

GISELLA GRUBER: And I think we'll get the recording started. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. On today's ICANN Academy Working Group call on Friday, the 5th of October, we have Sandra Hoferichter, Hong Xue, Sebastian Bachollet, Glenn McKnight, Chuck Gomes, [Saradouche Babanagne? 00:00:20], Yaovi Atohoun, Tijani Ben Jemaa, [Roxanna Priocho? 00:00:27], Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Stephane Vangelder, Ron Sherwood, Adam Gosling, [Rumi Kanesh? 00:00:35], [Jonathan Cohen? 00:00:38]. Apologies noted today from Elliot Noss.

From staff we have [Liv Eemnav? 00:00:48], Silvia Vivanco, and myself Gisella Gruber. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. If I have, please speak up now. Thank you very much, and over to you Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Gisella. Just to reconfirm, am I audible.

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here.

UF: Hello Gisella. [Den's? 00:01:19] joined.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you.

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.

UF: I think there might be some GNSO people on the call, I'm not sure.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, we've done the roll call, thank you.

UF: Sorry.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, over to you Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, thank you Gisella. First I'd like to ask everybody if some amendments to the Agenda should be made. The Agenda is visible on Adobe Chat but for those not on Adobe Chat I will read it again. We have the roll call stuff done. Second, I will give an update on where we are currently with the work in the Working Group. Third is to re-evaluate or to confirm the scope of the Working Group. Fourth [find? 00:02:13] the [setting? 00:02:15] the Agenda for the three-hour Toronto Meeting. Fifth to discuss the role of staff in this project and the sixth is any other business. Are there any amendments to the Agenda, then please let me know in this moment? Okay, I see no hands and I hear no interference from the people on the phone.

So I will proceed with the second point on the Agenda, giving an update of where we are and since Prague. A draft proposal was submitted to the Working Group which was to ask [inaudible 00:03:00] and myself to

have a private project, or a Leadership private project in Toronto. The proposal in the moment of when it was submitted, it sparked a lot of discussion on the mailing list – a discussion about the content, about the target group learning goals and so on. This was a discussion which was really fruitful and – in my point of view – necessary, because this discussion should have actually taken place in Prague already, but as some of you might remember the meeting in Prague went to a totally different direction; talking about budget and responsibilities only and not about the content for a Leadership Program.

However, it turned out that the Working Group was not very comfortable with the draft curriculum and [ha doodle? 00:03:57] was up to decide which kind of way to go. We had three options; a day meeting, a two-day meeting, or to postpone the... Sorry, a one-day private project, a two-day private project, or to postpone the project for Toronto. Finally it turned out it was a slight majority to postpone the project and so we did.

And then given time constraints and we got off the NomCom announcements for appointees, and also the travel arrangements for participants. I think this was the best solution. However, the need for a Leadership Private Program is just not agreed. Who exactly is the target group? There are two ways of looking on Leadership. On one hand we can talk about ICANN veterans, on the other hand we can talk about incoming ICANN Leaders. Furthermore, it was not quite clear, depending on which target group we want to appoint; the learning goals, the methodology and also the... Two-day or three-day or whatever problem, but it is also [addicted? 00:05:19] to the budget.

Another question was raised during the discussion, which was, is it one project or are these two projects we are talking about? I expressed myself on the mailing list and I want to do this later on, on the point three again, but for the moment this should be my upset and I want to ask at this stage if there are any questions or comments? Please, apologies; I did not follow the chat whilst I was speaking so people who raised a question there might raise it here again. Please raise your hand or...? You are not connected to Adobe Connect.

Okay, I see that there are no hands raised so I will immediately proceed with point three of the Agenda, and this is the re-evaluation and confirmation on the scope of the Working Group. I wonder that we confirm we are on the same page? I mentioned it already; the question came up, are we talking about one project or are we talking about two projects? From my point of view – and I want to reiterate this again – we can only talk about one project. This one project implements two components. One is on a long-term distance, and the other on a short-term distance. The long-term distance refers to this pyramid, which is currently displayed in the Adobe Chat Room, but I want to reiterate again, it is not carved in stone. The other short-term refers to the pilot Leadership Program where a budget was allocated and which should actually have [wash? 00:07:35] and was postponed now. In my opinion – and I really am a strong believer of that – we should not separate these two projects from each other because the implementation in a modular system always needs us to think about the broader scope and the broader [call? 00:07:57]. If we can agree on such a modular system as in this pyramid, we can actually don't do anything wrong. Because

working in the modular system gives us the opportunity to adjust, adapt, to synchronize or to improve existing or new models.

MARILYN [Surname?]: Sandra, it's Marilyn. Can I get in the queue please?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: At this stage I just wanted to... Yes, Marilyn, I was just about to give the voice to the Working Group. And you may be the first.

MARILYN: I just want to mention... I wanted to make sure that others... I had been...

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Marilyn?

MARILYN: Hello?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hello, we hear you Marilyn.

MARILYN: I had been speaking on the Adobe Audio but I think you couldn't hear me.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: We can hear you.

MARILYN: I know you can now, because I dialed in. Thank you. I am a little concerned that I still am not sure... I listened to everything that you said but I'm still trying to understand... What are you trying to come forward with today? Something that then goes into the... I understand it's something that then goes into a discussion on Toronto, but I just wanted to mention that given the Toronto Agenda and the fact that there are a number of competing meetings, at the end of this call maybe we should really consider whether that call will be able to last a full three hours. So if we could just park that and just come back to it?

STEPHANE VANGELDER: This is Stephane.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay, Stephane, please go ahead.

STEPHANE VANGELDER: Can you hear me?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, if you could speak up a little bit?

STEPHANE VANGELDER: I just wanted to echo... I'm almost kissing my computer so I don't think I can speak any louder... I just wanted to echo what Marilyn said. I think

the meeting we're trying to have in Toronto is ambitious in terms of time, so although we may want to part this subject for now as she suggested, it may be one that we want to work out before the end of this meeting so we know what to do in Toronto, and what meeting schedule we're expecting. Thank you.

MARILYN:

Thanks Stephane. Sandra, I'm just going to mention for some; the workshop that has been scheduled, which was not scheduled at the time we scheduled this, on accountability structures and expert panels, may require the speaking role of some of the Chairs of the various groups. And I'm not trying to cause a problem; I'm just trying to provide information so we can plan accordingly.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Marilyn, and also thanks to Stephane. The main call of this conference call – maybe I should have mentioned it before – is to set up the Agenda for Toronto. I think that is the most important part to proceed most effectively in Toronto. But before that I think we should also discuss some basic questions. We can put it aside and we don't have to finish that today, but setting the Agenda for Toronto is the most important thing. Also under the circumstances that it's conflicting with other meetings. But before that I want to give the floor to Tijani, he raised his hand for a long time. Please Tijani, go ahead. Tijani, you might be muted?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I wanted to say that nobody spoke about two projects. I was to know the first one who spoke about it and I said we should work on the long-term in parallel with the short-term. I didn't speak about a second project, a different project. I am aware that it is one part of the whole project, so I don't think that we have... I don't think someone proposed to consider it as a catchment project, or a different project. As for the Toronto meeting, I think that the discussion was very long about it and I remember most supported the fact that we had three-hour meeting on Wednesday, so now there is a conflict of time I don't know what to do. But it is always like this. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Tijani. Are there any other comments or questions on this matter? Yes, Hong you raised your hand. Hong, please go ahead.

HONG XUE:

Hello, thanks Sandra. Well I'm not wishing to repeat what I've commented on the list. Whatever, if it's one project or two projects, it's fine with me. And the issue here is that in Prague, at our only face-to-face meeting, I took quite some time to understand that the pilot Leadership project is one that is different from the Academy proposal. So, after Sandra's very constructive briefing on the list, I learned that the pilot project could be a building compartment for the Academy proposal. Well, that would be brilliant. But I really want to know, is this really the consensus of the Working Group or has it actually been agreed by ICANN? Or is this only our understanding? And it's not really

been supported by ICANN? I guess this is quite an important issue to know. So over to you, Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Hong. I had some difficulties to understand... Sorry, go ahead.

MARILYN: Sorry, I just wanted to... Is it okay that I speak?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, go ahead.

MARILYN: I just... I think I'd like to... I'm not exactly sure, Hong, if I'm adding to your questions, but maybe adding a parameter, another aspect. So ICANN has now a new communications and stakeholder Vice President. I guess the larger question may be, how does all of this fit into a larger initiative? And perhaps that's what relates to Hong's question of, what do we have consensus for in this Group? But then also, what do we have a consensus for proposing into the larger picture at ICANN?

We're trying to have a meeting in Toronto to try to continue to advance a couple of proposals and how they relate to each other. But I guess there is a question about what, overall... How overall would this fit into a larger ICANN picture? Is that what you're asking Hong?

HONG XUE: Oh yeah.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Hong, do you like your reply?

HONG XUE: Sorry, Marilyn just paraphrased my question. That was my question.
[laughing]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Problems to understand the last part of your speech. So, yes, I agree, we should try or the scope of the Working Group should be how any capacity building provision. Either if it's Leadership Programs, Training or something else, which make a picture within ICANN. In parallel, we should of course look at the concrete project to be implemented, which is apparently the Leadership Program. Does this answer your question or is this a sufficient comment?

HONG XUE: Well, Sandra, well I don't know if it's a problem of line or if it's my expression. I'm sorry for my English capacity. Well, of course, I understand, your viewpoint is crystal clear to me. Your expression is very, very informative. But what I'm attempting to know now is whether this is also the understanding of the whole group and whether this is the understanding from ICANN as well, in Prague. It was on... There was some difficulty, at least from some Members in the Group, to understand that this pilot project was a project designed by ICANN

for capacity building. Now, as you stated that this is the implementation to the Academy proposal, that's really great. What I want to know, this is really the interpretation with authority from ICANN as well, or if you're representing ICANN. Right, so I don't know if I expressed myself clear this time. Over to you, Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Hong. As we have Filiz Yilmaz from ICANN on this call, she might reconfirm or refer to your question. However, just the way you'll receive my [RES? 00:20:12], that's the way it is. And I would like to have this Working Group to agree on this course of action. And I know from ICANN staff that this is... That we are then on the same page, and I think that this could be a good starting point to start with. But before I speak more, I'd like to give the floor to Tijani then Stephanie, and later on [Traxano? 00:20:40] because they raised their hands. Tijani, you have the floor please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Sandra. I do understand the worry of Hong because at the meeting in Prague you gave us the impression that we have different views from ICANN staff. But it is the truth; I don't care a lot about what [I do think? 00:21:13] ICANN about our project. We have a project we want to present to ICANN, and if they don't want it they will refuse it. But we have [written? 00:21:24] the project, we worked on it and we want to work on it permanently. The second question of Hong is very important. The whole Working Group is the whole Working Group agreeing on the whole project and this part of the project that we are

working on for Beijing. And I think that this call and the meetings of Toronto will give the right answer to this question. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Tijani. Next on the list is Stephane, then Traxano. Stephane, you have the floor.

STEPHANE VANGELDER: Thanks Sandra. I just want to react to a couple of things that I'm hearing, just to make sure that I'm hearing that I'm hearing them right and that we're all on the same page. I'm surprised to hear people asking ICANN for permission or guidance. My understanding is that the work that we're doing here is working on the idea of ourselves. I don't see ICANN, whatever that is, I don't know who people think they are asking. Is it ICANN staff? Is it ICANN...? I mean ICANN is a community of various parts so it's always difficult just to refer to ICANN. But the point I want to make is that it's up to us here to determine both the outcome and the kind of aim that we are setting for ourselves. That's the whole point of setting groups like this. So I don't think it's up to ICANN – if you mean staff – to provide guidance, I think it's up to us to determine where we want to go. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Stephane. I just saw Filiz raised her hand, and as your comment was about staff I would like to give Filiz the floor first and then later on Chuck and Olivier. Filiz, the floor please.

FILIZ YILMAZ:

Thank you Sandra. Filiz Yilmaz here, hello everyone. Well, first of all I'll start by saying I completely agree with what Stephane said, I think ICANN staff being ICANN staff is part of ICANN as much as we talk about ICANN, it's also the community.

Anyway, going back to Hong's question, who is doing what and what does that prove and what approval really means and... I would like really... Really like to go a bit back to 2011, February, maybe, by then we were already talking about this initial idea, I was aware that ALAC as a Group was working on a concept called ICANN Academy. There the concept included various types of [archery? 00:24:28] activities and training and forms off them, and it was a concept. As Sandra said, it looked like the picture with the graphic, where the box of implementable, concrete projects are forming off the framework and the concept around it. And then ALAC produced this idea of having Leadership Training Program as part of this project. We gave even floor to Olivier at the time to explain this to ICANN staff and the Board so we understood what the concept was together... Was implementable with... What could be or what could be sent as a Request.

So then, after receiving this information there was a Request, a Budget Request sent out by the ALAC Group for the FY 13 budget process. And this FY 13 Budget Request specifically, [inaudible 00:25:35], I again asked Sandra to send it... Send the link of the Request so everybody could see it; what the original Request was. It was sent within the FY 13 budget, okay? And that Request was for an SOAC Leadership Training Program. It was very concrete, it was very specific in the needs of it; what the [balls? 00:26:02] are, what it should be doing, how the... Even

the content guidelines of how the implementation should be taking place. So having received that... Oh, Sandra says she doesn't have that link but it should be somewhere. ALAC staff who sent the Request on behalf of ALAC Group should have it; so can I ask Gisella or Silvia to provide the link please?

And having received that, we got back to the ALAC Group, we started talking about, okay, you want this to be implemented, how is this going to happen? And one of the advisors brought the ICANN Board and the staff agreed on giving was that this is an overall community effort, so it needs buying and acceptance and consensus from the larger community. And following that advice, I believe, Olivier, Sandra, taking it further, they went out and formed this, 'make the call', and this Academy Working Group is formed. So it's not only an ALAC initiative, the idea, but it is for the entire community needing the entire community's consent.

So that happened in Prague. In Prague, when the ICANN staff first attended the meeting of this ICANN Academy Working Group, we only knew that the budget was only approved for a pilot because the concept versus concrete implementation was not clear; that there was still discussion within the ICANN Academy Working Group. Accordingly, the approval was only given for a pilot to see if there would be an agreement of consensus on the pilot project. So that's what happened in Prague. And as I explained there and I repeated several times to ICANN staff, we do believe this is a good initiative; this is a good idea. Bought the concept and the implementable [did? 00:28:22], which is

called the Leadership Training, which ALAC first put in place, or put forward as an idea.

Now that the entire ICANN Academy Working Group, if you agree on that implementation then we will get our guidance from you guys; saying that, 'okay, this Group, the entire community agrees on this initiative with these implementation plans and statistics'. And we can tell you, okay, this is what we can do; this is what needs to be done to have it happen, as ICANN staff, this is how we see it rolling. But if you don't agree then, yes, we will have to wait for your conversation to be over. So this is important now. If you are talking about the concept, the concept is there, but what needs to be implemented and put in place is another specific thing, I believe.

I hope this helps, Sandra, in explaining how it is seen by ICANN staff? It was never an ICANN staff initiative. We received a Request by ALAC Group and the advice was, 'okay, this looks like a good idea. Does the community agree? Do the others agree?' And based on that, Olivier and Sandra went out and worked hard in forming this Academy Working Group and now here we are, hoping that we will get the guidance from consensus or not reaching consensus. Either way, ICANN staff will follow the guidelines that the ICANN Academy Working Group will reach, hopefully. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Filiz for making this point to clear. I think this helps a lot in the future discussions and to avoid future misunderstanding. I would

like to give the floor to Chuck who has been waiting quite long and then Olivier please. Chuck, you have the floor.

CHUCK GOMES:

Yes, thank you Sandra. I think I heard you say, Sandra, earlier, that the... You were asking basically whether there was an agreement on this Group in terms of where we're going. And then, Filiz, if I understand correctly, was asking for the same thing – whether there was agreement? I'm not sure what I'm being asked... Whether I agree too. One of the things that was clear on the list is, before we can really talk about specific projects and so forth, is a clear understanding of who the target audience is. Now what I'm hearing this morning – this morning for me – is that we're talking about Leadership Training.

But even with Leadership Training we are needing to find the target audience. There are potential Leaders that are coming in cold, with regards to ICANN, there are very experienced Leaders, there are those that are just about anywhere in-between. It's hard to agree to anything until I know what target audience we're focusing on... Audiences. Even if we're talking about Leaders. I assume that what I'm doing really is saying we really should be working on the Agenda, and the first part of that Agenda really needs to be targeting the audiences that are out there, that we're considering. To pick one of those audiences and then we can move forward and develop learning objectives and so forth; just like we talked about on the list. So, again, I'm not clear what the questions are from both Sandra [sic] and Filiz in terms of whether there's consensus. Consensus on what? I have no idea what the question is asking.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Chuck. Just to quickly answer your question. I couldn't actually agree [more based? 00:32:37] on the target audience and the learning goals and the [inaudible 00:32:41] goals. I see this as the main discussion point for our Toronto Agenda which points for the Agenda today. What I – and maybe also Filiz – want to agree on is the scope of this Working Group. And this is simply is that. Are we talking about one project or two projects? I think this is clear now. Everyone expressed their opinion that it is one project. It is, on one hand a framework that has a long-term implementation and on the other hand we are talking about... The Working Group is talking about short-term goals which are to be implemented within these frameworks and what actually [do one? 00:33:33] for Toronto and is now postponed to Beijing or later. I'd like to give the floor to Olivier next. Olivier, you have the floor please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sandra. It's Olivier, for the transcript.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just a couple of things... Yes? Can you hear me? There is a small delay by the way from the time that I speak and the time that you speak so I think that might be the reason why there is a problem sometimes when handing over from person to person. Anyway, assuming that you can hear me, and I don't see anybody waving otherwise, I think that the

discussion that we're having at the moment is one where I kind of feel like Groundhog Day. We've already discussed these things. We're turning round the pot at the moment, and some of wish to dig into the pot while others are still turning around. The actual audience that the project should be having – so the target audience – is something that I think would be best discussed face-to-face, and that would be the first point in the Agenda for Toronto.

The second point then in the Agenda for Toronto would then be the story of funding, and I can already provide you with the details that the reason why the target audience that was originally set for Toronto... So, the 'thing' that was supposed to happen in Toronto – I'm calling it a 'thing' because I don't want to give it any name – but the thing that was supposed to happen in Toronto; the funding was provided specifically for that and for Leadership; the incoming Leaders of ICANN. This was because, at the time, upon the discussion that At-Large had with Finance, it looked as though it was the project that was most likely going to be funded.

Now, if this is not going to take place in Fiscal Year 13, if the Working Group decides that it does not want to contract this in Toronto, and – well that's already out, so the next thing would be Beijing – so then we're already looking at Fiscal Year... At the next Fiscal Year after that. And that effectively means that a new Budget Request would have to be put together and that might be completely modified compared to the current Budget Request, because what we do also have is a complete change in Leadership at ICANN, and one of the things that I managed to talk about when I talked to Sally Costello, the new incoming VP for

Communications – I believe that’s her position – is to invite her to that meeting, for her to also provide her points of view on things. She doesn’t know anything about the project that is at hand, it’s all up in the air, but it would be a good opportunity for her to get acquainted with the people involved in that project and to perhaps even start from the beginning; having a relationship between staff and the actual work that has taken place.

The concern that I always have is that we work in SILOs, staff works in one side, communities separately work on their own side, and we end up with the kind of situation that we have now – where everybody is talking in parallel. Although I think we’re all talking about the same thing, everybody gets a bit confused. So that’s the second thing that really should happen in Toronto.

The third thing is really to set up a... I would say a timetable of how we are going to get where we want to go. In other words, when does this Program need to be ready by? And then working back from there, giving ourselves an actual timetable of exact timings and deadlines, and basically being able to track that project. It seems to be quite a complex project because it involves all the SOs and ACs and I’m sure it will involve a lot of discussion and so on. But we really need to make sure that we’re not going to be pressed for time and at the last moment, which is what’s happening at the moment. So I would suggest the calendar is the third one.

These are three things that I think three hours would be enough to discuss. Now, understanding that there might be a problem now with the clash, this is maybe the thing that you should discuss now and say,

'do you want a three-hour, full discussion face-to-face, or do you want a shortened face-to-face in Toronto?' Because the other thing that you do have to remember is that we still have six months until Beijing. So that's six months without being able to speak to each other face-to-face, and that sometimes is a problem. That's all. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. I'd just like to clarify, because I might have understood it wrong. For Beijing we don't need a new Budget Request. Beijing is still under the Financial Year 13, but for any other following meeting, Durban or Latin America, we need another Budget Request. The Budget Request has to be submitted...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: ...Yes. In January. So when you think about this also... I just want to give Filiz, again, the floor for just three seconds. She'd like to clarify something. And then I'd like to move onto our Agenda Point #4. The most important; setting the Agenda for Toronto. Filiz, you have the floor please. [coughing]

FILIZ YILMAZ: Thank you Sandra. Filiz here. Sally is a new VP of Stakeholder and Engagement Team; she has indeed been briefed about this project. She knows about it. And I think that [IN Y? 00:39:22] is a good idea to

involve her so she can follow-up the developments from Toronto in regards to this, she finds this important already. The second part about the budget. What you said is right Sandra, the budget that is approved at the moment is for the FY 13, which includes Beijing, but if this ICANN Academy Working Group decides to do something on, maybe in Durban, then that will require new budget process, which can be handled through the normal channels; it's not a big deal. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Filiz.

MARILYN: Sandra, it's Marilyn. Sorry.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, Marilyn, you have the floor.

MARILYN: I guess I'm going to make a time proposal for us, and I don't even know if it's feasible. We wanted an extensive period of time because we're not in agreement on all things, even if we are in agreement on a high-level concept. So we were looking for face-to-face time to better understand people's concerns and views and what might be effective moving forward. I'm wondering – and I know it's short notice, but just on this call – is it even feasible to think that since the Board no longer meets on Friday, most of us will be flying out. I don't know what else is scheduled and the Strat. Plan Meeting may even be on Friday morning,

which would tie some of us up, but is it even feasible to consider Friday morning, if many people aren't travelling until Friday afternoon? Or is that out of the question. [overtalking] Just let me... Sorry. What I'm worried about is, we're going to get to Toronto, the schedule is really crazed, and I don't need to say more about how busy it is, you all know that – all of us. But I think it's going to be difficult if we can't have face-to-face time. [banging]

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Marilyn? You are finished?

MARILYN: Yes, sorry.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: [laughing] Thank you Marilyn. Yes, thank you for this proposal. Also I see there is... People like your proposal, I like it as well. I will be there on Friday also, and I was also thinking about arranging an informal meeting beside the schedule for all those interested and all those still available on Friday, or maybe on Saturday, even, to discuss what we couldn't clarify during the three-hour meeting. Or with maybe what came up during the ICANN Meeting. Because our meeting is on Wednesday in the middle, and maybe we'll have some more information by the end of the meeting which can be evaluated or discussed further. And I would really like that and I will work with... Well, I think mainly on the mailing list I will work out a proposal on how to organize it.

MARILYN: It's Marilyn, I...

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Olivier... Yeah?

MARILYN: Sandra, I just need to clarify my proposal. It's Marilyn. I'm not saying we should do it. I'm saying we should assess it and... So, I think we need to be careful not to hold meetings when the majority can't attend, right? So Friday might be possible but I would ask that we clarify, first of all, and [Carol Carrell? 00:43:31] could do this for you – whether the Strat. Plan Working Group is lunching on Friday. That would tell you whether the Chairs and other people are already tied up. I think Tijani also was in that group. But could we check that to see if it actually is feasible? And is it a time that the majority of people could be there for a couple of hours? I'm cautious about saying it's a proposal. It's a tentative proposal until availability is verified.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, Marilyn. Thanks for clarification. I would say let's do a [Doodle? 00:44:11] and then we will know more about it. I'd like to give the floor to Olivier... Or I'd like to ask Olivier because you've still raised your hand. Is it still from your old comment or would you like to comment? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sandra, it's Olivier, for the transcript. Just to remind you that there is an ALAC and regional wrap-up meeting from 8.00 am until 10.00 am, so it would have to be after 10.00 am. After that, from 10.00 am until 12.00 pm there is an ALAC ExCom Meeting, but you don't need to be in that and so you would be able to attend a small meeting with those people who still remain behind. But I'm hoping that everyone can still make it to the Wednesday session.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier for reminding me. I will consider this when I fill in my time into the Doodle. Let's figure out that on the easy way and not discuss this on this call.

I'd really like to go onto the next Agenda point now, the Agenda for Toronto. What I learnt from this call so far – and not only from this call; also from the discussion on the mailing list – is that the most important discussions, the key issue is the target group or the target groups. And I want us to put this on as first point on the Agenda for Toronto. And after that we can define other Agenda Items like the learning goal timings for Beijing. And I'd like to ask you and to indicate this in the chat, or raise your hand, if you do not agree. Put the target group on the top of the Agenda for Toronto. Can you please use the...

MARILYN: I need to get in the queue.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I see... Yes, please?

MARILYN:

It's Marilyn. I actually think the learning objective is the first topic because we have to understand what the purpose of this is, and I think that helps to define the target group. And, by the way, I hope everybody agrees with this, but I'm going to say that to me it's target *groups*. With an 'S'. And I think from the conversations we've had we do agree. But I think we have to define the learning objective and the purpose, otherwise how do we know... We're just saying, okay, we prioritize this group with that group, but if this is an ICANN-wide initiative, and I think it should be, what's our purpose. What are we trying to accomplish? Is it building awareness and understanding [blindly? 00:47:12] about what ICANN is, and acceptance of ICANN's role? Is it building the capacity to be effective in participating in ICANN? Whether it's participating remotely or in person? Is it building the capacity to contribute in policy development?

I know some of the proposals have targeted the idea that we're going to 'groom' Leaders, from the BC perspective, we're thinking about this as broader capacity building to enhance and support the entire organization, with the idea that people lead where they are. [laughing] And that much of the contribution comes from those that are working in building the groups or in taking information about ICANN into the community. So, for me – and I will live with the consensus of the group – but for me, I think we should continue with the learning objective and then turn to the target audiences. But I think those two are very intertwined, by the way.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Marilyn. Have you finished?

MARILYN: Thanks, yes.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: [laughing] Okay, thank you. Just to summarize, I saw everyone was in disagreement in the Chat Room from Rumi, Chuck and Olivier, and myself. Hardly... I disagree with what you've said. I disagree with that we should first define the learning goals and then the target groups, it's the other way around, but I agree with what you said. That those things are not too separate from each other, that somehow they go together and yes, maybe we should extend the first Agenda point – defining target groups and learning goals. Maybe this could be a solution. But let's give the floor to Chuck. He raised his hand immediately when you were speaking. Chuck, you have the floor please.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, this is Chuck. I certainly agree with you Marilyn that the two are very closely inter-related. But the learning goals are going to vary so much by the target groups that I don't think you can go very far on learning goals without knowing the target groups. And what I would predict would happen is that we're going to have to select some subset of the target groups that we may have for the long-term, to focus on in the short-term. And that selection will greatly influence the learning goals for that particular group or groups. So, again, I think they're

closely inter-related but I don't think you can go very far on learning goals until you know whom the target groups are.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Chuck. Next on the list is Olivier. You have the floor please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Sandra, it's Olivier. And I really – I think I might have said this in the past – but I really enjoy speaking after Chuck because he usually says all what I want to say, so it's really great. Just to add, there is the framework diagram on the Adobe Connect page, and I think that effectively defines what the different target groups are. And, well, the rest has been said by Chuck. This is really the sort of discussion we need to then have in Toronto. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. I would also like to point out what Filiz was mentioning in the chat that if we are talking about learning groups or a learning group, we are also talking about the next implementation step within this framework. And I agree with what Marilyn said, that they are clearly not only one target group, there are multiple target groups and we should think about sufficient capacity building framework and we should just concentrate now on one to get the next implementation steps down. Are there any other comments on this issue? Because otherwise I would note, as agreed, that we discuss the target groups/learning goals as the first point on the Agenda for Toronto. If

you have objections or other opinions please raise your hand or your voice now. Okay I have no hands raised in the chat.

So my second proposal for the Agenda would be that we have the possibility to implement something, whatever, for Beijing or later. I think this is the next important thing with regards to forming a new Budget Proposal for the next Financial Year or not. Because the Budget Proposal has to be submitted by the end of January. We meet in October. Beijing is somewhere in April, so we should start working on the Budget Proposal immediately after Toronto, if we decide that we won't have anything for Beijing. So I think this is a point for discussion as well. Are there objections? Do you agree?

MARILYN:

Sandra, it's Marilyn. I have a counter-proposal if I might, and we can debate them both if that's okay. I think that actually our second item should be materials, mechanisms and approaches to do the capacity building. So one approach is face-to-face, other mechanisms are online training and other supporting materials are going to be needed. So once we agree on target groups, learning goals, I think we should be talking about mechanisms. And I don't think... So that would include the idea of possible face-to-face meetings, but also address the development as other approaches.

To supplement, augment, enhance. So I'm just going to go on to say, one of the things that has concerned me about the previous discussions has been the assumption that people can come in and get trained on different groups' opinions, as opposed to we're broadly developing

capacities and skills. And we'll deal with that, I think, when we talk about the learning goals, so I don't need to talk about it further here, but we really can't train people into any kind of orientation, training, skills enhancement, etc., unless we understand that we have to have well-prepared, clear reviewed materials and supporting mechanisms. So I think we need to talk about that as well.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Marilyn. I think your proposal is in the direction of the long-term perspective on the framework, which we have proposed by the ALAC, but which should be modified by the ICANN community. Just to explain one little detail, if you look at the pyramid there is one white, which has no color, you cannot read what's in there because it's too small, but it says 'advanced virtual learning'. And when we drafted this pyramid we were thinking about missing implementation modules within the ICANN structure.

So I think what you are proposing goes, pretty much, into the discussion on the overall concept, and we should then be very clear to separate – and there we have to do a separation between the long-term goal and the short-term goal. The short-term goal can be Beijing, can be later, can be face-to-face, can be online, can be anything. The long-term goal is to look at all the different needs and all the different mechanisms that should be put in place, inclusive of the capacity building program, which deserves the name ICANN Academy.

Olivier, I see you have raised your hand. You have the floor please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sandra, it's Olivier again. I have the feeling we are somehow in violent agreement here. We all want a number of Programs to be set up. The trouble is: how do we start? Starting with one of them is much more likely to be sustained, or sustainable, than trying to run five or ten things in parallel at the same time, on several fronts. And I've said it on Adobe Chat, that first, on the funding front, that's one thing. Running a lot of things in parallel seems to be very expensive.

But then also, as far we are concerned, if we want the community to build those Programs, build the curriculum, it will be an absolute challenge to be able to build one for the different target groups all in parallel. It's going to be very hard. So we have to really concentrate on one thing, baring in mind this might just be the first year where we have one pilot – not even pilot, I don't want to use pilot because it's... – one target group, one subject, one type of teaching. Moving onto the next year when we can expand at that point and have the Group continue and work on other ways and to address other parts of the ICANN community.

But if we want to do everything simultaneously, I see this as being a case of just going round in circles and getting very, very frustrated indeed that nothing is happening. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. I agree with what you said. And I think we can resolve this problem, or this issue. If we define target groups and goals in the first step we can then decide on what we are heading to be implemented first. And this also implements a discussion about

mechanisms; online, offline, face-to-face, whatever. However we decide, if we go for Beijing or later because this has an impact on our immediate work after Toronto, so work either on a new Budget Proposal or not. So I would still put the timing for Beijing or later as [inaudible 00:59:20] budget impact on the second point of the Agenda. And... Yeah, and then move on further.

As a next point for the Agenda, I see a very important one, which is the role of staff. The role of staff should be defined in a very clear way. We had, when we submitted the proposal for the pilot in Toronto we had some quite controversial discussion on the mailing list about staff giving presentations, which were not even considered to be educational. So we should give [earlier? 01:00:04] about what roles staff should play in this whole system. I don't want to go into detail of that, I just want to summarize because I see that we are now running out of time.

I want to summarize what we have for the Agenda so far. We have, first, the target group and the target goals to define. We have, secondly, to decide what – once we've collected the different groups – simply to decide about how to proceed on a short notice for Beijing. And it was my proposal to discuss, also, the role of staff.

I think what Marilyn mentioned, to talk about mechanisms, we'll always see an underlying issue when we talk about target groups, goals and so on and so forth. I don't think we can really separate these from each other. Maybe this belongs all to the first part of the discussion, and later on also to decide on what we are going to for Beijing or later; that we talk about mechanisms and so on and so forth.

I just want to ask you if you agree to this Agenda because then we will work on the timings to allow most of the people to participate effectively. So to say that if you have conflicting schedules you maybe can jump in and jump out into the discussion. I'm not sure whether this will work. I still hope that we have many Members of the Working Group for the three-hour meeting, and we can see what we can do for Friday. But if there are no objections, I would set the Agenda as just proposed and I would like to ask you to indicate whether you agree or do not agree, either by the Adobe Chat Room or by raising your hand.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Sandra, we want to add one more please?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes, Yaovi, you have the floor please.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yes, thank you Sandra, just, first off, I agree on the Agenda but I can see one comment [I can make is that? 01:02:23] I see the current labels [wrong? 01:02:26], very important in this Program. So I just want to suggest that you put in the Agenda the role of the current Leaders. So I don't know yet how you call them, speakers or what, but I find their role very important in that Program. Thank you very much.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Yaovi. Let me put it this way, I think that is another very long discussion once we have agreed on the first steps. But if there is

sufficient time I think that we could also touch on this issue. It goes a little bit into the direction of the role of staff; staff had a role to play in terms of teaching and of educating, which, as I mentioned, [Spark? 01:03:27] very controversial discussion. So I think this is also an underlying issue, which will always be with us during the whole discussion. Let's put it as a side issue. So are there any other comments?

I just tried to post the Agenda again because there were questions in the schedule. Tried to post the Agenda again and in the Chat Room it says, 'the first is the discussion on target groups/learning goals', the second is 'time in Beijing or not?' And then the third would then be roles of staff. And I think what was mentioned regarding mechanisms and presenters – we had this discussion also, who are they called...? What are they called? Presenters? Teachers? Whatever... Will be also a side issue.

So, as I see no objections and no other hands raised, I consider this as agreed for Toronto. And the last point on our Agenda for today is any other business. And this point is particularly important if there are any issues that were not raised during this call but you think should be discussed. Even if we cannot finish the discussion today we can maybe fulfill or continue this discussion on the mailing list? We still have one more week to go until Toronto. And I would ask you to raise your hand or your voice now if you have any other business. Glenn, you have raised your hand. Glenn, you have the floor please.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi, Glenn McKnight for the record. A few meetings ago we talked about the Moodle, and [Steven/Stephen? 01:05:54] and myself provided a template of the Moodle and also I provided my short... I have approximately 40 short videos that I have offered to the Academy to use, so just, if there's a Working Group still working on the Moodle or using some of the material that I've produced I'd be happy to talk to them.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: [sighing] Thank you Glenn. Yes, I remember, pretty well, the work you and [Steven/Stephen] have done on the Moodle, which was very much appreciated. I just think, at the moment, it is too far ahead. It is too detailed and too concrete to be discussed right now. It will come up on our Agenda once we have decided how we are going to organize, or which mechanism – as Marilyn is calling it – will be put in place. I think then your proposal will soon come up again and will be discussed. But for the moment and for Toronto I see no point in putting this in the Agenda. But anyway, maybe you can use some informal discussions and promote the work you and [Steven/Stephen] have done.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Are there any other questions? Okay, I just went back to the Agenda for our today's call and I saw that the role of staff in this project was a [singular? 01:07:38] point. As we are running out of time now I propose

that we leave it on the Agenda for Toronto. I think it's better to [audio breaking up] [inaudible 01:07:45] or on this call. And if there are no other comments, I would then thank you... All of you for participating in this call. I'm really impressed by the number of participants and for the comments and for your active participation. And I would then conclude this meeting as closed, and finished.

[general goodbyes and thank yous]

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you to everyone for joining today's call. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Have a good weekend, and for those who will be travelling to Toronto, see you there. Bye bye.

[End of Transcript]