
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ok, let's go. So good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the At-Large webinar on accountability and transparency on the work of the Accountability and Transparency review team. Today is the Wednesday the 15th of May, and the time is 1903 UTC. We have exactly an hour to be able to give you a little more information what the ATRT does and certainly more information on the current ATRT-2 survey that is taking place, the public comment period that is going on at the moment. It's important that we relay the message over to our ALSes and one of the aims of this meeting is to give you the regional leadership and interested At-Large members more information about what the ATRT does and be able to provide you with some knowledge so that you can actually bring some input to this current public comment period. I was hoping and still am hoping actually that the RALO themselves will be able to submit some responses themselves so we will just have to hope that this is going to be a good result I guess from this call. A quick Intro from Gisella please, if you can just give us the housekeeping for this call.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much Olivier. I won't be doing a roll call on this webinar but if I could just remind everyone that we do have interpretation in French and Spanish. Our French interpreter this evening is Claire and our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and David. If I could please remind you to state your names when speaking not only for transcript purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other

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.

language channel and please also do speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you, over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you very much Gisella for this quick intro on the housekeeping. Without any further ado, I'm presenting to you, there's Brian Cute who is on the call. Now he was the Chair of the first ATRT that took place a few years and he is now the Chair of the ATRT-2. There's also Alan Greenberg who is the second representative that was chosen from At-Large to be on the ATRT. I'm the other one, so the three of us are here to be able to answer your questions and I believe that Avri Doria might be joining us a little bit later, hopefully she will be able to do so as well. She is also on the ATRT and she has come in from the GNSO side. So first thing I guess is really a little feedback, a little sort of review and summary of what the ATRT does and some of the main points that have come out from ATRT-1, the first Accountability and Transparency Review Teams work, and for this I am going to ask if Brian, since you were there in person, you'd be able to give us a good summary of what effectively has happened until now with the ATRT and what it does and really start from basics because I can remember when the first ATRT started and we had Cheryl Langdon-Orr on there, she did an enormous amount of work to explain to us what was going on and what the work was enticing and prior to her explaining I must say I have absolutely no idea whatsoever, so Brian you have the floor. And at the moment I am not able to hear you so I don't know whether you are on the Adobe or are you speaking or maybe I am the one who has been cut off, I don't know. Otherwise in the meantime we can ask someone who was on the first ATRT and that's Cheryl Langdon-Orr. So perhaps we'll

do this in the meantime, so whilst you get on the call using audio or even a dial out, then maybe I can ask Cheryl to give us a quick intro of what the ATRT does if that's okay. Sorry to put you on the spot Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Not at all. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all of you and Brian will be us joining shortly so I'll hand over to him. ATRT-1 of course is the very first of the Accountability and Transparency Review Teams, so it is also the very first of the review teams that were brought into play after the signing of the Affirmation of Commitment, the AoC, between ICANN and the US government. In the Affirmation of Commitment which was a major maturation point along the lines of our growing internationalization and greater independence of ICANN which was a very important piece of negotiation which had taken quite some time to work out. In this new affirmation of what we were going to do in terms of managing the numbers and naming resources on the internet, there was this thing called review teams that were an essential part in that relationship. These review teams are independent review teams, they have specific topics that they need to look at, key focus areas of ICANN and their role is to use wide community based selected individuals who interact with ICANN and the external community but usually within the internet community and assess exactly how ICANN is doing. The first one which was about Accountability and Transparency was focusing on the board and board mechanisms, the GAC and GAC-board interaction and to a slightly lesser extent some of the mechanisms which were used internal to ICANN regarding policy development and communication processes and if I've filibustered long enough, is Brian on the line?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I wouldn't call it filibustering but yes Brian we can hear you, so welcome, and Brian I'm not sure whether you've heard the past intro that Cheryl has done on the ATRT-1, whether you could just fill in and take it from there please.

BRIAN CUTE: Sure, my apologies for the hiccup there, and that's not the first time that Cheryl has saved my back so thank you Cheryl for that. I am very happy to be here, thank you for calling this meeting, I'll just follow on to Cheryl's introduction. In terms of ATRT-2 we are at the first phase of our work, we have to provide recommendations to the ICANN board by December 31, 2013 and one piece of what we have to do is in fact to review ICANNs implementation of recommendations from the prior review teams, so the ATRT-1 as Cheryl was outlining for you, the WHOIS review teams recommendations, and the Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team' recommendation, so one piece of our work is to review how well ICANN implemented those recommendations and what effect, positive, neutral or negative the implementation may have had and where they have not been implemented, explore the reasons why and factor that into our recommendations. The other very important piece of our work are any new issues that should be the subject of accountability and transparency, as Cheryl noted, to some degree ATRT-1 addressed policy issues within ICANN, but looking at the PDP for example as one area that the ATRT-2 may take on as a new issue for the focus of assessment of accountability and transparency and potentially a recommendation to ICANNs board. So those are the two buckets if you will, of work that we have to undertake. What's important at this point is that we are in our data collection phase and

just to give you an overview of the arc of our work, we between now and the end of August 2013 or the first half of September 2013, will be in full data collection mode. We will interact with the community in a structured way in Durban, all the SOs and ACs, we have request for public comment that are out now and we may engage an independent expert to assist us in data analysis, gathering an analysis, and then in early to mid October 2013 we will issue draft proposed recommendations to the community for public comment, and again there will be an opportunity for the community to provide us feedback that will help shape those recommendations, so we are at a critical stage now of data collection and let me thank you At-Large for proactively engaging at this point, not all the ACs and SOs do that, and making yourself aware of the request for public comments and for making yourself available to provide inputs to the process as it is critically important that we get all the inputs we need to give a wholesome review. So that's the arc of our work. I won't belabor the internet further and turn it back to you Olivier so we can have some healthy discussion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Brian. One just quick question before we engage on the actual questions and can focus on some of the questions which are asked in the ATRT-2 the question that the public comment that is going on at the moment. The ATRT itself formulates recommendations, where does this go from there? Does it get sent to the board, are these recommendations that are binding, are these just recommendations? How does it fit with overall review process that all of ICANN is always subjected to with the reviews that go on for each SO and AC?

BRIAN CUTE:

That's a great question Olivier, and it is very helpful to establish or also assist with perceptions in the community and in the broader environment. They are recommendations in their nature. The ICANN board is not bound to accept and implement any given recommendation, and in fact in the early process of ATRT-2, what we are asking for explicitly from ICANN staff and board in part is tell us if a given recommendation either by its design in terms of what it was asking you to do or if the ATRT-1 gave you an implementation date, was somehow flawed that the resources required to fully implement this recommendation were not available that legal issue that prevented or created obstacles to implementation in a timely fashion or fully. We really do want to understand if ICANN is to have a healthy review process then the recommendations need to be well designed and well founded, so a long winded way of saying no, the ICANN board is not obligated. However, the ICANN board did implement, accept all of the recommendations of ATRT-1 and the board and staff and GAC went about with this trying to implement them. I think there is a sense that the review team process, as Cheryl noted, with volunteers from across the community as it is structured under the Affirmation of Commitments, should produce worthwhile recommendations that ICANN should take on board. That's the most I would say on that point. I do want to note a couple of things though, particularly for the At-Large members and I'm sorry I didn't do this already but Alan Greenberg is one of the Vice Chairs as is Avri Doria and Lise Fuhr, and I will also add that Olivier very graciously has offered to be the Chair of work group 1 which will be reviewing the implementation of ATRT-1 recommendations and so we are very happy that he is taking that leadership role in our process as well. Olivier back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Brian. I have just put a link to the Adobe Connect with regards to the Affirmation of Commitment. You have mentioned that on several occasions and it appears, well it is certainly is the case that the mandate of this review team is partly I guess, or at least the first review team was directly related to the Affirmation of Commitment themselves and the part that it was looking at specifically was 9.1 on that page and sharing accountability and transparency in the interest of global internet users, and I think you will find that there is much interest in this part of ICANN for this to happen. I wondered whether I can give the floor to Alan Greenberg for a few words, whether Alan wanted to add a few points to what you have added, what you've said Brian. Alan, are you here?

ALAN GREENBERG: I am indeed here. Yes a couple of points, first of all Brian said that Olivier is chairing the first work stream which is reviewing ATRT-1, that work stream is also looking at other issues which ATRT-1 did not have a chance to look at, several of which may well be of interest to ALAC, so it is a little bit wider than that and I thank Olivier for doing that too. The list of questions that we put out is a long and complex one and I guess I want to caution people not to get put off by that. The list of subjects the ATRT-2 is looking at is in essence is the GAC and the board functioning well, is there are good process for getting input from the public, and one of the particular new issues is the policy development process and you can take that as the formal PDP or just the generic policy development process working well on ICANN. If it isn't, what's wrong and what should we do. There's another issue of does ICANN have access to sufficient volunteers to allow it to do its work. So those are

very crucial issues regarding whether ICANN can function, I mean the whole concept of a bottom-up model means the people are available and the processes are available to do the work, and ATRT is looking at that. In addition we are also reviewing the board and ICANNs implementation of the WHOIS review and the SSR review and I don't think there has been a lot of involvement in At-Large and ALAC with the SSR review, but WHOIS has been of significant interest to At-Large and I would be surprised if there are no comments on that front. So those are the kind of things that I think we are certainly looking for any input, but those are the areas that At-Large and ALAC has been very interested in and it would be a shame if we did not get substantive input on those particular areas. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. The question that we have had here from Yaovi on the chat is whether we believe that many people will send feedback using just the public comment procedure. I think it is hoped that there will be some feedback and certainly a lot of input and one of the reasons why this very webinar is taking place is to try and stimulate some feedback from our community. As Alan has said, there are several points which are directly related to the work that this community tries to do and feels particularly strongly about. I am not sure whether this community would be able to bring much input to the questions whether GAC is functioning well, but certainly the input from the public is working well is one point which is, is the public going to be quiet, well we probably have an answer for that, but there needs to be at least some feedback exactly as Evan mentions in the chat. So really we are at this point where the public comment has been opened for a while and

there hasn't been very much input into this so we will just start here to answer any questions that there might be over the actual questions about the questions if you want, or maybe expand on some of the questions which are there. Brian do you wish to kind of take us through some of the points which you think might be of specific interest or you particularly need fit in here or maybe shall I just open the floor for questions?

BRIAN CUTE:

Actually open the floor for questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, so let's do that. Thank you, Brian. So I open the floor for questions. You've got the link over to the ATRT-2 Wiki page, you've got the link to the actual public comment and the set of questions that are in there, and I just open the floor right now if anyone has questions, otherwise will be going through specific points of the questionnaire.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much Olivier. Whilst I'm rebooting my computer because Adobe Connect is being somewhat difficult at the moment, I am trying again to get back into the room, I apologize for not using the technology efficiently. I did want to first of all ask a question and secondly raise a point more for the encouragement of the individuals and the region to fill in this rather extensive survey. First of all, the question is and I know the answer, but I am asking it because I want to be put to the record, it is a very extensive survey gentleman but do I have to fill out everything or can I pick and choose? Is there a minimum

amount I need to respond to? Is it going to be statistically useful to you if some of us just put anything or do we have to put everything when filling out this survey? And then the comment is looking at of course Section 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments, which I believe and once everyone has read and digested it yet again, and those of you who haven't read it I would highly recommend that you do, it's pretty much a mantra as far as I'm concerned about what the At-Large community and its involvement in ICANN should be doing and what ICANN should be doing to be a good corporation in this global internet world, so it's not just important, it is critical that we as a community interact in this particular second round process, particularly because it is focusing on the mechanisms by which the opinions which as the At-Large structures we exist to find out and facilitate the funneling of into ICANN. I mean we are there for little else, so if we don't do this, one wonders why we exist but what At-Large actually does. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. I see Alan and then Brian. So Alan Greenberg first.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give Cheryl the answer that she knows anyway. You can respond to anything that you think is appropriate and that you have input on, so you can pick and choose or you could do it all, and moreover if you have input that you believe is relevant to the ATRT that is focused on the applicable section of the AoC and we didn't ask a question on it, you could give us input.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Next is Brian.

Brian CUTE: Thank you and to follow up on those points, what Cheryl said was critical. Paragraph 9.1 of the AoC really is the scope of work of this review team and so I want to add a couple of points. As I said before, the review team has to review ICANNs implementation or recommendations from the three prior review teams. It also has to address new issues, and as Alan pointed out, there are specific new issues that are already the focus of the different work streams, but that being said, those new issues do need to map to Paragraph 9.1, and that's a checkpoint for all of us. And then also, this review team will be providing a report and some recommendations with respect to the review process overall and how well that is done. So, again as Alan said, if you can only answer one question on the survey, please do so. Any input is welcome. But those again are the three basic areas - new issues, review of implementation and how well is the review process itself working to the extent you can provide more inputs and more answers and observations, that's even better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Brian, is there a possibility for inputs to be outside the actual questions that are being asked, in other words free writing, you know prose basically, rather than just answering some of the questions which are asked there?

BRIAN CUTE:

Well, sure, and as you know we decided to maintain an email address to the extent that someone wants to provide anonymous inputs as well, so if you go to the Wiki there is an email address for input, there's an email address I believe for anonymized input as someone has talked about the notion of whistleblower. So yes, this is an open process, input can be received at any time, in any fashion really.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you Brian. Any other questions? Okay, so I don't see anyone jumping up and down at the moment with excitement, and I'd like them to jump up and down with excitement, so I thought maybe we would focus on a few of the questions which were asked in there. Certainly the amount of public input, for example, I mean you see here on a scale of 1 to 10, so we are looking at 9.1C, question number 9 on the survey, on a scale of 1 to 10, what is your assessment of the process by which ICANN receives public input and whether ICANN is continually assessing and improving these processes as specified in the affirmation. This of course would question number 10 which relates to the public comment mechanism which is exactly one gripe that this community has, being able to reach out to their ALSes and reaching out to the edges takes a lot of time and takes a lot of energy, I guess, and especially when one starts looking at other languages, we do have on this call Spanish speakers and we also have French speakers. The sort of question that is asked here is just on a scale, is there any possibility for actual explanations to be included in those answers? And maybe I should point this question to Brian, if you're still here?

BRIAN CUTE: Yes, when you say explanation to the answers do you mean within the survey of the public comments or the actual new comments processes?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The survey itself effectively gives you boxes to fill in. Whether you are on the paper survey or the sort of electronic survey or the one that you actually go to the website and it sort of generates the question and you just tick or click boxes, is there a way to actually add additional comments on those questions that are being asked?

BRIAN CUTE: I believe so. On the survey tool itself, and I believe that staff had added a comment box, at least for some questions for elaboration. Clearly a qualitative sense of how well ICANN is doing in a particular item on our 1 to 10 scale is useful data that we will look at in the aggregate but also qualitative observations about and in particular the effect of the implementation of our recommendation. Again, the overarching goal here is the improvement in accountability and transparency and what is very useful is observation about the effect on accountability, whether it is positive, neutral or negative by the implementation of the recommendation and transparency as well. So I believe there is an opportunity there for elaboration Olivier in the survey tool and we welcome as much observation as anyone is willing to offer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Brian. Let me ask a question to the participants on this call. How many of you have actually gone or read through the whole set of questions that you can download from the

website? Cheryl is a given obviously. I see Holly has also done, so goodness the Australians are out in force, it seems to be. Brian?

BRIAN CUTE:

I just want to throw a couple of issues out there to the extent it might spark some interest. There are a few issues, one is kind of a backward looking at one of the recommendations in ATRT-1 and one is kind of a forward looking new issue. The first is, we have these new comment and reply comment vehicles that were instituted after a recommendation by ATRT-1, it has become clear from input from ICANN staff and others that these new tools do not appear to be bearing the fruits that was hoped, that the reply comment itself is not being used the way it is intended, that the breadth of argumentation on issues is not getting up to the staff and the board as was hoped, and therefore this one doesn't appear to be working on some level. Understanding how important public comment process is to ICANN and its policy development process, this is a big issue and this review team will take a very careful look at why these mechanisms don't appearing to be delivering the benefits that were intended and what might be done to ensure that they do, or are there other approaches that should be considered? So I throw that one out there as a very important one I know to At-Large and one that's already got the attention of the review team. Another one looking forward that is going to clearly get some attention is the issue of metrics. The first review team did not develop or recommend specific metrics to ICANN that it could use to measure the effectiveness of implementation and measure improvement in accountability and transparency. The first review team did put some dates on recommendations that is implemented-by this date, but left

metrics or the development thereof to ICANN. There is some good rationale for that, but at the end of the day, what we heard from Fadi and from staff in Los Angeles in our first meeting is that for better or for worse, metrics have not been developed or largely developed. This review team is going to take a careful look at the issue and may in fact make recommendations that speak to the adoption of metrics by ICANN. So I put that issue out front as one that has already garnered significant attention and may be of specific interest to At-Large as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Brian. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Olivier. The matter particularly that Brian raised although I do get very excited about metrics but I think I'm ignoring that and we might come back to that later Brian, the matter of the public input, the comment and reply comment as you might imagine, the At-Large community has a huge interest in this as do many of the sectoral interests within the ICANN world, most applies inside of ICANN, of course have a huge amount of their work involved in interacting with the public comment, but I would like to remind everybody that in fact the design that ATRT, Accountability and Transparency Review Team, number one put forward was one that we have modeled on a established and very successful tool used elsewhere in what I'll call the real world, in other words a world that isn't specifically involved in the internet, and it was a little bit puzzling for people like me to see that a somewhat variation on a same model was put into practice, but a very important part of what we asked for didn't happen and that was an

associated management and prediction tool of what we all know is a ridiculously large amount of calls for these public comments to come in, so part of the issue is not just the process of comment and reply comment itself, which I still think is currently a beast of burden, but I think we can turn it into a racehorse and probably train it to operate well for us all, but it will take community education and input to do that. But we still don't have a piece of the puzzle which is an advanced looking tool where we have an ability as a community and staff to look forward and go these are the things that are coming down the pipeline at us so that we can prepare and decide what to duck and cover for and what to get ready for. We also don't have any form of gauging or management of how many calls or public comment gets thrown out at the community and it appears to me as an observer now that any time anything gets hold in ICANN, and I am talking ICANN the organization rather than ICANN community, believes it needs to be taking its policy development to the next step, budget and strategic planning called public comment, now one of those is more relevant to the other, from the community point of view I'm pretty sure about, but we do have a deluge of these things coming at the community. I'm a member of a number of communities across ICANN, I'll be clear I'm not an active member in the naming and numbering of the ASO, it doesn't have me, but I do play in RIR, so I think other than the GAC I think I have got my finger in most pies. And what usually happens is terribly close to the end of these calls for public comment, the meetings are held in these communities and the communities go, "Oh quick, we need to put something together," "Oh, our processes take longer," "We'll put something in the reply section," or they will say "The reply section is open, we will put it now," and that is clearly a situation where ICANN

has not communicated effectively what the model is even supposed to do. I will stop now because I don't want to monopolize even though I'm passionate enough to try, but I am very fearful that a very good model unless it is given a little bit more time and a little bit resuscitation, may go down the tube here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Brian you have your hand up, do you wish to follow up on what Cheryl has said?

BRIAN CUTE: That's all, sorry Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Well in the meantime Garth Bruen has been typing in the Adobe Connect regarding some of the questions that have been asked that there are no links to the actual ATRT-1 recommendations. I mean the links are somewhere but I was going to ask maybe as an action for this call that Matt as a measure of priority beefs up the At-Large public comment page. We do have separate quality development pages and one has the public comment that links over to the ICANN public comment and therefore with this we could have the links to the ATRT-1 report, links to the various reports that are there, but of course there are links that comes from the ATRT-2 workspace as well, but anything that can help our regions. I see Garth has put his hand up? Garth, go ahead.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just entered this quickly in the chat but I think it might even be more effective to list what the recommendations of the ATRT-1 were and then ask the community to rate each from 1 to 10. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Garth. Yes, go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Because we can do pretty much whatever we want to on the Wiki, that might be another very valuable mechanism that Garth just raised. It is outside of the survey per se, but it would feed into the same data feed and I think it would be very valuable. Is it possible, Olivier, I wondered if Heidi could arrange for, probably Matt I would think, to create exactly that sort of table, and it could almost be a scale of 1 to 5 where we put a dot in somewhere between 1 to 5 or 1 to 3, where we think it has or has not been successfully implemented, because what that will do is take a community-looking view on these recommendations from ATRT-1 rather than what we are currently doing and that is seeing a staff-reported implementation matrix on all of these, which means there have been “buildings” put out there and hopefully people are aware of them. This will be an awareness level measure and I think what Garth has raised would be an extremely valuable thing if it was properly filled out by ALAC or at least the regional leaders of the At-Large community and the ALAC, then that would be a very interesting snapshot and one might be repeated in a timely manner with the other parts of the ICANN community if it was seen as valuable. Thank you for that Garth.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Alan Greenberg next.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just want to make sure we clarify and I wasn't 100% sure what Garth meant, whether he was talking about rating the recommendations or how well the recommendations have been implemented. The former is somewhat relevant if you deem the recommendations to have been unimplementable or perhaps even ill advised, but to a large extent we are looking at the implementation of the recommendations, so I wasn't 100% sure what Garth meant but whatever we do in a Wiki, we should make sure the questions we are asking are crystal clear so people are all answering the same question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Garth Bruen and then Brian Cute.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Just to respond to Alan, what I am referring to is that questions 1 and 2 refer to the ATRT-1 recommendations in trying to gauge people's opinion on whether those were implemented properly or effective, and rather than referring to a document people may not have access to or haven't read, is just to lay out those recommendations and then ask them to respond to a question in that format with the information written down.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understood that part, I just wanted to make sure the endpoint was clear. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, next is Brian Cute.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you Olivier. And Garth thank you, you raised an important point. In this case this may come across active but actually it is really important. Within the context of this review teams recommendations of the review process overall, one thing we have talked about is are there tools, survey tools or data collection tools that we could recommend or use and leave behind so that this review process is more efficient and wholesome and serves the community and serves the organization, and so a small point but an important point - if there are tools from metrics, input on metrics, survey tools, or best ways to structure these types of reports, that actually is good input to use for our final recommendations, so please keep that in mind.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Brian. And I note we are reaching the last 10 minutes of this call. I wanted to ask some of the other RALO leaders, I see Holly. Well first let's go over to Holly Raiche, do you have any questions specifically on the process? Garth has raised one thing and that's great. Is there any other question which you might have? The reason for this of course, I am going to ask the RALO leaders to drive this to our ALSes and drive this in their regions. I think that there cannot be just one point of view worldwide on all of these points and I would be interested in hearing really from the RALOs on this and that the RALOs are able to actually file answers. As we said earlier, you don't need to answer every single question in the survey, but pick your part that is important for your region. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't have questions having actually read it; I have a lot of comments, but my plan was for the next APRALO meeting to spend about at least 10 minutes saying please everybody read it, everybody read the questions particularly, and reply either individually or for ALS or tell me as Chair what you want APRALO to say. So I think this is a process all of us to undertake as Chairs of the RALOs, to get everybody coming in because I don't think what I think necessarily agrees with what everybody else thinks. But I don't have any questions so much as I just think I shouldn't be the only one along with Cheryl who has read it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl wants to jump in. Go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Sorry to jump in there Olivier, but we need to make it in a timely manner Holly and we are talking June 9, 2013 by closing and this APRALO meeting is at the very end of May and this what worries me. We would need another 30 to 45 days for the process you outlined in our region to work. Unfortunately, I fear for that, so I would perhaps suggest we might need to be proactive in the regions as well. Some of the regions will have their monthly meetings a little bit earlier in this cycle and they can probably do exactly as you are proposing. For our own APRALO region I fear for that particular model on the timing, and that doesn't mean we can't do it that way, it's just I would suggest we have to be proactive and do something perhaps akin to this webinar here, specifically at sort of a 0500 UTC time zone or something that is more appropriate for our region and actually get the input there. It is a very long survey and it isn't easy for example when you go into the

online one to know exactly how long you are going to have to commit to it, and that's very scary for busy people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. I believe you can skip questions even on the long ones. The first version we had you needed to fill up all the answers and then in the last review we had in Los Angeles we decided to take those red stars away and you could skip through questions. Has that not been implemented?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I may not have looked at it since then, sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Cheryl, thank you. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: A couple of answers, some of which my colleagues on the ATRT may not agree with. Number one, you are not committed to use the online survey. If you really wanted to answer a question halfway through, just answer it; email works, the standard comment form works. Cheryl was talking about the comment and reply period, the comment period officially ends in four days. Clearly we are not going to have a lot of time to do that. The comment reply period ends I believe June 9, 2013, but I will point out that although we really do need input as quickly as possible we are also going to be in input mode during the meeting in Durban. So if there is a drop-dead date by which you know we are not going to guarantee to really act on things that come in too late, we are

still in that data gathering mode in Durban, so yes, please try to address the comment period within the dates allowed but understand that if you have something important to say, say it anyway. If you say it much past Durban, it gets a bit dicey. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. I note some question from Dev Anand Teelucksingh on the Adobe Chat asking - what is the deadline for RALOs to submit possible answers to the questions asked by the ATRT-2? Now clearly, if we look at the initial common period of the ATRT-2 public comment period, it's only 4 days' time, I think there is not a chance in hell that this happens. I would say within the next 2 weeks, I would say if we get things out over to the ATRT-2 by the May 31, 2013, and I know that's not really playing very fair with the reply period and so on, but we know that's gone out the window already. If we get it there, what's important is that the committee, the ATRT-2 receives input and that's really important, so as long as the input is received by the end of the month and Brian please correct me if I'm wrong, but I would say it's better to have it late still during the public comment period, than not to have it at all.

BRIAN CUTE: Absolutely, I would agree 100% and the only other note I want to make because I know we are just about at the hour, is we are very much aware of how busy the At-Large and the community is with all of the new TLD work that is going on and we know that the community is focused on that and in that sense potentially distracted from this very critical work, so I concur with Olivier, please get in your comments. It

really doesn't matter how many questions, at what level you answer them, try to do it within the time frame but in any event, get them in and I would say get them in no later than the middle of September if you want them to be considered and factored into the draft recommendations that come out in October, that's really the drop-dead date.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Brian, and one more thing, I understand that the questions, the text version of the questions is available not only in English but also in the 6 UN languages or is it just Spanish and French as well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: More than the 6 UN languages, this I did check, the line tool has a huge list of languages.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But that's using the line tool. If one uses the actual text versions, I understand that they are both in Spanish and in French as well, I don't know whether it is in all the UN languages plus Australian, that's something that we will have to add at some point perhaps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No one ever writes Australian.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think we are reaching the end of the hour so we will probably let you all read through the documents in your own time. Just one quick

question - Can the answers to the Spanish version and the answers to the French version be in those languages Brian?

BRIAN CUTE: They should be, yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay perfect. So that's something that we have to push over to our regions and certainly in some ALSes, and some members in LACRALO and in AFRALO will be very interested by this. I thought I was going to ask for a quick feedback from Tijani Ben Jemaa in AFRALO, I don't see him, I think he might have dropped off the call, but any last questions? I see Cheryl you've put your hand up again?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Brian, one thing that bothered me when, I've now gone back into the survey tool, I was a little concerned, and I am pleased to say that you can skip through the questions, that when I go from the ICANN link, the very first thing I have to do is give my information, my name, my rank, my serial number, my affiliation and my email address, and if I am sitting particularly in some other places and spaces within the Asia-Pacific region, I am not going to be very comfortable doing that, and yet I still want to contribute. Now I did think and I did see Brian mention the anonymity option, the only way I can find an anonymity option is if I go directly to the line tool access point. Now that's fine accepting I know how to do it, not everyone does. It would be smart perhaps in the future if we make claims that we are making anonymity an easy option on these surveys, that we also have a link that would take us through

two things like just the questions because if you go in one way you end up looking as if you have to fill out name, rank and serial number and probably have your IP address captured, but if you go in the other way it is quite clear that you can just start doing the questions, and I'd really like that housekeeping done at some point in the not too distance future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Brian did mention earlier that there was an email address to which anonymous replies could be given. I just wonder perhaps that was not put in the public comment. The public comment is really for the public comment process, so maybe that is something that we would have to share with our community. I see it was not mentioned there. Okay, Brian, we are running out of time, it's 4 minutes past the top of the hour. Any last few points you'd like to make and then I'll let Alan also add a few words and we will probably close this call.

BRIAN CUTE: Just a plea for inputs from everybody from At-Large, from individuals, to the public comments, and please anticipate a structured interaction with At-Large in Durban, and ATRT-2 will communicate in advance and really look to have a healthy exchange there as well, and thank you all for this call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Brian for joining us, you've been very helpful. Alan, a few words?

ALAN GREENBERG: No I have nothing else to add. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Alan. Well thanks to all of you who have attended this call, of course this call will be both transcribed and also is recorded and I hope that those regions that have not been able to, or those leadership teams from regions that haven't been able to follow interactively will be able to listen to this because that is the task at hand, the regions need to fill this in. The next time I hear someone telling me ICANN does not listen to us, I will point them to this working group or to this PC and say, well, you didn't say anything when you were asked, so at least there is here a committee that is listening and that has the power to change things or at least make recommendations directly to the broad and seriously on these things. So that's how it goes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]