GISELLA GRUBER:	I'd like to welcome everyone on today's ATLAS II Survey Working Group meeting on Monday the 1st of July at 19:00 UTC. On today's call, we have Roberto Gaetano, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Eduardo Diaz, Jordi Ipparraguirre, Wolf Ludwig.
	We have apologies from Satish Babu, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Natalia Enciso, and Fatima Cambronero. From staff, we have Carlos Reyes, Heidi Ullrich, and myself Gisella Gruber. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Wolf.
WOLF LUDWIG:	Okay, thanks again Gisella. As we all know it's not number at particular call conference account, it's the quality of attendees. Therefore, I am pleased to welcome the few of you who could make it for this phone call. And as you may recall, we agreed on this, I think it was, middle of June, to hatch this notification or this planning, this design call conference to discuss basic outlines of the next survey.
	We will be planning and we intend launch early enough in the planning process to ATLAS II. And it was the agreement at the time that we should not reinvent any circus again, but we should come back and review the first survey we circulated before the first ATLAS in the early planning process of ATLAS I.

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

And the survey was launched in autumn 2008 to my memory. Thanks to Dev who raised the respected feelings, which were added to tonight's agenda, circulated to the list before, to have a closer look at what we did. What we designed in the first step in the first design for the first ATLAS survey a couple of years ago.

And I still believe this offers an useful basis to be considered to be looked on, etcetera, and to be discussed for next outline of survey questionnaire. And I still believe the better questions we may design, draft, and formulate for the next survey, the better answers will be – we may receive on our next survey.

This is the context, or this is the frame of our task at the moment as far as I can see it. I would like to know from the attendees whether you more or less agree with the goals, and with the aim and scope for the next survey, what is to include our audience, our member, our members. Not to design a survey which is seen from as a top down endeavor.

But to include questions, interests, and concerns from our members at the very early stage of any design of next survey questionnaire. Any comments from your side. I see approval from Roberto on this basic outlines and basic idea. Any questionnaire needs, and any survey, and any questionnaire for a survey needs to serve a very particular purpose.

And the purpose and context must be very clear before we can restart drafting such a survey, and the goals and scope we intend to reach in this context. Is there no questions or comments or remarks from your side? Let me say that from the chat I see first approval from Jordi. Let

EN

me just to start with some definition of aims and scope for the next survey.

This was partly covered more or less from the next introduction. If you allow me a remark at this stage, I have compared, according to our – to tonight's call agenda, I've compared previous At-Large survey. The first one which is listed with a respective link here, At-Large structure 2010 survey, which was a second big survey conducted by At-Large after the first summit survey.

And I've looked at and I've compared the questions we raised at the second survey. And it was a completely different goal and it was a completely different context, we tried to fulfill with the second survey. Therefore, in my personal opinion, and I underline in my personal opinion, the second survey does not really serve as a good pattern or as a good example for our next survey.

But I still believe that the second one listed here with a respective link, the At-Large survey, was much better and was well done at the time. And I think I believe we can take a majority of the questions from the first survey, slightly adapt them, and we could more or less use the structure of the previous first At-Large survey for the next one.

But I would first have some preliminary feedback from your side on this issue. Any questions? Comments on this? Yes [CROSSTALK 0:07:52]

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes I have a question. This is Eduardo. The first why – I'm just curious. My question is for curiosity. We've had two surveys before the first ATLAS, is that correct?

WOLF LUDWIG: No. We had… To my memory, the first real big survey at At-Large was the ATLAS I survey. The first one. And the other one was about ALS structures, and about ALAS functioning, about ALAS contact points, about ALAS communication tools, etcetera. It was more the organizational and functional type of a survey, and not more the topic really, not topic related survey.

And therefore I think the second, the functional one, was – wouldn't be so relevant as an example for us now. But the first survey, which is now on the screen, first ATLAS I survey, questions sent to ALS. This structures and questions, somehow was directed to a bottom up approach. Ask your members, ask your respective ALS, what their interests are, what their concerns are, and include their ideas into the planning process of a summit agenda.

And not doing a summit agenda in the top down manner, where you only ask some insiders who regularly or always is the usual suspects, so to say, who always participate. If we, among insiders design an agenda for the next summit, it will not necessarily meet the expectations or interests of our members. I think we must be very clear about this potential contradiction, that you have a different view if you are always participating at ICANN meetings, if you're always participating at

monthly calls of ALAC, if you're always participating in monthly RALO calls.

Or if you are kind of ordinary member who does not have the time, who does not have the capacity to regularly participate, you may have completely different views and angles on EURALO, on At-Large, on ICANN. And I think we have to get the people from where they are to really make an interesting summit agenda for them, and not taking for granted what we as insiders think the agenda should contain.

This was a basic idea, but we followed when we designed and discussed the outline of the first ATLAS I survey and questions. And, to my memory, we really stepped into the right direction because we had a considerable response quorum at the time, and we get some very useful feedback.

And I'm still convinced that the outline of the program, or the agenda of the first survey, in Mexico in March 2009, would have looked completely different if we wouldn't have asked our members for their input, for their ideas, for their concerns, for the program planning design. I think the success of the first Mexico summit was to a major extent do to the efforts we have taken, launch – designing the survey and then launching the survey, and giving our members opportunity to consult us, to consult the summit organizers what agenda should be all about.

I think this is a key… This is a crucial element in any event planning, ask the audience for their interest and don't always consider what you think would be good as being important. So we are walking now in a similar

direction, and I think we… It's not… There is no need to reinvent anything. We have done a good job from years ago, and now we need to adapt what was done before.

I see Jordi's hand raised. Jordi, please, you have the floor. Jordi?

JORDI IPPARRAGUIRRE: Hello. This is Jordi.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes.

JORDI IPPARRAGUIRRE: Hello?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Speak a little bit.

JORDI IPPARRAGUIRRE: Hi. Can you hear me? Hi. Hello.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Yes we can hear you.

JORDI IPPARRAGUIRRE: Hi Wolf. Hello everyone. Just very shortly, I have to leave in 10 minutes, but just to comment on what you said. I mean, Wolf, I really

EN

agree on that. I mean, that's going to be to the success of the meeting. My only point here would be to keep in mind what was already said in the mailing list about what [? 0:13:29] would like to talk about, and what a RALO is supposed to bring into the ICANN framework.

So that means, not any topic is valid, because in theory we have just to discover what ICANN, whatever is related to ICANN, not just about things that maybe are out of the scope. So beside that's point, I really subscribe to what you said. That's all, thanks.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Jordi. It's Wolf Ludwig again for the record. It's exactly what we discussed some years ago. It must be clear that member ALSs cannot just suggest whatever subject comes to their mind, or what is in the daily scope of the ALS aims and business. Of course, it must have a clear link with ICANN issues. For this reason, we said, "Okay. We define the scope of ICANN issues."

Which are part of the questions. So we give them a choice, from A) what questions, issues are covered under the ICANN mandate, and etcetera. And after that, they can give their priorities, their particular interests within one, two, three, four, blah, blah, blah. And then after that, we give them… It gives them an opportunity to say any further thing you would like to discuss what are not necessarily included in the narrow ICANN scope and mandate.

And I remember a lot of responses we got from the first survey was issues like privacy, or user concerns. User concerns can be somehow broader, but then we can try to re-relate them back to the ICANN

mandate. And this will be a very tricky issue afterwards for the working group to make the bridges and to make the links.

But I see Heidi's hand raised. Heidi you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Wolf. This is Heidi for the record. Just to clarify one point about the first summit, and then I would just like to make a suggestion for the upcoming survey. Eduardo asked the question whether there were two surveys for the first summit.

And actually the answer is yes, there was one that was basically just trying to gauge interest in general. And you can see that on the Wiki page on the agenda. There was one that was sent out, it must have been early 2009 and results were to be discussed in June 2009 at the Paris meeting.

And then a second survey was sent in the autumn of 2009, strictly to ask the interest – prioritize the interest in working group topics. So again, you can see that on the Wiki page for the summit. And then my comment for the current, the upcoming survey, is whether there could be an upcoming question asking the ALSs to list the approximate number of their members.

I know that Fadi has asked that a couple of times that in the next survey, if At-Large could ask some more information about that for their ALSs. That's it Wolf, thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks Heidi. I just typed into the chat, thanks for your comments, but in terms of chronology, Heidi, the Paris meeting was in 2008. And this was before the first ICANN – the first At-Large Summit. The idea came up before the daily meeting, which was in spring 2008, then we had the Paris meeting in summer 2008, and then we had the Cairo meeting in autumn 2008.

And we always planned such a summit happen in 2008 already, but it didn't work out. Today we know it was good that it didn't work as a quick shot, and we needed to go into some more detail and serious planning, and therefore we could only make it happen in March 2009. And the first survey for the summit was launched, to my memory, in autumn 2008.

The second survey you were talking about Heidi, this was a survey about particularity about At-Large structures and working methods, and this we did for the next European meeting for Brussels. And the result of the second survey, to my memory, were presented in June 2000 – at the Brussels meeting. So this was a subsequent endeavor. What we did… What was useful for, let's say, At-Large and At-Large stuff, but which was, okay, which included also interests for participation in At-Large working groups.

But I think the model case now for our next ATLAS II survey, in my opinion, is the one we designed and conducted in late 2008. And we receive the outline of the questions here on the screen. Further questions, comments?

EN

I just see now further [deliberations 0:20:10] by Heidi. Second summit question, question… I have to check Heidi, I'm not aware about this any…

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Sort of, it's yeah. We're getting into the details. So basically that's on the Wiki page. So I joined in 2008 when the first summit survey had been already sent. And then, later in the year, a second first survey was sent. And then I, for the 2010 survey, Cheryl and I worked very closely on the development of the much broader questionnaire.

So that one, that was the one, Wolf, that you and Dev, etcetera, then and various sub group, or working group, developed or worked on the results of the 2010 survey which you presented at various meetings, including the Brussels meeting. And I'll put that into the link too.

It's was a much deeper survey.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yeah, yeah. I just see it now. Well, this means we have basically three surveys conducted already. I only had the two main ones in my memory, I forgot about this second survey which wasn't on my radar anymore. Well, maybe it should then be a link between the two of them.

And well, a major challenge in my opinion is always, if we compare the circumstances and conditions we faced in 2008, when the whole RALO system was more or less a new one, which was introduced in 2006/2007, mainly. And it was a basic outline with far less member

ALSs compared to now. And the question is, even if we have more or less established a number of ALSs compared to 2008, we found that many of them can still be considered as newcomers.

And I think not over demanding the agenda, this was again an observation I made during our last EURALO General Assembly in Lisbon. EURALO has developed over the past years, became more performing over the last years, got more member ALSs over the last years. But if ice melt, the atmosphere during the General Assembly one and a half weeks ago, well it became clear that newcomers still have difficulties getting involved in the discussion.

They became certified ALSs, many of them do not participate regularly at our monthly calls, therefore they are not insiders, they are not necessarily outsiders but they are newcomers or beginners. And a lot of issues we discuss, we regularly discuss at telephone conferences, etcetera, may not necessarily ring a bell to them.

Therefore I think we should start designing our question at the very low level, more or less at the newcomers level, more or less at the level where we normally start this capacity building programs, etcetera. And I do not want to mix now the two issues that ATLAS II should be all together in capacity building effort, but I think some of the entrance conditions may be similar to capacity building programs and therefore the questions should be designed in this direction.

Dev, I see your hand raised. Please, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. Are you hearing me?

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. We can clearly hear you, yes.

DEV ANAND TELLUCKSINGH: Great. Thank you. Dev Ananad Tellucksing speaking. I've been just looking to the first ATLAS I survey, the second At-Large Plus 2 Survey, and then the ALS structure survey in 2010. I do think that we shouldn't, in fact, try to mix them, the goals of these surveys into one – into each other.

So I think in terms of… In terms of ATLAS II survey, I think what we can say we can do the same thing, conduct a short survey now, I would say as soon as possible, and just to give feedback as to what do ALSs want to see in a summit, in the summit too. And then, based on that information, we find – well, we find the summit objectives, agenda, and so forth.

And then at the second follow-up survey then. In terms… But my… In terms of the capacity building questions I believe we also want to ask, and getting some more information regarding the At-Large structures as well. I think the At-Large structures building and the capacity building could be bundled into its own survey separately.

But I think what we should say is that as a pre-condition for attending the summit too, you must fill out the At-Large structure survey bundled

with the capacity, you know, asking about capacity building topics and so forth. I hope I made myself clear. But that's my first impression.

WOLF LUDWIG: Right. Right. Thanks a lot, thanks a lot Dev for your comments. I see next, Eduardo who raised his hand. Please, Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello this is Eduardo for the record. Are we going to make these surveys like we did last time for the last summit, you know that the ALS are interested in participating, they have to answer the surveys one way or another? That's the question. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Thanks a lot Eduardo. I was just thinking about actually the next steps and how to proceed. I think that we face a slight difficulty that only a portion of the survey sub group, could now attend this planning call tonight. And I have some difficulty now to take a decision in such a small group on the next procedures.

Therefore I think the potential outcome of this, of tonight's call could be if we could make some suggestions, what we think would be a good or reasonable next step to proceed in Durban. And my suggestion would go into the direction from the people who attended this call tonight, we are now aware about three type of surveys being made so far.

And let's have a quiet look on the three, one after another, are being put on the table, one next to the other, and sort out and make

suggestions which element of questions should be the main part of the next ATLAS II survey. So this would be a kind of homework for our small group.

We will have a close look on this after the call again, and we make respective… I take now as an example from the first ATLAS I survey, we have the preamble, we have question one and then question 12, and then we can say, "Okay. This type of a question should be part of the questionnaire for ATLAS II."

And we can have a look at the other surveys with it, and this element of the other surveys would, could be reasonable to be confident to be included as well. If you come up with such a list of suggestions from our small group now, and put it on the list for the whole working group, we can give them a chance to respond, let's say up to a certain deadline.

Let's say until Durban would be realistic, and then my suggestion, my further suggestion would be those people from our working group who would be present in Durban, let's find a time slot in the Durban program to sit together and make it a face to face way, which maybe would be much more productive to say, "Okay. We made this suggestions, we got this and that feedback, now we have more or less a sort of consolidated picture."

And then we can really, in Durban, make a sort of final drafting of a survey outline. This, from a procedural point, would be my suggestion. Eduardo, Roberto, Dev, your opinion on this procedure, suggestion is highly welcome and much appreciated. I see Dev's – was it Dev's or Eduardo's approval?

Roberto raised his hand. Roberto, you have the floor.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes thank you. Yeah, I think we have no…

WOLF LUDWIG: Can you speak up a little bit Roberto? I have difficulties to understand you.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Okay. I'll try. I think that we have no other choice. I think that we need to bring this matter forward, and we need to make a decision in Durban. So we… The problem is that I would kind of hope that we can get advice from more, and contributions, from more people than just say four or five.

So that we arrive in Durban with a [AUDIO INTERFERENCE 0:32:32]… that's the first point. The second point, my suggestion would be that to work this in [? 0:32:44] mode in the sense that, in this early stage to put maybe even more questions that is reasonable to put in the questionnaire.

So that then we need to reduce to the questions that are – that we would like to really put in the questionnaire. But in the first phase, to put more… I mean, really a brainstorm. So all that comes to our mind to put it down so that then we can make a decision on what to really make in the second phase.

EN

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Roberto. I must admit I couldn't even understand half of what you said because of transmission, I don't know whether it was my line. The transmission quality was very lousy, perhaps somebody else has understood it in detail from staff, Heidi, Gisella, etcetera, and could summarize what Roberto was suggesting.

Yes I just see, I will send an email to the list. I think this would be the best way to proceed. To… To collect suggestions from other people who participated in tonight's call. And then to check the structure of the previous surveys, somehow the target of the previous surveys, and then to collect types of questions.

I would… There or I would try to suggest, let's start from the ATLAS I survey, and the type of questions we had are still useful for the second question on whether we need some new questions adopted over. Eduardo, you have question and you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo for the record. I just wanted to say that from what I got from Roberto was saying, he mentioned something about doing a brainstorming on this questions, what was to come up with more questions, and then you do some kind of brainstorming and then you said to the amount or the most important ones.

That's one of the things that he recommended.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes. Okay. If this was some other things then for this summary, I think it would be exactly the approach method into the right direction. Take what we had before, but not in a limited way, keep it as an open brainstorming, whatever useful interesting comes to your mind, this should be added, etcetera.

And then we have an outline of many proposals. Then we can start in Durban this sort of short listing and creating a new structure for the next survey. Dev, you have raised your hand please. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. Actually, you kind of answered my question. Eduardo kind of touched on it, so I don't have any further comment at this point. Just one observation though.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. So… Yeah? Go on.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just one observation. This is Dev speaking. I would say that the first survey questions need to be sent out very soon after Durban. That's it.

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, I highly agree with you Dev. I think Durban than should be a kind of ultimate stage for the question design, to be completed immediately afterwards and circulated afterwards. Okay, we have to consider the

summer break, sending out the question during summer break in what is in many parts July and August would be a problem.

But I think in Durban, it should be the aim of this sub working group to have, check the outlines, the proposals, to come up with the short listed question and structure, etcetera, and having some kind of a final outline. And send really to prepare the distribution after the summer break.

This is my opinion, could be reasonable and feasible timeline. Let's try to collect first the ideas, let's try to exchange via our mailing list, and to collect as many proposals, suggestions, ideas as possible. Keep them listed and account under the control of staff, for having this proposals on the structure and question time of the survey until Durban.

And then let's discuss a list, let's discuss the structure, let's discuss the focus again, etcetera. And do the shortlisting on the spot. It will be much more productive when we can meet face to face, etcetera. I guess we would meet now for an hour and a half to do this all together in a face to face atmosphere, and then simply agree on it.

And then once we have done it face to face in Durban, we can say, "Okay. The working group consisting of Dev, consisting of Eduardo, consisting of Roberto, etcetera, and more, came up with this suggestion." We put it on the list again, and ask members not present in Durban for the comment or compliments to come up with the finalized version, which then can be prepared in detail during August, and then circulated to the members shortly afterwards, after the summer break.

EN

Would this be a feasible or realistic way to proceed? I see Roberto's, oh wonderful. I see approval from all of you. And I guess this is seems narrow timeline until Durban, which is in about two weeks from now. We couldn't come up tonight with a complete draft of a next survey, also partly due to select participation, etcetera.

It should not be a sweep [? 0:40:46]. I think we can now define the next steps to do, and I would like as an action item ask staff to see where we may have an extra hour during Durban where we can announce such a meeting happen out of – not out, besides already six ALAC meeting schedules, etcetera, to publically announce it for all ALAC members in Durban.

I think it could, or should be an open meeting, in my opinion. And then let's get it together, and I think once we had a look in detail on the structures, etcetera, we will come up very quickly with some productive results. My suggestion so far, and I think it's the most we can do, we can achieve, first moment to keep it open, to keep it inclusive, etcetera. And to come up with something reasonable and substantial soon.

Any further questions? Any further comments from your side? I see no hand raised. I think it should be clear, the minutes will should approval by acclimation, okay. Thanks for that comment. The staff could schedule a room on the sign up spaces, but no service will be available. I know there shouldn't be any remote participation realities, we only need a room where we can sit together and discuss and continue from our today's basis.

Probably substantiated by some more ideas and by some more suggestions like Roberto announced already. And I believe we can do it in a very productive way. If there are no further comments, I think all the next steps and detail are clear for the moment. We know how to proceed, we know approximately about timelines, etcetera, but at least we know what to do in Durban and what needs to be done or completed in Durban to proceed afterwards.

Thanks a lot to all of your for your participation, for your ideas, etcetera. And I have the feeling even being in fewer composition tonight, it was useful to have this call, and probably brought some more clarity about next steps and procedures to come up with a good survey.

Thanks a lot to everybody. We are ahead of our time, I think, but I think the most important points were raised. Yes, I see more comments. If no survey is available, then the normal procedure will not be possible. Well, if this is not feasible, Dev, the group in Durban will come up with a proposal, will come up with an outline, and we can at least submit this for further consultation and comment after Durban.

That's the way we usually proceed at EURO [Dic 0:45:08] planning meetings. It's not wrote in stone, what we decide on what meeting, so it's kind of a preliminary outcome, and we can send it to the list again and people cannot attend in Durban, if we have to comment. Or we can even make…

After Durban, next call, but it is always difficult during summer breaks, but Gisella sent a Doodle poll for the entire ATLAS II is going out now to

schedule a call for early next week, okay? And we can bring it up next week again. Okay. Any further questions? Any further comments?

I would like first to thank the few participants for taking some time during a lovely summer evening, and also At-Large staff in high numbers who have made this call possible, etcetera. And who is providing any assistance to make such calls, etcetera, and such projects happen.

Thanks a lot to all of you, and I wish you an excellent evening and good night. Bye-bye.

[Various good-byes]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]