TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the ALAC Sub-Committee on Outreach Conference on Monday, 29ᵗʰ September 2014 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Pascal Bekono, Roosevelt King, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Roberto Gaetano, Siranush Vardanyan, Alan Greenberg, Murray McKercher and Glenn McKnight. We have apologies from Jacqueline Morris. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Kathy Schnitt, Joe Catapano and myself, Terri Agnew.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Terri. Welcome everyone to the ALAC Sub-Committee on Outreach call. On this call we're going to be looking at the post-ATLAS II AIs for outreach. This is what we're going to take the most time on. Just to introduce this issue, at the ATLAS II Summit, the At-Large community came up with various recommendations in its Summit Report. The ATLAS II Implementation Working Group has gone through the recommendations and has assigned various Working Groups to certain recommendations – either to enhance the recommendations and/or ensure the recommendations get implemented.

The ICANN Board has also come back to the ALAC and said that they appreciate the Report but they want to see some clarification as to what these recommendations are exactly asking ICANN or the ICANN staff to

---

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.

EN

do. One of the things we have to do now is also make sure that the recommendations are in a straightforward manner for the ICANN Board and/or staff to implement. There are two keys ones that we'll start off with first, that are for the Board and therefore we need to look at. Both these recommendations are assigned to multiple groups and it's Recommendation (2) and (21). Let's start with Recommendation (2).

Recommendation (2) reads: "ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to programs having brought valuable members to the community." This has been shared with us, the Outreach Sub-Committee, the Capacity Building and the Finance and Budget Sub-Committees. This recommendation came from TG1. The Finance and Budget Sub-Committee is having its meeting tomorrow, and the Capacity Building meeting, which was on Friday I believe, I believe the outcomes from that meeting was that the Capacity Building would be looking at the various programs that brought members to the community.

I'm trying to remember the exact things but unfortunately I was late for that call. I don't know if anyone on the call could mention what the outcomes were from that? In either case, what would the Outreach Sub-Committee have in looking at implementing this recommendation? Now, is it that we should think of other innovative methods of outreach to recommend to ICANN? Or what? I'm going to throw the ball out. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. Indeed, the Capacity Building Working Group met last week and one of the first steps that was looked at and decided on was

that if ICANN should increase the support for those programs, which brought valuable members to the community, one should find out what those programs are. One of the AIs moving forward is for the Capacity Building Working Group to list those programs and find out which ones brought valuable members to the community. That's some of the work they're looking at moving forward with.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Olivier. That's jogged my memory. I see Heidi is also posting the recommendations from the Capacity Building Working Group in the chat. Thank you for that Heidi. I think perhaps what we should also do is a similar exercise as the Capacity Building Working Group in terms of outreach? What I would think are the various outreach programs are, one, the CROPP Program, which is the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, which funds travelers to attend various events for outreach purposes.

There's the Fellowship Program, which allows for persons interested in, but not understanding ICANN, to attend an ICANN face-to-face meeting and learn about all the various ACs and SOs and the whole ICANN community. Those are possibly two key ones, but should there be other outreach-type programs, or do you have any particular ideas as to an additional program or other ideas about improving outreach?

I imagine also, thinking more about it, that the Global Stakeholder Engagement Group, as the name implied, they actively work in various stakeholders across all the regions and that's probably another area where I suspect increased collaboration from the outreach global

stakeholder needs to happen. I'll stop there now and let Cheryl take the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Dev. You did wander off a little bit into another hemisphere that my brain wasn't connected with, but you pretty much have pointed out a whole number of the things I wanted to point out, which included the GSE activities and CROPP. I also thought, from the At-Large perspective, we would be able to… What we're doing right now is part of what's asked for in the notes, in other words to define programs that brought valuable members to the ICANN community.

The other one I'd add in there is also various activities now being undertaken at the regional level, which would include some of the business webinars going out from the Asia hub, and I'm sure there are similar things in other regions. I think we do need to go onto a little rework, list what we have and some of what we have now, and undoubtedly some of the others will pop into mind as we're filling out a matrix. Let's start with those that the group would agree are the programs.

I parted ways with you mentally, Dev, when we got into the what's yet to come activities. I think that's probably a subset, but it shouldn't be a priority for the ATLAS work. I think for the ATLAS work we should start with what we actually have; use that as a proof of concept. Then perhaps we could use the measurable outcomes there to show how doing more of these similar things would be a good idea. The only other

EN

one I would have added in is any "any other" bracket and I think that's where some of the new ones may be able to be built.

Having listened to, Dev, it may be better to just have a, "…And similar programs yet to be determined or highlighted." Then on the "any other" bracket I would have on that line specific activities that have been brought up from time to time. This might be a particular constituency meeting town hall style, for example – so it's not necessarily a cross activity but it would have gone through some other mechanism – maybe perhaps associated with an ICANN Meeting, which as you know falls outside of CROPP funding.

I think that "any other" bracket probably needs to be there. Having defined the programs, we are going to have to do the dreaded measurability stuff, and some of those programs already have that built in and some of them need more work. We are getting reporting back from CROPP activities, so that's a bit of low-hanging fruit that can be actively looked at and hopefully effectively measured. The Fellowship one, which we all intrinsically know has had great success, does need some quantification.

It's got plenty of qualitative material and work that can be looked at to say it's been effective, but it does need some quantification. I'm going to stop after sharing the following piece of information with you – because there's a whole bunch of things on this page as well – and that is that with the things like the Fellowship, the APSTAR Organization have recently agreed at their meeting in Brisbane – and APNIC – will be assisting with APTLD and other support – for a rather wider than ICANN but inclusive of the ICANN Fellowship Program review on where in the

Internet sphere are any of the people that have been supported by Fellowship acting.

Thereby it will be trying to find a way where the best investment into doing more support can go. The Fellowship will be wrapped up in that. That's kind of exciting news in its own right, but I think that will be a useful measure for us. I'll stop now. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Cheryl. You made a point that perhaps we need to expand upon – the various RALO initiatives. I see Glenn has also posted something about that, in terms of the various RALO initiatives to reach out to the other ISTAR organizations, the local RIRs, the regional TLD-type organizations in order to facilitate communication and collaboration, to get involved in their policy work and so forth. I think perhaps recommendations could be made as to perhaps support can be given to those sorts of initiatives. Thanks for mentioning that. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that, what I just described – that study that will be undertaken in the next 12-18 months – is an example of exactly what Glenn has said, but that's run by all of the ISTAR organizations, or will be, and we might highlight that as a short-term and effective pilot for the measurement of at least one aspect for this item number two out of the event.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to clarify, we should not be looking to define or suggest any new possible programs then?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not saying we shouldn't do it, I'm saying for the ATLAS part of the work, that shouldn't be the top priority. Some may shake out of the tree, but in the APSTAR meetings what we were asking ourselves is what is working and what is not working as well. The next step of course is why are they working and why are they not working as well when it comes to funding and support across the region? This is exactly the same question but slightly turned on its side, where we've asked for, "We'd like more support for things that are successful." The first question is, "Which are the ones that are successful?"

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thanks Cheryl. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Dev. One of the problems with coming after Cheryl is that she says everything you want to say. That doesn't help, so I'll just say everything that Cheryl said. I'll add one more thing: on occasions the Regional VPs have been able to unlock some funds for specific targeted reasons. I know this has happened in Africa and Europe. I think it has happened in Latin America and Caribbean as well. The ROIs on these is also of great value as well.

They are exceptional items, but the Regional VPs now have their own budget, specifically for this type of thing. I think it would go along the kind of line that we're taking in having the Speaker's Bureau expanded to local speakers, local as in regional speakers, rather than just having it

for staff and Board Members. That's another one to maybe add to the list. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Olivier. Roosevelt is asking a question in the chat: "What about support towards assisting RALOs with increasing their regional membership?" Well, I suppose the idea would be that would be the CROPP, in terms of if it's an outreach event and we meet with prospective organizations and entice them to [raise their flag 00:17:52], come to RALO calls, etcetera. I don't know if Roosevelt is trying to suggest a different tack on that? Roosevelt, do you want to take the floor? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the transcript record, because you're saying, "That's good," Roosevelt was asking about the regional outreach for RALOs to be able to increase their regional membership, and that's exactly what the CROPP is for. It's exactly what the regions are asked to go for – they go for pilot programs, to go out there to regional meetings, find some new ALSes, grow the region, this sort of stuff. I don't know whether Roosevelt was pointing to anything other than that, but that is specifically for outreach in the region, by the RALO. Roosevelt, if you're thinking of something else then it would be very interesting to hear about it.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I see Cheryl raised her hand and then Roosevelt. Cheryl?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Dev. I just wanted to suggest, whilst we're talking about CROPP, remembering that the second to last P on the CROPP says it's a pilot program. We still have to do a proof of concept on that and we've got a second year running now in an effort to do just that. It would be useful for us to attach for this meeting – maybe someone can grab it and share it in the chat – but more importantly for the archive to link a copy, unless it's confidential, and I don't believe it is, but check with Janice first, of the recent Staff Operational Report on the CROPP to-date.

I think this Working Group should probably be aware of the issues, points, questions and to-dos that were raised in Janice's recent Staff Report. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. I put that Item on the Agenda. Roosevelt, please go ahead. I'm unable to hear Roosevelt. Staff, can you work with Roosevelt and make sure he's able to get online, or do a dial-out to him? All right. Going back to Recommendation (2), we seem to have covered some of the key points regarding this.

I think perhaps what needs to happen here, from the outreach perspective, is to review the various outreach programs that already exist, that have really brought members to the community, such as the CROPP, the Fellowship, and the Speaker's Bureau under GSE, and make recommendations for the ALAC to pass to the Board as to how this recommendation could be increased and in what ways. The CROPP Agenda Item is coming up next, and there's an Administrative Report,

which talks about certain concerns raised regarding CROPP. Does anyone have any points on Recommendation (2)? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Just to wrap-up Recommendation (2) – and I think this is something we'll be coming back to, and also it's a particularly important matrix to build; and everyone who's worked with me in the world of matrixes – as Dev and Olivier and so many of you have, you'll know that we can still have neat matrixes that aren't too enormous, providing we hyperlink to other active pages. It might start looking like a very large shopping list exercise, but we can tidy it up and allow the Board to look at a helicopter view matrix that allows a more drilled-down view into more detail and detailed reports.

I just wanted to say that about the cosmetics of that exercise. I think it's an important one and one that if we get started on, I will also undertake to share with the APSTAR Community in doing the regional work, and see whether we can get a specific timeline on our agreed work. All we did was agree to do it. We didn't say we'd do it by March 10th or something. We can see if we've got something a little firmer that we can point into our stuff.

The second point under the notes is the need to think of ways to optimize the budget. From an outreach point of view, and here I'm echoing what I've heard in the GSE meetings and in the Speaker's Bureau meetings, just as many of you have, attending all of those, I think what we need to do is just do the mantra of "we need to work smarter, not harder". But we also need to multi-use resources that we develop.

It's the principle if we, from the Outreach Sub-Committee, recognize that principle and put it at the top.

We might need to develop a couple of principles but if we do do that, I'd certainly put that as one of them – where rather than re-inventing wheels we spend money in a way that develops things as being multi-purpose, reusable, archived and can be modified as needed. At that point I'm comfortable finishing up with Recommendation (2). Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl. Roosevelt has typed into the chat: "In terms of programs that help form user groups, especially in countries such as islands in the Caribbean, they don't have end user groups." I think that's probably the key point in that; as whether there should be some sort of program to… My response to that is I suspect this is where the GSE needs to happen. This is also to answer Murray's question, as to are there any metrics for global stakeholders?

This is going to be part of my question for this GSE Team – as to does the GSE Team have any idea or metrics as to where their stakeholder gaps are and therefore do they identify then and therefore have targets to say, "If there are no At-Large persons in these countries we'll try to improve that"? I'm not sure how GSE works in that regard. That was a question I think we probably need to ask our global stakeholders. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I can only speak from a NARALO perspective, as I put into the chat. We identified certain groups that were under-represented in our NARALO. The two main groups are Native American/Canadian and also the disabled group. The other groups we've reached out to but not had success with are some of the protectorate areas that are under the domain of the US, like the American Samoa [unclear 00:28:47] communication. There's been a number of efforts to try to get to areas of the United States and Canada which have no ALS.

I think approximately we have 30 plus. The second problem with outreach is keeping the new people engaged and inspired and keeping them coming back, and hopefully getting some of those people that are silent as well, involved with Working Groups and stuff. So we have not just outreach but the ongoing engagement and participation. That's the second issue.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, that's inreach, as some have referred to it. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Glenn, I think your two comments are quite linked, and that's an important issue. When recruiting ALSes it's important to make sure we recruit those that have an interest in ICANN. In the past we've equated the Internet and ICANN in terms of presenting ourselves to prospective ALSes, and that makes engagement after the fact a lot harder. I think part of the trick is making sure ALSes, once they join, are engaged, is in making sure to set expectations properly at the beginning.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Alan. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Just following on from Alan and Glenn's comments – yes, they are linked, and I agree that they're vitally important, in fact if they're not in balance then we don't have effectiveness of the outreach – but in that balance point it switches fro outreach to capacity building, because as Alan said you've got to make sure people know what they're getting into, and it just can't be a numbers game of getting more and more ALSes or whatever. They have to be got and then continue to be engaged.

We hope a valuable part – and that's certainly what the APSTAR survey is going to focus on; what value have we got out of where we've supported people from our various component organizations – but that said, that's where it cuts across capacity building, because in many cases it's the capacity building that is critical here. We probably need to make sure our work in outreach has a clear nexus with the capacity building stuff as well.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Cheryl. May I suggest a way to move forward? I'm going to suggest that we start by creating a Wiki page on this Recommendation (2). I'd like to suggest that Cheryl and Glenn talk about… I think both of you have raised some very key points as to some of the various outreach initiatives, especially within the Asia Pacific and North American Regions,

EN

that are taking place. This Wiki page could be the starting point for which to document the ideas for Recommendation (2). I think we all can contribute in terms of the CROPP and Fellowship and so forth.

I'm going to make that an AI – to create a Wiki page. Cheryl, what you've been talking about regarding the matrix, and Glenn, I think you have also make some specific examples of what is happening in terms of outreach in the North American region. I think both of you could make some comments there.

I would say the rest of the Outreach Sub-Committee can also give opinions on the other aspects, which is regarding the GSE, the Speaker's Bureau – and I think that would potentially fall under the GSE, in terms of trying to facilitate those groups being created in those countries that don't have any At-Large presence. Maureen is also welcome to work on that matrix. Excellent. I see Glenn's hand is still raised. Glenn, do you have anything to ask?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I was just going to say you've assigned some tasks to us, so I'll give you some notes based on the NARALO experience.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. Could staff create the Wiki page for this Recommendation (2) so that people can then…? Then can you immediately circulate that to Outreach Sub-Committee mailing list, so the group can get started on that? Okay. I want to look at Recommendation (21). Recommendation (21) reads as follows: "Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet

for education, information, creativity and empowerment." This is assigned to both the Outreach and Social Media Working Groups, and intended for the recipients of the ICANN Board and GSE.

The Social Media Group felt that how it could handle this aspect would be to work with the Outreach Sub-Committee to promote the public campaigns and give recommendations as to how the public campaigns can be better formatted or presented for easier sharing or re-sharing across social media. The question that comes up for the Outreach Sub-Committee is to encourage public campaigns in using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment.

Now, one aspect of this is that the way this is phrased is that it's not really on ICANN-specific policy issues, as such. The campaign is on using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment. It seems to be a much wider scope than an ICANN policy issue. I don't know what the Outreach Group feels about this. I open the floor for any comments or questions. Seeing no hands raised, let me ask the question – do you think the Outreach Sub-Committee should work with…

What do people think about the content of the recommendation in terms of should we, as Outreach or At-Large, be asking ICANN to have public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment, or is it that we should seek to re-share content that's already available out there? I imagine there is content related to education, information, creativity and empowerment. What the Outreach Group could do in the first place is perhaps highlight already existing campaigns? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This one's a little flakier than the first one, in which we can put the nice building blocks in and get nice outcomes from. Why do I say it's flakier? Mainly because it says all very audibly, that it starts off with, "In collaboration with the ALSes, ICANN should put in place campaigns…" The short answer is yes. I think part of that we've discussed in our matrix. I think what we do is say once we've identified what works and where, we then implement and ask for specific support planning and as-required budget.

That means actual resources including staff, to target identified places that are not represented, and in some ways – as we've been discussing in chat –even existing things like CROPP could be done through that, but there's no reason why we couldn't peel out smaller islands and developing states away from CROPP specifically, and have based trans-regionally, where small island states exist, a focus with GSE and the regional hubs.

In terms of the public stuff, that's the flaky part. Because it's very hard to put out a single message that's going to be equally effective – this is Recommendation (21) now – across all our regions, because of the diversity. However, there could be – and particularly when we're talking about social media as a tool, and here I think we need to work with a sub-team with GSE – a GSE job to come with a couple of tag-lines, which are ICANN-wide applicable, that fit by our – the ICANN – strategic planning and thinking, through to 2016/2017. That's the timeframe.

It's a little bit flaky, as far as I'm concerned, for just us as the Outreach Sub-Committee, to try and think there's an ability to do that just for the social media, because we would only be focused from our outreach and our social media, in terms of reaching the Internet end users and the potential ALSes, as well as the individual domain name registrants. That's our remit. I think if we're going to have a unified prospective program, which is a public campaign, it maybe needs to be bigger in concept that that, but that we have as At-Large a specific benefit and measurable from that larger one.

For example, now I'm walking around – as an example from Australia in the ccTLD community – not only with my cap, my pen, my travel coffee mug, my carry-bag, I now have branded bottles of water that say "Do you AU?" as well as billboards and various things. That's what you talk about when you talk about a saturation public campaign and the fact that our AU IGF, every time a person took a drink out of a bottle of water, had "Do you AU?" firmly in their hand.

That's a saturation campaign. That's the sort of thing that would need to be done globally. I think we should be part of (21), but not the solution to (21). Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl. Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Circling back to the point, as I read it – I'll read it again quickly: "Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education,

information, creativity and empowerment." Are we encouraging ourselves to use the Internet to do those things, or are we just encouraging people in general to use the Internet to be involved in that? I was just looking for a little clarification. I wasn't in TG3, so I'm not sure there's anyone on the call that can speak to that? Or am I being too pedantic?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No, I don't think so – I don't think it's too pedantic. I think I'll go back to what exactly the public campaign is on using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment. As I said, to my mind, it puts the Outreach Group in a very difficult situation because it's not an ICANN policy issue they're asking for. It's in education. If it was an ICANN policy issue – and yes, perhaps Outreach could take a strong role in storyboarding education on ICANN policy issues, things like that – but for me…

What I can do is try and contact TG3. I don't know who was involved in TG3 but perhaps we could go back to their notes and try to clarify what this campaign is… Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just to let you know, TG3 was led by Wolf, and I believe the rapporteurs were Glenn and Judith. There was also the assistance of Gunela.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Heidi. I guess we could contact those persons.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've got Glenn and Judith on the call.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl. I don't know if Glenn or Judith has any comments on Recommendation (21) as to what the TG was thinking when it raised this recommendation?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Glenn, you can talk. Are we on Recommendation (2)?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: No, (21). This came out of TG3 and this was on encouraging public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think we were talking more about trying to increase awareness of the benefits of the Internet and in increasing access. It could be some project, like Roosevelt was talking about, in trying to get awareness of ICANN, awareness of education and awareness of how we can empower people by doing programs in areas that are not the normal ones. Maybe we want to do something in remote areas? I think that was the idea of it. Maybe Glenn has more information?

EN

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No. I think you're on the right track. Again, this came from TG2 and we wanted more clarification. In fact, we've already added some content already, but we had to convert this into cogent short slides, so the more clarification we can have from the Committee that came up with this, the better for us to come up with an answer.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Glenn, he's talking about (21), which was TG3.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, thank you for clarification. I haven't wrapped my mind around that yet. I can't speak on that right now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Dev, I think this has defined my flaky comment, but that doesn't mean we can't do anything about it. Just because what's written is flaky, what I've been saying in the chat is we've got to get an ICANN-wide, ICANN-relevant message, preferably that has specific benefit to the At-Large community, and do this.

I think that's not an unreasonable task, but it's one that we should do as a specific sub-team with the existing regional hub, officers and GSE, because it's their bailiwick to do that, obviously with Coms, because it's something that would need to be tied to strategic planning and key focus areas.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl.   If I understand correctly, it's not really to try to acknowledge that the recommendation is not as clear, but suggest that in various Internet governance-type events, we encourage an ICANN message that holds those international events; that could best bring those persons interested in those issues; education, information, creativity, empowerment, and tell them they need to be involved in ICANN, because ICANN policy affects these activities.   Yes?   I suppose that could possibly be the way forward on that? Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm re-reading this a few times, and I see where Cheryl's coming from. It's a very lofty goal but from a tangible point of view, in terms of education, outreach and trying to do this sort of public campaign, I think of [Web One Day 00:51:14] and what they did in terms of outreach. That was sponsored by the Mozilla Foundation and they were really concerned and leveraged the whole issue of net neutrality and security.

There are these entities out there – Citizen Lab – and to a small degree, even though it's ISOC-mandated, they do some effort, especially with the Internet awards each year to raise awareness of the contribution of the Czech community, but we have so many things. There's the IGF, the IETF. There are so many things going on all the time where perhaps we can raise the bar a little bit in terms of reaching out to those communities on education – but this is a big job.

The more I think about it – and I'm listening to what Cheryl was saying – this is almost over-the-top in terms of getting this task done and having some very serious deliverables on this, so I'm still thinking this through.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. I guess the thing would be, as a way forward on Recommendation (21), is that… I'm just reading the chat. Things we need to identify are, 1) What the Outreach Sub-Committee can do. We can identify existing public campaigns that already exist and that tackle these aspects of education, information, creativity and empowerment, and possibly consider promoting and/or having an ICANN voice, to be able to spread an ICANN message within those fora. Would that be the suggestion of the way forward? I do sense that it's really a lofty goal and I'm not sure how you could measure the outcomes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's have a conversation with GSE and the VP. As Heidi's put in the chat, there is that opportunity on the Sunday, when the Regional Leaders meet with the VP. There needs to be some serious analysis. I don't think it's undoable, I just don't think it's doable fast and short-term. It would need to be put into someone else's priority box. It doesn't mean we don't do it though. I think also it's not one that should be…

As much as it's come out of ATLAS II, I don't think it's one that's going to be wholeheartedly supported by the wider ICANN community if it only benefits the At-Large community. I think the trick to getting this one done and to implement it is to have the development of a key message, that is ICANN's remit, and fits in ICANN's vision and strategic planning. It should tick these boxes and clearly benefit – from our point of view –

the At-Large community, but will also obviously benefit the wider ICANN community.

That's a big and very professional job to do. It's one of those "we need to talk about it" ones, rather than "it's too hard". Yes, it's pretty damn hard, because of the flakiness of how it's written, but I think we can defect that into something that will work, just not in Los Angeles. It will take a little longer than that, and it will have to be on our priorities list. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think so. I do realize the time is going here. I'm going to ask, for my indulgence, if persons could stay for 5-10 minutes more? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Dev. I couldn't help but hear about the idea of having the meeting with Global Stakeholder Engagement in LA and discussing this face-to-face with them. In fact, we have a location for the topics to be discussed with GSE – so that's Sally Costerton and her full team of all the Global Stakeholder VPs. At the moment we have two different topics in there – the first one is what is being done to make ICANN accessible to global end users.

The second one is how does the GSE Team identify stakeholder representation and how does it act accordingly? These are just two topics and we could actually add another topic in there. If you wanted

EN

to discuss this thing with GSE, I would really suggest that we put something in there. I'm ready to edit it right now on the fly, if you want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, since this document is public, why don't we as a Working Group put forward the question to that GSE meeting, "With reference to Declaration (21) from the recent ATLAS II held in London, how can ALAC and At-Large effectively work with GSE and ICANN Coms to engage and implement an ICANN-specific program that meets this proposal aim?" Something like that? Obviously Alan would need to put it into English because Cheryl's saying it, but yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As a follow up, I've quickly typed what Cheryl has said, and there's a very typos in there. "With reference to Declaration (21) from the ATLAS II meeting in London, how can ICANN and At-Large effectively work with GSE and ICANN Coms to engage and implement an ICANN-specific program that meets this proposal?" Is that what you wanted to say?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, because it shows that we recognize that what was written in (21) is flaky, high-reaching, and all very laudable, but it's like motherhood and apple pie – human rights desire for the Internet type stuff, which is great, and we all support that, but it's not ICANN's remit. We recognize that what we can do in ICANN's remit, that will kind of tick that box. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Cheryl. I think this is probably the way forward – to [unclear 00:59:23] have that question and add it to the questions to ask the GSE. Murray, go ahead.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I just wanted to make a quick comment. When I was in London I had reasonably good connections with the Communications Group at ICANN with the role that I was playing. I spoke with a number of people who were doing press releases and handling all of those sorts of communications at London. It was a very busy time. We do have some connections and I thought I made some progress in that regard. I'm happy to continue with that as we move forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Murray, Coms and Sally's Team are always very keen to work with our community, so I think we could be fairly confident on progress in this area, providing it's tightly defined and professionally managed, be done. Seeing as that's some networking you've already done in London, that could build on the existing relationships, because we've certainly worked very well with them in the past. I think we can't forget the focus as well, which I know you were also involved in, on that social networking.

The social networking is a tool that's going to certainly have greater ease in getting to some of the as-yet unlinked communities to ICANN and what ICANN does. As you all know, an effective social networking program is a very tricky thing to get right, and the ROI for social networking is quite a big area itself, because it's probably even flakier than the way this (21) is written, and that's saying something. We do

need to work very closely with their teams to get the measurements baked in from the beginning. Thanks.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Glenn? Then I'll come back to the wording of the question for GSE. I'm seeing two versions being proposed in the chat. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think I'm out of order. My item is Other Business, so if you want to table me I'd be happy to do that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Very well, I'll table that. Let's go back to the wording of the question for GSE. Heidi has suggested: "With reference to the ATLAS declaration Recommendation (21), how can ALAC and At-Large work effectively with GSE and Communications to engage with ICANN's current plans for communication and outreach, to raise awareness and extend education programs across under-represented regions?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's two different questions. That one's addressing (12), not (21).

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Sorry Cheryl.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I have no problem with two questions, but yours is answering (12) and Olivier's is dealing with (21).
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	I think that's answered (21) quite well. We could ask two questions to the GSE. Olivier has some text here: "With reference to Recommendation (21) of the ATLAS II declaration drafted in London, how can ICANN and At-Large effectively work with Global Stakeholder Engagement and ICANN Communications to engage and implement an ICANN-specific program that meets this proposal?" I think that's good.
	I think the question with GSE that we need to come back to is the flakiness of the language, but I think that would be good enough to start the conversation. I assume global stakeholders would read these questions before they come to the meeting. Isn't that the intent?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Correct. I've already sent them the link, but I will send them a note that the questions have been added to.
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	I think if I include the one for (12), but obviously with reference to the ATLAS II Declaration, Recommendation (12), that would be the update to Heidi's one. We have two questions for this. Excellent. I know we were supposed to try to do an update on the CROPP Review Team. Just last week, ICANN emailed the CROPP Review Team Members a sort of staff review of the CROPP FY14 Program. That was the pilot program that ran from the third quarter 2013 to second quarter 2014.

One of the concerns raised as part of that report, to summarize, was that the measurement of the purpose, goals and outcomes needs to be more quantitative rather than qualitative. I don't know if we'll have time to go into this topic, however there will be a CROPP meeting on Wednesday, during the ICANN LA Meeting, so I'd encourage people to read that report and look at those CROPP proposals for FY15 and how we can make it more quantitative – as in actual numbers.

Did we actually contact four or five ALSes? "Here's their contact information, we talked to this person," etcetera – some quantitative metrics for these purpose, goals and outcomes. Our next Agenda Item is adding a Co Chair for the Outreach Sub-Committee. I've been the Chairman of the Outreach Sub-Committee from the last year, and as I'm standing down from the ALAC at the end of this year, as I'm having new responsibilities at work and at home, I think it's important that the Outreach Sub-Committee has a Co Chair.

They will help to really help handle the activities, especially as it relates to post-ATLAS II, and because outreach is so particularly a crucial initiative that needs to continue for At-Large. We don't have At-Large representation in all the countries and I think having a Co Chair would help this Working Group. With that in mind, I've had a chat with Murray McKercher and I'm suggesting Murray to be our Co Chair of this Outreach Sub-Committee. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's an excellent idea. I think it's absolutely vital that we have somebody who's stepped up during ATLAS and – as he's just outlined –

who has already managed to galvanize good working relationships with the people that are critical to our mission. I think Murray is an excellent choice, and if it requires seconding I'm happy to do so.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Cheryl. I do see green ticks and plus ones in the chat from Glenn McKnight, Siranush, Judith, Roberto, Maureen... I'm not seeing any objections. I think Murray would be seconding this as well, but I'm not seeing any objections to this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If he puts up a big red cross there's a real problem.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: He had the right to do so. I'm seeing no objections. Murray, thank you for accepting the role of Co Chair for the Outreach Sub-Committee. Right, well time is going on here. Let's see. Any Other Business. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I have two announcements. Thanks to Heidi, she has worked with ICANN staff to get an outreach booth for us. It will be an ALAC and ISOC table at the Newcomer section. We're looking for some volunteers. We're really only focusing on the breaks and lunch through the week. The idea is only a couple of people per time. We don't want a crowd there, so a couple of people per those slots.

It's not going to take away from your important meetings, but it's a chance to meet newcomers and other people that are going to be at the event. It's going to be similar to what we did in Toronto where we had a table and we were inundated by people. If you have an ALS, if you're with a RALO, please contact me. I have a Doodle set up so that people can slot their times in.

I think it's going to be a great effort to reach out. the reason it's partially ISOC is ISOC is going to give us some giveaway. There's nothing like free things. I'm working with Raquelle to get some freebies, so we're letting them put some of their literature together. Most of the ISOC Chapters are all for ALSes, so that's exciting. The second thing is that the NARALO Outreach/Showcase will be Wednesday night, and again, I need to recognize two people in particular.

There's Olivier, who's done a splendid job in getting the sponsorship from three main sponsorships. We will have refreshments. We thought we'd just get a cracker and a glass of water, but we will be able to give refreshments. It's not a limitless bar though so it will be reasonable. What we have is a main theme, and our main speaker is going to be Jacquie Johnson Pata, who works with The HUD – the Housing and Urban Development agency in the US. She's a native from Alaska. She'll be talking about broadband issues for natives in the US, so very relative.

To top off the native American theme we're going to have a hoop dancer at the end. Very exciting culturally. A great opportunity, and because we don't have our gala event, I think this outreach is going to be well attended. Please make sure to put it on your agenda. It will be 6:30 pm on the 15th, which is the Wednesday. We have limited seats and limited

EN

invitations, so if you want to bring a significant other or something, make sure you get your invitation, and Silvia's working on those. Any questions?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks Dev. Exciting news. Indeed, I hope there will be enough material that we can give away at that joint ALAC/ISOC group – material about At-Large, Beginner's Guides, etcetera. I hope we have those materials well in hand. Thanks for the update on the outreach event on Wednesday. I think given that there's no gala it will be a unique opportunity to reach other members of the community. Excellent.

It's 17 minutes past the hour. I think we can now adjourn this call. I thank everybody for attending this call and for staying on for the extra 17 minutes. I look forward to continue working with you on the ALAC Sub-Committee on Outreach. The two AIs coming out of this are the Wiki page being created on Recommendation (2) and for the link to be forwarded to the mailing list, and for Cheryl, Glenn and Maureen to put down information related to (21).

Of course, all the Sub-Committee Members, please look at this and make comments on this. With regards to the second recommendation, we'll be submitting two questions regarding Recommendation (12) and (21), asking to [help 01:15:22] with the GSE and ICANN Communications on how best to implement a program that meets these proposals. Okay. With that, thank you all very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]