AVRI DORIA:	I guess I'll start and see what we get. I assume the recording is on and marked.
JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Yes that's correct Avri.
AVRI DORIA:	Okay, thank you. In which case the agenda, this is not a regular meeting with a full agenda. This is a meeting with just one path to see how far we can get on it and that's the outreach evaluation and recommendation, something that a few people have put some work into but for the most part has been lingering and that may in part be my fault in that I haven't had a meeting like this yet. But anyhow, I had three things on the agenda. One was to look at the theory paper to see if it was ready for review, include Wordsmith if it was necessary, look at the survey and see where we're at and do any Wordsmithing if necessary, and then based upon how far we've gotten and what else we're doing, look at the Beijing meeting. We have a whole session planned for this I believe, and see what we can do in that session to make it worthwhile and to get this project back on the road. We have in my estimation slipped at least pretty much three months on the original schedule, so the notion of doing it in a year has been compressed. So we either have to get it back on the road or we have to admit defeat and move on. I'm hoping we get it back on the road. And then any other business that may come up. Does anyone have any comments on this agenda, or does anybody have any other business?
DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:	No, no please, no please.

AVRI DORIA:	Evan, I see your hand up. Did somebody try to talk before Evan though? No.
EVAN:	I guess I'll state my point at the beginning of this call in that I think that there is a larger issue that needs to be addressed. The issue of outreach regarding the objection process and the success with which our efforts were able to find people that had objections to gTLD and the relative lack of success of that based on the number of objections that we actually had to consider is not only something that needs to be strongly dealt with and considered but I thing can't be addressed in a vacuum. We went through the exact same set of issues and over the matter of applicant support where we had a similar situation in which case we had At-large and other volunteers put enormous amounts of time and mental effort into putting a process that was fair, it was usable, it was effective, and it was largely unused. We look at the applicant support program and see that at the end of it in fact only one I believe of the applicants has come out as deemed worthy of support at the end of the process that was designed, and I consider that to be a fairly unacceptable result. While the problem with that is not part of this agenda, the issue of outreach is, and I want to suggest then that the issue of outreach is a larger one that goes well beyond just the objection procedure and it has to do with the fact that the At-large activities in regard to the gTLD program as a whole have generally not been put forward to the general public. They have not been promoted, whether it is applicant support, whether it is the objection process, I believe that when ICANN goes out and it does its road shows it essentially targets applicants, it does not target communities outside the applicants that also have an interest in doing this. I think there is a

broader issue here than simply applying outreach to the objection process and I think we need to work on a more broader strategy that has to deal with why is ALAC continuing to put enormous amount of work into processes and systems that we believe fairly represent trying to bring community into these programs and yet through the results that we see, both in applicant support and in the objection process, are so massively underused as they indicate pretty well nothing short of a real failure to get the word out. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. However, first of all, this was actually not outreach on objection; it was outreach on new gTLDs, but I see no reason why within this, unless of course ALAC central tells me that it's not, that the lack of success on the objection process and that you didn't get as many objections as you thought or hoped could also be an element of this. This project was an overall one on why has the outreach to internet users globally on the gTLDs, on applicant support, and perhaps it would need a small pick of the pen for ALAC to enlarge the scope to include the objection process in that and that certainly is something that can be looked at especially since at least two of you are indeed ALAC members or are here. On the other part, a lot of what you said seems to me to be stuff that belongs in the theory formation paper. I know you are talking about reasons, perhaps the reason that outreach in general for ICANN to internet users and of ALAC projects to others doesn't go to internet users. So I actually don't see what you said as being necessarily beyond the scope of this project, but it certainly was something that will perhaps need to be added into the scope of the theory paper, I don't know. But that's my first take on what you said. I don't know if others have comments, I don't see any hands. No? Okay, so having said all that,

both you and I, what I had thought we would do is look at the theory formation paper as it currently exists. Now what I did, just so people know, there was a theory formation webpage, I think these are all showing, tell me if they're not, which have started with just a list of bullets made, in Toronto I believe it was, then from there Tijani has amplified that list and had put it unfortunately in a addendum as opposed to just editing the original, but nonetheless that's okay. Fatima added some comments and the Tijani wrote essentially what I believe a first draft of the paper. Unfortunately he is not on the call, but he is in the apologies, I see.

EVAN: I'll read just a small point, speaking of apologies. Natalie has asked in the chat if you actually wanted to take a roll-call of this.

AVRI DORIA: Aw, so sorry, I forgot. I'll slap my wrist. Please, can somebody take a roll call?

NATALIE: Thank you Avri, this is Natalie. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, this is a new detailed report for the outreach evaluation and recommendation test. On the 26th of March, we have Avri Doria, Yaovi Atohoun, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Evan Leibovitch and _____<09:09>. We have apologies from Hong Xue, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Cintra Sooknanan. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself Natalie.

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

AVRI DORIA: Thank you and apologies again for forgetting that just going into the agenda. Okay so back to this. So I don't know if it is showing on your

screens because when I'm showing my screen it doesn't show me what you all are seeing. But I basically took what Tijani had done in that section and created a new page, and I'm calling it the paper. It has got two sections in it yet, I don't know but Tijani's stuff has been in the Wiki page for quite a while so hopefully people have had a chance to read it, but if they haven't I guess one of the things to look at now is to look at it and see if this is an adequate starting document to put out or do we need to add more to it. I believe, listening to what Evan just said and my own opinions, probably there is more to add but let's see. So we have a section here that starts with very high application fee and basically sets the background of that fee. Second paragraph talks about the creation under jazz of an application support program, then there is a paragraph that gives the statistics on that very much similar to some of the issue that Evan brought up of lots and lots of work from lots and lots of people and nothing, you know the number of applications for support was three only while the funds were up to 14 and that was at least a minimum. Significantly low proportion of the developing countries and poor communities of the program was due to several elements, and there's lack of a proper outreach to which he has the beginning of a section, and then there's timing of outreach, technical capacity lacking, cost of registry service providers, no interest, no business, aid, no buying from local community, unnecessary duplication of CPTLD and IBNCPTLD. Now, one questions is, do all those bullets need to have an appropriate section, and if so do we have someone to write it. I am not volunteering to be the author of this document. And then we do have one with the lack of appropriate research, and this I think echoes again some of what Evan's said, the outreach of a new gTLD program which only makes only potential applicants from developed countries well

informed. In fact the campaigns were mostly done in North America and Europe, the only effort for the developing regions was done through electronic means, website, Twitter, Facebook etc., without noisy physical event, the information could not reach the possible applicants in those regions especially because they are not well served in terms of access and connectivity. The electronic campaign was more useful for the north people who are already well informed. As for the applicants work program, no outreach was done in the appropriate regions that could encourage people to apply. The number of applicants for support shows clearly the failure. Moreover all outreach programs for both the new gTLD program and the applicant support program were implemented very late. We can say that the outreach effort was conceived and implemented for the developed world only. Is that enough there? Does that need to be further developed? So I guess I'd like to open the floor first on the bullets. Are the bullets there accurate representation of sections that this paper needs? I am making an assumption that this is a project that we need to continue on, or Evan perhaps I need to be corrected and is your evaluation that the problem is much broader than this puny effort and we should really bag it and leave it up to somebody else?

EVAN: Well my own take is simply that it is absolutely within the scope of the gTLD working group because even if you look at applicant support in this, as a whole they still both come under this working group, so I don't think there is an issue of scope of whether or not of who is the right group to be dealing with this. I think it is in the right place. I just wanted to suggest that it wasn't duly focused so much on the objection process

but simply to the efforts that ALAC has been putting into its applicant support and indeed to other components of the program. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. So in other words, if I understand, you think we should still keep working on that?

EVAN: Yeah, but simply not to focus on it specifically in terms of objections or specifically in terms of applicant support, but outreach efforts and regarding the gTLD program and its consequences to the public.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, I certainly, if people are generally in agreement with that, will have to raise the issue on the list, I'll certainly tweak the charter and then send a note off to Olivier and he and the powers that be can certainly review an enlargement of the charter. The only question I have is we are having trouble getting the work done on a narrow charter, so broadening the charter makes me feel, Oh, okay, sure, we can try to do that. Anyhow, there are two hands up. I see Andrew and Yaovi. Andrew.

ANDREW: Thanks Avri. I guess I just have a little bit of a question about our goal with all of this. A lot of what is being discussed sounds like it may be true, but I am not entirely sure I'm following where we wanted to go. Are we looking for a Mea Culpa from the broader group? What's our end game with this, I am just a little unclear.

AVRI DORIA: If I can answer that? As the charter says, first we do an analysis and then we make any recommendation of remedial action. The goal so far was to figure out what the problem was and the second part was going to be to actually make recommendations that could range all the way from Mea Culpa from everyone if that pleases people to actually asking for a

remedial program. But we haven't gotten there yet, but that's the goal, that's clearly stated in the charter.

ANDREW: Okay, my only thought is this, to do the look back, I get what you're saying. If we can, our small group, make it as clear as clear as possible what we'd ideally want. For example, in my perspective, a mea culpa is definitely worth a lot unless we were to come forward with specific recommendations that were at least moderately actionable. So I don't know exactly how everybody thinks about it but I am trying to get a little clear sense of what we'd like our end state to be.

AVRI DORIA: The end state was supposed to be derived from the analysis. Now obviously lots of us have possible end states in mind but we sort of held them in abeyance as we were doing the analysis so that when we recommend something as this charter mandates us to do, we are doing it on a fact basis as opposed to, I mean my opinion is that they should immediately start plans on a remedial program to reach out to developing areas, that includes a lower fee and support and all kinds of things, but that's just me hand-waving and someone could quite quickly say, yes Avri, the idea of a remedial program sounds wonderful, but why do you think it will fix anything and how would we construct it so that it didn't encounter the problems reported.

ANDREW: Okay Avri, so I agree with you on both ends. I appreciate it.

AVRI DORIA: Yaovi, the floor is yours.

YAOVI: Thank you very much. For me I think too much on the content of the theory formation. I agree that we need to try from this group to have an idea but we cannot think on behalf of people. This is why the most

important step is to hear from people because we cannot assume, but we can try to think about the reason, but we can get real reason only when we do a very good survey and we reach the maximum number of people in this survey. So this is my comment. So for now what we have in this document of theory formation is okay, but maybe we need to maybe improve the survey to have a better idea but we can only go ahead after we had the survey reaching the maximum and diverse group of people. This is my comment. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. So if I understand you correctly, you are basically saying it's nice the paper got as far as it did, people should perhaps volunteer to start working on some other section, but really we should push the paper now into the background as background work and we should bring the survey into foreground using what we have got in the paper to perhaps educate the survey a bit more, but we should make the survey our primary work item while people continue to work and think in the background on the paper. Did I understand that correctly?

YAOVI: Exactly, correctly.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so what do people think? Should we follow Yaovi's suggestion and basically push the paper back, I can work some more on a paragraph or two, perhaps others of you who have inclinations to say things about it can continue to work on it in the background, and Yaovi has done some work on the survey, we bring that to the foreground. Does anyone have any objection to doing that. I see a green check, I see no red checks, a couple of green checks, I'm trying to find my way to the right page. Okay, looks like three green checks, no red checks, and the only two that didn't comment are Yaovi whose idea it was, and me. So let me go

back to the work that Yaovi has put in the page and others. So on survey, Yaovi, do we have more? There's comments on the Caribbean survey, so it's all in this front page. So, Yaovi, you've sort of been taking the lead on this and we're shifting it to the forefront on your suggestion so I'm going to rely on you bunches, and I'm wondering if I can turn the floor over to you for you to A) Tell us where you think it is at, B) Tell us what you think we should do, and C) Tell us if you think there is anything we could do before Beijing or this work that we need to do in Beijing? And sorry for putting you on the spot but I kind of believe people taking the lead would be put on the spot. Unfortunately, Tijani wasn't here for me to put him on the spot but if you are willing I'd like to turn the floor over to you for you to tell us where we're at and what we need to do.

YAOVI: I'm trying to get the link, can we have the link of the broker names.

AVRI DORIA: There's the link.

YAOVI: Okay, one minute. So what I did, I just put some comment to the original survey documents from ideas. So what I can do now, maybe I can just talk about the comment I put about the original document. So the initial document, or core document, was talking about location so maybe we need to make it worldwide because we want to have a global or a general survey. The second comment I put is that was one of the questions. I was submitting that we need to have more examples because that one was for the Caribbean region. So we need to give more examples to the public involved in order to reach the survey. _____<25:34>. Again this question is limited so I will say this question is more relevant to users who are most relevantly potential applicants.

Maybe we need to ask business people so that was one comment. So I think we may need to ask more questions in the new survey, what we want to get from people. Do we need to apply for new domain name after final delegation? Because this is something we need to understand. We are asking users, we are not just talking to business people. So we need to ask them do you think we need to apply for a domain name _____<26:33>. Some people can say we don't care of what I'm using on your page, so it's good to know at this stage. _____<26:55> because of the very low application for developed is a problem for them. So we talk to the public again, we need to ask them if they think about any wrong. So this is what I wanted to talk about the survey, this in the Caribbean region. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I know one question immediately jumps out at me after I see question B there is do you think seriously that you can, and what would you need in order to be able to, might be another question. My impression looking at this is that we have a start but they were nowhere quite near the set of 10 questions yet. As we had talked about trying to have a general survey we never quite figured out what kind, we had a thing of creating questions and I guess we have got two or three questions now. If we broaden the scope of this group then we probably also need to broaden the scope of the questions and we may indeed want to think about having questions in the area of new GLTD program. Did you hear about it? When did you hear about it? What did you hear about it? etcetera kinds of questions about applicant support, when did you hear about it, what would you have needed, and others. And then if we are also adding the objection process to questions of did you know we had an objection process in At-large. Do you ever hear news from

ICANN on the new gTLD program, do you hear news from ALAC on the new gTLD program. If you were to hear news, how would the best way for you to hear news was? And other questions like that. So it sounds like at least to me it looks like there is certainly more fleshing out of questions that we need to do and perhaps it can become to smaller numbers with a slightly broadened scope and such, and I'm wondering maybe that will be inspiration for someone else to comment. Do people generally believe we need more questions?

EVAN: I don't know if it is a matter of more questions or less questions, I to be honest with you, have not given this an entire amount of whole lot of looking at right now if only because of the pressures of other things pre-Beijing. Frankly given the fact that this is not extremely time sensitive, I would even suggest that we start talking about this in Beijing and start working on this a little bit more past Beijing if only because of the massive pressures that have built up of what I myself have at least seen to be a massive rush of issues to be prepared for in time for Beijing. So at least at a personal level I'm going to suggest that we talk about this at the ICANN and that we work on it immediately after because it is of immediate timeliness and we can probably do a better job by working on it a little bit more afterwards. I can only speak for myself in saying that I haven't given this the attention that I think I should give it and it's only because I've been driven away on a whole bunch of other things.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. There is a question about asking questions regarding the objection process and are we aware of the objection process and so forth. I am kind of wondering, those type of questions geared for ALS and At-large type of thing? Because I was under the impression that this would be something that would be made available to the public, like the

general public hosted in various forums and not in the usual ICANN for a, so to speak, maybe at the IGF, that type of stuff. So questions about the objection process and so forth as to why we are aware of the objection process, should that not be in the internal community like all the five RELO and so forth?

AVRI DORIA: I don't know. That's certainly something worth discussing. I actually thought that the ALS were willing to receive objections from anywhere but it's perhaps you could have a part of the question that was broader. You are a member of ALAC, right, so perhaps you will look at this notion of expanding the breadth and say well, objection should have its own postmortem and it should be done differently, which is also fine. But certainly, yeah, that is something we could certainly talk about.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: If you try to put so many elements in such a survey I think you are going to wind up with a very long survey that I don't if anybody is going to fill out. _____<34:03> outreach, the objection process, so I'm just a little bit concerned about the length of the survey because if you make it so large nobody is going to fill it out.

AVRI DORIA: And indeed we could decide that there was more than one survey and that they were at a different times, and indeed that was what I had originally suggested a 10-question survey.

ANDREW: I think I'm going to agree with a couple of different thoughts here. One from Evans, I think there is a lot of time to be considered so I agree let's get this process started but I don't think it makes sense to try to rush through. I think it was Dev who said that there was a need to have this reach out well beyond the ICANN world, I think that that makes a lot of sense because a lot of the people, part of the challenge is especially in a

lot of the markets we're trying to reach, ICANN world is pretty thin, and I'm not sure how we choose who we focus on getting this out to but I definitely think it will be helpful to have a lot of not-usual suspect kind of voices in that. Those are the two things that jump out of my mind. Whether we have a longer survey or a shorter survey, my inclination is that of a kind of a combination, something that is easy to fill out quickly and then open-ended questions where we can get some feedback would probably be the best way to go but nothing too long. I agree.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Roberto.

ROBERTO: As I said in the chat, I am realizing you are not on Adobe.

AVRI DORIA: I am. I'm just too busy talking to read it.

ROBERTO: What I would propose is I agree with Evan but I think that there is one thing that we can do before Beijing, which is to do on the list of brainstorming on the potential questions. I think it won't do any harm to have that done and that will at least to the people who will be in Beijing which I assume will not be everybody, can give a sort of a starting point for the discussion. That could be useful I think.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Okay, so I must admit I tend to agree with people about the next two weeks being hardly a time. I think Roberto makes good sense, we can start trying to brainstorm on this on the list. I'm not sure how much hope I have for that. We'll still keep the meeting on in Beijing to talk about this in specific. I kind of like to add a chore for everyone for everyone that's on the group though, something that they can think about perhaps on the long, arduous and painful flight to Beijing, is that everyone that is part of this project team, to basically come in with at

least one well-formed question for a survey to the meeting, not that that will necessarily go in as written but at least for everyone that sort of says yes this is work that I want to be part of that they basically come in and that in Beijing we talk about questions, we try to actually put a draft together of questions, we talk about methodologies for the survey, we talk about things like one survey, multiple surveys, in a sense the survey has the same problem as the outreach. It's nice for us to say we think we should reach further than the usual suspects in our survey, yet harder the problem that the survey is trying to answer is how come we only reach the usual suspects. So I think we will have to do a little bit of creative thinking and we have the offer from Heidi to get staff help in actually trying to reach further with the survey than we have ever managed to reach before with any of our outreach. So that too can be something we talk about there. I forget, is this an hour or a 90 minute meeting. Heidi, you remember? Okay, I didn't remember. So I will look at the agenda that I put together for that meeting and basically sort of start with question gathering and question-smithing. We obviously won't finish in that meeting, I'll be looking for volunteers to take it away, finish it, we will define a process for finishing this action and for doing the surveys. Now, does that work for this part of the call, and there is no reason to extend the call too long. The other thing though that we wanted to do, and we were going to do it based on the questionnaire, obviously we can't at this point, but we have thought of using the meeting to sort of gather some information. Is there any desire that we would want to do that or do we at this point want to say too busy, too many things, the pressure of time, all these instantaneous changes that are happening all over ICANN and perhaps we'll save the

conversational talking for post Beijing and the survey. What are people thinking out?

ANDREW: Thanks. Based on the other meetings that I've been in, my sense is that it is a bit of a crap shoot for these kinds of things and given all the other pressures and meetings and such, I am not sure that we are going to get good data if we try to use this as a brainstorming or a data gathering session. That's my only concern about doing it that way, but I think maybe getting the process started and talking about what we are trying to do makes more sense.

AVRI DORIA: While you were speaking I actually thought of, and maybe I heard the word, talking about what we were doing in a slightly different sense than you uttered it, but I thought about some of us reaching out to some of the leadership in CCTLV and at regional assemblies or whatever it is we are having there and if there is a chance to talk to a group of Chinese users, is a chance we will only have this once, and so taking advantage of some of those opportunities to talk about what we are doing, but not necessarily do what we call data collection so much as sort of what they sometimes call socializing an idea. So we've talked about Beijing plans, we've talked about the theory paper, and while I would still like people to look at those bullets and think about whether they can craft any bullets or sentences to add to the paper, so please do so over the next month, and I'll keep bringing it up and such. We've talked about the survey, we are going to try and get some conversation going on the survey on the list. In the meantime I'm asking each of you and everyone else that plans to come to this meeting as a member of this project team, to come with at least one thought out survey question and perhaps sub-question and what have you, but to come in

with one thing you think is really important to ask that you thought about and you've done some initial work trying to frame as a good question. Does anybody disagree with that? Okay so I see no instant red stars, no hands going up, or whatever it is. And then we'll try to get the survey crafted in Beijing, or at least a first draft of it drafted. We will then also talk about the methodologies and how to proceed on doing it at that point, including the notion of how do we do outreach for a survey about outreach, and so on, anything else we need to talk about now to try and get this project back on the road. I sort of resist the notion of us initiating it in Beijing but I do accept the notion of us reinitiating it in Beijing. Any comments? Yaovi, can I ask you to remain a lead on the survey project and on gathering?

YAOVI: Okay, I will do Avri. And in the check Adobe I was thinking we may also start thinking about how to make the final document available in order.

AVRI DORIA: I think that's a really good idea. I think once we have a survey, I think when we are talking about the methodology, I think it is really good to include that it needs to be translated into many languages, perhaps even more languages than staff normally does in reaching out and so I think that translation is obviously a great idea especially when we are talking about why did outreach for IDMs not work. Anything else? And thank you Yaovi for taking the lead on this project. No? In which case I thank you for your time and future effort, and for those that already put in effort, thank you very much for sort of keeping with it. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]