stakeholder groups need to be part of the ICANN policy-making process. It is not vague in the new bylaws. The question about the work of the ALS, Alberto, very interesting what you were saying -- it's a really well-made point and, Glenn, you made the same point -- what you're really saying is, "Look guys, we actually do a lot of this really well," and Satish, as well: Please don't make it harder for us? Please don't

make Alberto go back to his ALS and say, “Look I know you’re working really hard, but I’m just going to take away the thing that I’ve been giving you for the last two years to make it a little easier”?

And the CROP budget is a relatively small amount of money; I’m aware of that. But I also know that it goes a long way, and it was designed to do just that. It was never designed to be one mega-program like the fellowship. It was designed to be a whole series of very small, tactical support dollars that would very localized activities to happen. So, we need to, as a staff team, help you to do that in different ways. One of the ways that we are increasingly focused on -- the team here is spending a lot of time with me and also with David Conrad’s team -- is to accelerate the rollout of capacity-building initiatives, online.

So, as you all know, we have a new version of ICANN Learn. I have fought tooth-and-nail to protect some dollars for maintaining and growing that, because I know that for all of you this is a critical tool. It allows you to, for example, run a readout session or your own capacity-development sessions. It’s easier to do in multiple languages, and the platform we’re using now is a very good fit for our technical training.

And there are two areas where we have a spike in demand for training and capacity development. One is internet governance,

as you rightly say, and this was mentioned several times here. And there are many good courses on internet governance available, particularly, actually, from ISOC. They have a very good online suite of training and, in fact, in the Asia Pacific internet governance school, we've partnered closely with ISOC, and shared that content in our sessions.

So, we need to be very smart about sharing things that already exist that makes sense. I mean, ICANN doesn't have -- internet governance is not just an ICANN topic. The other big spike is technical training. And, particularly, from non-technical audiences, which is, I suppose, obvious, but this is, for example, very true with governments -- when you think about the healthy functioning of the ICANN model, and the importance of the good participation in the GAC -- not just showing up, but being able to understand what's going on and to participate and take that back to the government from which you have come.

Very, very important that we make sure that our GAC members are comfortable and well-trained in the subject of ICANN core technical mission. Really important. And not just governments by any means, but also many different other stakeholders want us to now help to train them on ICANN's technical mission and issues like domain-name abuse, which, of course, extends way

beyond just our mission and right out into the broader cybersecurity sphere.

So, we are using a combination of a train the trainer program, internally, so we will have more of my team, some of whom are in this room, will be ready to come to the country they're in with you, the region they're in -- we want just be relying on bringing John Crain or Dave Piscitello out from Los Angeles, we will be able to do more of that in a localized environment, face-to-face, but we are investing a great deal of time and energy in putting up more content, online, that will allow both users to directly come to ICANN Learn, but what I hope will also happen -- and we will engage with you to make sure you're equipped to talk about this in your own regions -- that you can encourage participation, as you do your engagement.

The final comment I wanted to make was about metrics. This is a very well-made point. This is a difficult issue. It's an essential issue, however. Because actually, I mean, you know, Glenn said, look we have to be accountable -- and we spend a lot of time in my team focused on this. We expect to be held accountable for what we do. We always are. We have striven -- is that a word? [CROSSTALK] strived -- strived -- striven and strived -- to improve the way we report on what we do as a team, but really what we

need to do is to be able to measure participation in ICANN. I mean, that's the Holy Grail.

And it's very hard, actually. It's harder than I ever thought when I started on this exercise -- I'm sure even talked to some of you about it over the last two or three years -- because we have to be able to capture people at each stage of their relationship with ICANN, and now, we must do that in a way that is compliant with data-privacy regulation, obviously -- that goes without saying -- but that is essential.

And we must do it in a way that it actually means something. I'm not convinced that you would thank me if all I do is set up systems to measure a process. I mean, we need a bit of that, because you want to be confident that the machine actually works. But, really, what we all want to measure is outcomes. That's really what we're trying to do here. So, what happened as a result?

And one of the comments that I've seen in the public comment on the budget, which will fall to my team to answer, is: "When you do an engagement activity, what happens?" This is what you said, Glenn -- "I go and have a coffee with somebody." But what happened? Why is that a good use of ICANN's money? Whether you did it, Glenn, or I did it, or Humberto did it; it does matter. We're spending ICANN's money and we're, ultimately,

accountable to the people that provide money -- really, when you think about it -- to explain what happened. And it's much easier said than done.

I am fairly happy that we are almost there. You'll see more reporting from the engagement team up in the new accountability -- the next few versions of the accountability indicators, so keep a lookout for that. But I think I just wanted to sort of reassure you -- we haven't lost focus on that. We cannot lose focus on it. We must not lose focus on it. Just because it's difficult, doesn't mean it's not important. And using more online tools makes it easier, of course, to measure a journey, an outcome. But using more online tools brings with it quite a lot of complexity about people's agreement with that. There needs to be a lot of clarity about, what data do we hold, what are we doing with that, can people take themselves out of that process?

So, I know you all understand that, because you spend a lot of time thinking about data-privacy issues, I know. But, unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on your point of view, this is absolutely interwoven with this question about measuring outcomes. We must get this right.

So, please keep asking me. Keep holding me and my team accountable for this issue, because we won't give up until we've got it -- cracked it, and we are getting much, much closer, and I

don't think -- and I say this with -- I'm hoping this -- there are no reasons from a budget perspective, that I'm currently aware of, why that shouldn't happen. We're more in the stage of getting through compliance gates, rather than turning off the money tap. Because just the platforms that we need to measure are not new.

As I think many of know, we use Salesforce, so we have an existing system, and we want to make that much more visible and part of the community outreach work. That was rather a long answer, but I hope that it summarized the general points that were raised, and if there's anything that anybody else would like to ask me or my team, please fire away.

CHRIS MONDINI:

Hi, it's Chris Mondini. I just wanted to chime in and also join Sally in thanking you for all of the comments. And as your host, or co-host, with Rodrigo -- I just wanted to say, looking at some of the questions you've raised, and looking at the environment in which we find ourselves, and stepping back and looking at it strategically, we have sort of the injection of some discipline of being careful about resources.

At precisely the time that we are looking at enabling many of the people that you have brought to the door to be more active

participants and contributors to ICANN policy processes, and so, a couple of the things that I have raised, I think are those enablers that we might be looking for.

So, the ICANN Learn platform, which Sally mentioned; that's also your platform. It's an open platform to produce content. And I heard many of you talk about building community, and I also heard John talk about having stickiness of content and message. So, the story of: Why participate: Why be active? What's at stake? Why am I here? Why am I dedicating the time and the effort?

This is all, potentially, content, which you can create from where you sit. Because we need that content, and we need it from various stakeholder categories, and the great thing about At-Large is that you really encompass all of them, as users. And so, to the extent that the creation of a compelling story and content -- which we can add to all these existing challenges we have to get it out -- that's something that I think will require time and hard thinking, but it's something that I think would be compelling to bring us to this next level of enabling participation.

Similarly, speaking from the North America perspective, the readout sessions -- which, again, I have to thank Asia Pacific for leading the way and coming up with this concept -- but whether

we have Judith in New York, or Glenn in Ottawa, you know, they are giving the best example of what it's like to participate among people that are in a smaller group, that are going through an agenda that's ICANN-topic-based, like: What were the big things discussed at the meeting, and why should you care?

And in a small enough group with sort of locals to ask questions and feel safer about it, and feel like you can really get involved -- I'm sitting in a, you know, in a cube in Washington, D.C. -- like peering into a camera trying to convey what ICANN -- as sort of the introduction, you know, five minutes, and providing the mechanics that Sally talked about -- the Adobe room, you know - - the team helps with all of that -- but, again, that was a very creative way to say, "Okay, you know, we have people throughout the region that have neighbors that have an interest in learning more about ICANN."

And so, the readout sessions have been very powerful. And then just, lastly, on metrics, too, you know, I have to salute the North America team, because we had quite a frank discussion about this idea that we wanted to start looking at: Who's submitting public comments? Who's signing up for working groups? Who's getting onto a review team?

And these weren't things that we measured in the region before, but they are things that are measured now. I think Sally alluded

to the fact that, now, we have the challenge -- you know, it's one thing to sign up for a working group, but then, how do you measure that somebody's going to, you know -- oh, that person's being active in the working group?

I also in my role, though, I work across the SO/AC structure, so I see the submissions from the commercial stakeholder constituencies, and I see them from civil society, and I have to say, they're all submitting engagement strategies, and they all have metrics and KPIs -- so, this is something that has developed, really, over the last two years.

And so, the culture, and the language, and the comfort with looking for ways to measure outputs is something that we've embraced, and so I fully endorse what you're saying, Glenn, and Sally's remarks on that, as well. I'm happy to take questions, too.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you very much for that, Christopher. And thank you very much, Sally. I think your reflections -- I'm speaking for myself -- were very useful and interesting. We have three cards up. I can see Tijani, Olivier, and Evin -- is that remote? It's two minutes until the coffee break. Are you okay, Sally, if we maybe run a little over time? Okay. Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. Now, to precise issues. First of all, commenting on what Glenn said, I think that the CROP is, perhaps, the only program that have everything Glenn spoke about. Means that it must be the -- the three must inline with guidelines of the CROP; it must be inline with the RALO or the community strategy on outreach and engagement; and at the end, the traveler have to submit an evaluation report.

So, I think it is the best -- so far, it is not best, in general, but so far, it is what the community make the best. See, this is only a comment. Coming back to my -- you are speaking about capacity building -- do you know that At-Large have a group, a working group on capacity building? And do you know that we are, yearly, making between, let's say -- between 10 and 12 webinars for our communities, and we tried, and we are still trying, and I think we will manage to use the platform for these webinars -- for two reasons.

First because I think it much better than the Adobe Connect and the second reason is to make people go to this platform and find -- know that there is a facility that they can use. So, capacity building, I think, it is a very good thing, but it doesn't replace the other activities. I would like to ask about the discussion you found that we have, now, with the RALOs for the ALSs -- do you

plan to improve it since the CROP, it seems that it will be removed -- do you think that you have to improve it, to change the purpose, to change the way it is done, so that we can do other thing?

SALLY COSTERTON: Tijani, I just -- on that last point, can I just ask Heidi to take that? Because it's a very specific question, and I want to make sure we answer it. [Inaudible] confusing me, the budget for this is actually held by the policy team.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. This is Heidi. So, as you may remember, the finance and budget's committee submitted in Fiscal Year '19, digital budget request, to double the current amount. So, we'll need to see if that is approved, and possibly, also, if the CROP is not at all -- if it's totally eliminated, then perhaps investigate if that funding could be -- the criteria could be slightly stretched to allow for, you know, more than local travel. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Heidi. Yes. To your other points, Tijani -- yes, thank you on the point of capacity building -- yes, we are, of course, very well aware of the At-Large capacity-building activities and I

think the teams in the regions are very closely involved in helping to deliver those, or not always, but -- and, yes, I don't want to leave the impression with this group that I, or my team, believe that capacity building -- so, if we deliver a fabulous capacity building on ICANN Learn, somehow that's enough.

But what I -- rather the point that I'm trying to communicate or trying to share, is that have put it online, so that it can scale, and it can scale affordably, and by topic, and by language. And that is a critical way of responding. It is a particular way to respond to a more constrained financial environment, but not reduce the amount available. That's the point I was trying to make. So, I hope that was not confusing.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Olivier, can you keep it brief, please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Bastiaan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I'm so happy to be on this side, now, and I'm the one who can ramble on. Just on the points that you were making earlier, Sally -- I absolutely agree with all of the points that you've made, and I think that we're pretty much aligned with what you're saying.

The concern that we have in our community is that there are some parts of ICANN, in particular -- let's be -- let's name them -- the Contracted Parties House that are basically saying, "Yep, we have to do some drastic cuts." And all of this global stakeholder engagement and all of this outreach is -- and I quote -- "bullshit."

And so, we are really up against some very hardcore pushback on some of this. And so, I think part of the reason why we're asking this -- Is there flexibility in GSE with your regional vice presidents, for example, to be able to continue the same level of support that has been taking place? Or is that being cut drastically, too?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Olivier. You raise such an important question. Two different points there. The first one, I can only give you -- as they say in ICANN -- my personal view. But I'm conscious I'm on the record -- and at ICANN we're always, all, on the record, aren't we? Even if it's just on Twitter. We are so aware, as staff, that we have to strive to balance the discussion. All the time, all the time.

So, not just to balance access, which is something that I can do something about -- that's about how you divide the cake -- and

whatever cake you have, you can choose how you divide it, you know? But the question about -- the question you raise goes to the heart of ICANN's structure.

You know, this is the place in the world, where the civil society groups sit down with law enforcement agencies, and there are not many places where that happens. But it happens here. If the only people that came to ICANN were the contracted parties, it wouldn't be ICANN. It's now how ICANN was determined and how the bylaws work.

So, I recognize the sensitivity and the feeling of being judged, perhaps, if I could put it that way. And I think there are two responses I would make to that. One is to talk about metrics, again. It is so important that we demonstrate in hard data, in terms of outcomes, in terms of participation, which is very much what Chris was saying -- What happens? What our model delivers? And not just the At-Large, but the whole model. It's critical.

That's why we can't take our foot off that particular issue, probably, ever. Because it is inevitable that you are going to see those tensions in a community that is structured like this. You have one group that is -- in quotes "giving us the money," they're words, not mine. And the rest of us, in a way, who are accountable for deploying that against the mission, including

them. That is always going to introduce tensions. But the more we can share common-objective data that shows how what we do contributes to the mission -- all of us do, together -- the more we will be able to keep the emotion out of those debates.

Now, the other thing I wanted to mention on this is the fellowship program because the contracted parties have certainly tackled me, directly, in public, at ICANN meetings, saying: Well, Sally, we have this fellowship program and, hey, where are all these people? We're all exhausted.

We want people to come and pick up the pen -- I'm paraphrasing to make a point -- which is an entirely valid question, and I just wanted to remind you that we have -- the staff and I have asked for and kicked off a consultation process with the SO/AC structures, so Alan and you will know -- you will be aware of this -- that we have asked for quite a lot of detailed feedback on the program, as a whole.

Not the size of the program, although, you can comment on the size of the program -- and there are plenty people that are commenting on it, one way or another, especially at the moment -- but, perhaps, more importantly, on the efficacy, on the efficiency -- the, if you will, the sort of productivity. I know that's a horrible word. The stickiness, to use John's word, of the program. The pull-through.

Other things we should do about the way we run the program to improve the benefits that that program brings to ICANN. And I think that it not just for -- of course, that is not just for the At-Large. But if you think about the logic and the original purpose of the fellowship program, I think that it has a particular affinity with this group.

So, please do give -- through your structure here in At-Large -- please do tell us what you think. The fellows, themselves, have contributed to that, very effectively, so we know what they think is important. And one of the things they want is to be included more proactively in the regional outreach programs. So, my team know that, but also that's something for you to know. Because you're all very engaged in regional programs, and they want to be plugged in, in a more, sort of, structured way than we do today into those programs.

So, the second question you asked me, I'll be very -- you asked me to -- well, somebody said, please be direct, so I'll be direct. As time marches on, the way that money is spent to support community activity has to be done in a completely transparent way.

So, I just want to use this opportunity to be really clear that any money that is spent by the organization, whether it's the program Heidi's talking about, whether it's to sponsor travelers

to events, anything like this, they must be transparent and open. They must not be, in any way, I don't know what the right word is -- you know, sort of behind closed doors -- it isn't how we can be in the future. I mean, we haven't really been like that in the past -- I'm not suggesting we have, but any decisions we make about the way we use -- and I mean we -- us together -- use these resources that ICANN has -- these dollars -- that has to be done in a very public way.

I just wanted to mention that, because I know that that isn't always convenient. It isn't always as fast as you would like, but I know that you all understand the reason for that. And that is a very important part of our -- fulfilling our bylaws. Especially, our new bylaws of accountability and transparency -- and that is a duty for all of us that have any say, actually, in how any money is spent. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Evin, we're always 10 minutes into coffee break -- is this the remote? Do we want to give him or her the opportunity to --

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yeah. We actually have four questions from the chat. [CROSSTALK] But they're two questions from two people. So, if we have time, I could at least ask one, or --

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: We're already -- yeah -- like maybe you can put them in writing and forward them, or whatever, because we're already 10 minutes into the coffee break and I know a couple of people have to leave now.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Sure. I'll at least state them for the record, and then --

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Okay.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Okay. The first two are from Daniel K. Nanghaka. He says, "CROP has been shifting its focus with regional strategies, changing their focus from just reaching out to engagement. I believe this is not the best time to threaten the community with removing the program in its core transition. I believe when those who dropped the idea of CROP had some ideas when

throwing this core of community engagement and outreach. How does this team expect to achieve the core milestones and the fact that regional outreach strategies have got to be drafted? The constrained resources affect the core community.”

And the follow-up to that is, “If the CROP budget is small, then why should you cut down the small budget and not cut down on the travel budget and consolidate some travels?”

And then the last two questions are from Olawale Bakare. He says, “Is there a mechanism ICANN plans to use in measuring the type of projects that At-Large execute, either regionally or globally, specifically, impacts of the projects on core ICANN mission, or not on the end-users perspectives?” He means a new mechanism, different to the existing ones. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. Thanks. I was just saying to Maureen, the latter one will need to be coming from the ALAC leadership. The first one, yes, I hear the comment and the suggestion, and it’s very helpful. Thank you.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Excellent. Well, apologies. We’re way over time; the coffee break is almost over. But I sincerely want to express my

gratitude to our guests, also for their time, their input. And thank you very much all of you, now, for a very interactive discussion -- all the questions. There's one important announcement I do want to make before we close this session -- one of our interpreters has his birthday today. So, I want to congratulate Jack. Many happy returns. And I close the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]