SINGAPORE – ALT and RALO Officers Working Breakfast
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 07:00 to 08:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Hello, can you hear me? This is the French booth. Can you hear me? French booth speaking. Can you hear me?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. We'll start in a minute.
ARIEL LIANG:	Good morning to all participants here in Singapore, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening to all remote participants. Welcome to the ALT and RALO Officers Working Breakfast on Wednesday, the 26th of March at 7:00 local Singapore time.
	We have live interpretation in French, Spanish, and Chinese so please state your name when speaking in order to identify you on various language channels, as well as for transcript purposes. Please also speak at a reasonable speed in order to allow for accurate interpretation. Over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Ariel. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Welcome, everybody, for this early session. It is actually 24 minutes past the top of the hour, so we'll have a slightly shortened session.

Four things to speak about today and to discuss. The first one is the policy input from the RALOs improving the participation in policy work for the ALSes. Secondly, outreach in the regions. Major, major work.

Thirdly, capacity building in the regions. Once you've outreached, you've got to bring them up to speed. And then finally, accessibility. We'll start immediately with policy input from RALOs and improving the participation in the ALSes. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: If we're going to get any better than we are now – and we desperately need to, because we keep on telling people, as you did yesterday in a public meeting that a policy starts at the bottom and works its way up, which often it doesn't – we have to get more disciplined about drafting the first version of statements much earlier in the process.

I'm often as guilty as anyone else, but we absolutely must do that and we must gear up. The statements often these days are short. We must gear up for translating them quickly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I was going to provide a little introduction on this. You've [dug] straight to the target. Yes, I've noticed a number of things. The first, of course, is the time it takes for us to look at an announcement and then find a way to pick up the pen. Who's going to pick up the pen? Who's going to draft the first draft of the statement?

We have 21 days in the initial comment period and then 21 days in the reply period. Of course, we can file our statement after the end of these

42 days. The problem is we then are not in synch with some of the work that the board is working on. So our input comes after the board meeting that deals with this or after the staff work or after the working group has finished listening and is going back to its work.

So we need to be, on the one hand, in synch. On the other hand, we need to give enough time to our end users to be able to comment.

And on the third hand, we need to have a better communication with our At-Large Structures to be able, on the one hand, send out that information and obtain – ask for feedback. But at the same time, not overwhelm them with so much.

I've had so many people that I've met. Some of whom are ALSes that are present here through the fellowship and saying, "My mailbox is full. I have no idea where to start."

I think there was Evan, Holly, and then Wolf.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, Olivier. This problem you're describing has been with us from day one. It's baked into the design of ICANN processes and it seems like it's forever biased against us. You can't have a bottom-up thing with 21 days to work with, period. The thought of being able to have a process where information necessary to turn policy is translated, made accessible, brought down to the ALS level, properly discussed and then brought back up, we're talking something that will take many months, not less than one month.

This has been discussed as long as I can recall being involved in ICANN. It hasn't been changed. We can say we need to speed things up, but we need to be honest. There's only so much that can be done. That's why it's sort of incumbent on the leadership, people at this table, the people in ALAC and so on to have to pick that up, and occasionally try and go on their instinct of how their region feels without being able to be fully consultative.

That is a flawed process, but given the timing that's forced upon us, it's the best we can do. We even find a situation where – and this happens multiple times – where At-Large is given policy to churn and we come up with very, very good considered ideas that take months to produce and many people involved, and then one person steps up to the mic at public forum and essentially gets an equivalent amount of attention to everything we've done.

There's only so many times you can say, "This is unacceptable." It's been unacceptable for the years I've been here, and really very little has changed. I don't know if it can be changed with doing significant modification to the way ICANN runs. As I'm cognizant of multi-stakeholderism, I realize that ICANN is only one model. There's a number of models of multi-stakeholderism and a lot of the other ones make accommodation for this kind of necessary consultation and don't give undue precedence for the people that can show up at meetings and have the courage to stand up in front of a microphone in front of people. It's a biased that's baked into the system. We can ask people to work faster and more efficient, but I think there's really a hard limit to how much we can do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan, are you saying 42 days is not long enough?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: To do translation of issues, to make accessibility of the issues and language that ALSes can understand in terms of time necessary to properly debate, churn, and bring things up through the ALSes and RALOs, your darn right 42 days isn't enough.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Some suggestions. If some of us get involved in policy discussion at the working group level – not in our working group, but in other working groups – and keep people abreast of that. Now I know there's a policy against the person in the working group being the penholder, but that person actually has all the expertise.

So can we modify that rule and say the person who's actually been attending the meetings, knows what the issues are, do a quick kind of summary saying, "This is what we should say," have somebody else look at it or whatever. But at least that will shorten the time for somebody to get their head around what the issues are and maybe even do some kind of regular reporting back to ALAC to say, "This is where this is going," so in fact we've created a space before the 42 days to have some thought to the issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Informally, that's what happens and that's what should happen. But formally, it's not something that's set. Should we put this as best practice and make it known to all of our members who are parts of…

HOLLY RAICHE: I think so. I think we wait too late. If you're sitting on working groups, the time to get your head around stuff and then to have other people's head around it, there's always a lot of explaining to do. And if you've already done the explaining, then it's much easier to get people thinking about, "Well, I've already thought about this stuff." So maybe it is a best practice thing to say, "This is how we want to deal with policy," and be on top of it before the timeline starts.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Holly. Wolf Ludwig?

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Olivier. In my opinion, there are two basic issues. The first issue is what you described in your introduction as a framework condition for the policy process. This framework is designed for people who can professionally deal during the working hours with such issues either from the business side, either from the governmental side, from the technical side or as a constituency side.

But this framework doesn't work in a volunteer environment, and [inaudible] always since I'm involved in ALAC since 2006-2007, to me it

appeared always as a main contradiction, because our ALSes do not function according to these expectations and according to these timelines which are designed for a professional environment. So this is a main point why I over the years again and again try to encourage our members to get more involved and to participate more in these policy processes.

Then there was another point already mentioned. At the moment, the statement or the remark or complaint I hear most often is we are swamped with e-mails about each and any short announcement whether it may be relevant for our members. They are informed. Okay, it's nice that At-Large staff is really forwarding any little announcement, any little declaration by ICANN. But always thinking from that point of view keeps [inaudible] informed but never reflecting the realities of the recipient. The reality of a recipient is their involvement in ICANN or At-Large or in EURALO is only a small percentage of the other daily realities.

So they are over [demanded]. Most of them cannot even follow up with the quantity of mails they receive, not to talk about going into the content. Even I, myself, who invests a lot of time have moments where I can't do it anymore where suddenly I have another priority over a couple of days and then I file them or I delete them.

And the third element is a lot of these issues are simply too specific, are simply too complicated and do not really correspond with the perception from a user perspective of important problems.

If you are an ISOC member, you may have a technical background or a technical understanding, but not all of our members are ISOC people.

We have a lot of civil society people who are coming from civil liberties, data protection, privacy issues, etc., so they may be closer to WHOIS, but to any IDN or whatever, this is not their main concern. So why should they get involved if it's not in their scope of interest?

You may remember, Olivier, that's why at our last general assembly in June 2013 in Lisbon, out of this dilemma, we asked our members, "Please tell us five subjects of your key interest and priority." And one of them was, of course, privacy [inaudible] in Europe. Another one was consumer or user protection. I cannot even recall all five at the moment, but we had defined five priorities.

I, from my experience, can only say I wouldn't bother them any longer with any other issue if some issue in current policy [consultation] matters falls into one of the five topics. Then, I can encourage them or we can ask them, but forget about the rest.

This is the complexities. This is daily reality. Briefly, a concept which is designed in a top-down manner is [bumping] into or is conflicting with the reality of a bottom-up environment, and this cannot really work. Thanks a lot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. I was asking Sylvia whether all ALSes are on ALAC announce. I have a feeling that they all have to be on ALAC announce so as to receive all the announcements, and I think that's a flood of e-mails. I've got a queue at the moment. Just responding to this, Evan? Okay, you can ability jump.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just simply saying that it might be a matter of choice of tools. There's instances of, for instance, having a taxonomy of hashtags with Twitter that would allow you to subscribe to a feed and filter out everything except the topics of interest. Something as simple as having a published taxonomy of "these are the hashtags we use for these topics" and then making sure they're applied to the announcements, it's not a replacement for everything, but mailing lists are not the be-all or end-all. I find it's actually a generational thing. My kids don't like mailing lists.

I'm just saying the tools exist that if we want to have that kind of broadcast and filtering mechanism, it exists if we want it. We have asked for it here. Whether they actually do it is another thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. I've got a queue. There's Alan, Garth, Tijani, and Dev. Now it's Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I had a much smaller intervention before all those other people. With regard to that last item, Mailmain, the mailing list system we use, has the ability to filter based on subject. We don't use it.

Again, in response to Wolf, I completely agree. We pepper our list with things that are truly irrelevant. We didn't need to tell users around the world what they need to do to get a gala ticket, and we did. And we tell them all sorts of other similar things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wasn't that sent to internal?

ALAN GREENBERG: ALAC Announce. We do this all the time. So yes, we need to fix that kind of problem. Maybe one day we will.

We're never going to get more than a small number of people really at the periphery involved in policy on a regular basis and it will be a smaller number, but more targeted for each individual subject. Let's stop pretending that the policy ideas start at the bottom and slowly ripple up, and when they reach us, we try to get someone to write it. That's not the way it's ever going to work, with a few very specific exceptions. So let's be pragmatic about it.

I have written enumerable statements where I was the person in the work group, usually the only person. So I don't think we have a rule like that, but we've sort of pretended there is one. That person doesn't have to write the statement, but let's not delay things. We shouldn't be delaying things until we have the monthly or semi-monthly ALAC or ALT meeting to make these decisions. It's going to require more discipline, yes. If we can get more people involved in working groups, then as GNSO liaison, for instance, I will not get four requests or five requests a month – or six – "Should we be writing this and who should write it?"

We've got to work to get more people involved in a working group or a thing. We're not going to change the overall demographics, but we've got to do better than we are now because we're putting too much load on far too few people.

ATRT-1 and now ATRT-2 has made a number of recommendations on comment periods. The 21 plus 21 I believe has already changed as of this week. I don't know what the replacement is. No one told us. But I was told it was changing. It's going to change again as a result of the ATRT-2, because we made some pretty strong recommendations about how ineffective what they were doing was.

And there is an attempt – an again, ATRT-2 made another strong recommendation – to tell us ahead of time when things are coming. We don't know in all cases. Everyone didn't know about the ALAC comment on the PAB, but we knew it was coming two weeks before it hit the shelves. I don't know whether it was included as one of the up-and-coming ones or not. I don't look at it because it's an ineffective list, but again it's one of the ATRT-2 things and hopefully it will get better.

We're not going to fix the problem with one tiny change or one massive change. There's a lot of little things we have to do to make it work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. So, working backwards, first your mention of the forthcoming comment on the PAB. No, we did not send any notice to ICANN in advance. So we're guilty of having not sent—

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. The ICANN bureaucracy knew about it. It was being worked on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Which part of the ICANN bureaucracy?

ALAN GREENBERG: From the time Heidi told somebody outside of At-Large that we're doing a public comment period, there was a fair amount of time involved until it actually hit the mark. Did, at that point, it go onto a list saying it's an up-and-coming public comment? I don't know. It maybe did, it maybe didn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that's not how it works, unfortunately. Our staff has to write a complete notice to send so that it's published. There is no editing or drafting being done by the staff in charge of the public comment thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. The advance notice normally comes from a working group saying, "We're putting out a public comment in three weeks. We're going to have a draft," and put a notice there saying it's coming. That's the process as I understand it. It is supposed to be advance notice that someone is working on a public comment, which is likely to hit the shelves at a certain time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I can tell you, Alan, that every single comma in that public comment page which has been published was actually drafted by Heidi and I down to the nearest comma.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're talking different things, apparently.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, you're looking at the advanced notice when it talks about the advanced notice for forthcoming public comments. This I believe is the same sort of thing as when you actually draft the public comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding from other working groups and the process is that is a single e-mail or something that should be happening when we know there's going to be a public comment before it's drafted, before we have the text, before it goes through approvals.

HOLLY RAICHE: Can we not take time with this one? Can we just sort it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please check what the process is, please, for advanced notices of public comments. That was just one point. The other point you speak about is the ATRT-2 recommendations and the 21 plus 21 days. Yes, there's going to be some changes. I would like to note that the format of the public comment page has changed, and that might introduce problems for Ariel. She's going to have to check on this, because so far it's been a cut-and-paste from the web page over to the wiki page and now they've changed the whole thing upside-down, so I have no idea how Ariel is going to be able to do cut-and-paste. But that's a different thing. You're going to have to check that one out.

Let's go through the queue and we'll have everything on the record and we'll be able to look back and think back about what we discussed today. I've got Garth, Tijani, and Dev and then Jose Arce. Garth, you have the floor.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO chair. I can't agree with Wolf more. The two items that were reported up to him from his research are really the only two items. They're the mother and father of all of our problems. My slightly different approach was to ask our ALSes for one issue, to think about one issue. And as I collect them I see that they actually all fall under Wolf's one and two. I think that we can almost keep it that simple.

So in reaching back to ALSes, we can help channel them into public statements if we can communicate with them better. And we need better top-down communication obviously.

In terms of the technical tools we use, the bottom line is that At-Large needs an At-Large workflow interface where I can log in, see my messages, see my work groups, vote, put in meeting reports, put in monthly reports, do all the work that we need to do and collaborate on it and have it be a central focal point of what we do.

And then we can take what we do in this interface and make it results-based. We can have an agenda, and then at the end of it, we can have a product and we can watch the entire system, see where it stops, see where it breaks down and the fix those problems.

This is something that big organizations do fundamentally every single day. It's how they operate. And we're not doing it. We're using mailing lists and it's not 1995. It's been 20 years almost. We need to move past this and we need to start talking about how we can move past this as quickly as possible. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Garth. I like this. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I don't think that 21 days of comments and 21 days of reply are not enough. You have to put yourself on the other side. You are in a working group. You produce something. You put it for the public comment. It will take 21 plus 21. You have to respond to all the comments and then you have to rewrite your work and the you have to send it. It will be endless. If we make it longer, it will be endless. So I don't think it is short.

Second point, I feel that when we speak about policy development or policy interest for our RALOs and ALSes, we think immediately to the public comments. If we do like this we will not have any result in my point of view.

Also, I agree with Alan. Don't expect that the ALSes and the RALOs will make more work on policy development, unless we change our manner of doing that. We have to do what we are doing now for the public comment, and I don't think that we will be helped by RALOs and ALSes, but we can at the same time, when we submit our statement or our comment or our advice, we can come back to the ALSes, come back to

the RALOs and work after the deadlines and try to have their input, try to explain and to understand from them so that they become step-by-step interested in the policy development.

I don't think that we have to expect that everything will change like this, and also I don't think that if we make the deadlines more longer it will solve the problem. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I agree a lot with what everybody has been saying regarding the deluge of information and trying to make sense of it all as to what to look at. I think I can sympathize with At-Large Structures because I think I myself face the same problem.

Perhaps what we need to do is just consolidate some of the information. Instead of just blasting out the in as it comes – like, for example, sort of like a policy newsletter, but maybe once a week. So instead of when the public comment launches and we get like one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, all over the place, let's just have a policy newsletter, say, twice a week. If not, once a week is good enough.

What we try to do there is not only just not copy and paste from the public comment announcement going to the public comment, but already point to our At-Large wiki page where At-Large members could start chiming in with comments, but also to the At-Large Working Group that probably this falls under. So that's one idea.

Regarding things like trying to get the information accessible and possibly translated, maybe what we also need to then do is look at a way to do some sort of policy webinar. I don't know, a policy conference call or webinar for all of the At-Large. Maybe that has to be scheduled outside of the ALAC monthly call.

So basically, we look at what is this issue about? We just have someone from whatever working group this is coming from just give a few slides and say, "This is what the issue this." The that gets [inaudible] probably a little bit faster. And with those calls interpreted, it will be a little bit more accessible. So that's my idea.

Thirdly, Garth has the right idea. I'm also thinking of this sort of dashboard where, when you log in, you get to see these are the ALAC statements [in play], what is currently being voted on and so forth. I think it's going to be a challenge trying to do it on the wiki, but I'm trying to do it with the Technology Taskforce. I think that kind of dashboard [inaudible]. We go to a landing page. For each member, you can see what's on the way and maybe with the new changes to the ICANN website, because the ICANN website itself is trying to do this kind of personalized content where if you're interested in, say, IDNs, you'll get to see IDNs more prominently when you go to the ICANN website and so forth. Maybe some sort of synergy can happen there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Dev. We have a policy development wiki page.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. Indeed we have a policy development page, but I think what happens is the ALAC announces [allowances] only just take the public comment announcements. They don't really link to our At-Large pages. So the person gets the ALAC Announce page, then they get a second e-mail saying a wiki page has been created. Let's consolidate that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Dev. Jose Arce?

JOSE ARCE: Thank you so much, Olivier. I just wanted to make a contribution and this [inaudible] and why not take it as an action item? I think the coordination of all these matters is significant. If I may, I will add an additional one to all these issues, which is the following.

I believe that this could be addressed in the three items of the agenda as well. We have to show to the ALSes that the outcome of the work of those who are more or less committed has a real impact in the ICANN world. The decisions or the statements by ALAC have a true impact on the board decisions.

I remember having asked several times, Olivier, if there was any working group engaged in analyzing the impact of ALAC work on the board decisions, and I think that there has been none to date. That would be good to check what impact we have, because if we show to the [LAS] that there is an actual serious work with a true impact that we can quantify.

In terms of the board decisions, well, I think that this would eventually lead the ALS to consider this. I can't find the right words. I mean, that the [LAS] will see that this is not an effort leading to nowhere. This is something else we have to show to these new people coming to the ICANN world who want to be engaged, so that they can be certain that their work will legitimize the multi-stakeholder model. That's why we end users are here. It's already been seen that throughout the years, we sometimes do not have a voice in some places such as [inaudible] meeting, which for a long time, I have harassed Olivier to give us a place there, but apparently Fadi was never able to understand this issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jose. Next is Fouad Bajwa.

FOUAD BAJWA: Thank you, Olivier. Fouad Bajwa from APRALO. The fundamental issue of policy and policy development itself, we get the [inaudible] definitions, but the needs assessment of people or the participating ALSes is already a major factor. Why do we have only four or five people, or three or four people, from every RALO actually doing all the work?

It's happening because somewhere there is a gap between, let's say, communication and so forth between the ALSes and the policy development process.

Technology itself is a facilitator. It's not the whole solution. When the confluence community thing was happening, ICANN was incorporating

[inaudible] even at that stage, you might recall that I was saying that this platform could actually solve a lot of your problems in reducing gaps.

For example, mailing lists could have been integrated into the confluence system and you would have one long interface and then you would have access to all the documents and all those mailing lists consolidated into that system.

Second thing about the confluence system was [inaudible] separately. You might have noticed in ISOC they've been [building] interest-based groups, and within that we're having Internet policy discussion on one group. The IANA has a separate mailing list and interested people are having discussions over there.

So far we do not have a policy discussion list for ALAC. [inaudible] mailing list where you would immediately see who really wants to participate from ALSes in that policy development process that would immediately give you the figure for that and you'll be amazed that it would be a very small percentage.

So these gaps have to be revisited, and the problem definition we have at this moment is why can't we increase the amount of participation from ALSes within the policy development or the policy comment processes?

Second thing, a long-waited thing. I don't know if – Dev's suggestion is pretty good. But at the same time, we're already having problems with ALSes actually reading the amount of information coming in from ALAC.

If we had add more newsletters to it, it's only going to increase the clutter.

Do we have a weekly or a monthly, let's say, a page which gets updated with the summary and really do the point summary, which always has a reference to the issue definition or the issue details, that this is the issue we're dealing with. There's always a page on the ICANN website which has all the policy issues listed, but then it's running back and forth.

So we have to find that sort of integration as a facilitation to the policy development process or the comment process whereby we can consolidate this amount of information being generated into a single page or so.

We have to revisit the way we're using our technologies, the platform, the way we can go towards consolidation. I know for one thing not all ALSes have a direct involvement with those issues, because they're not relevant to them.

I can say for APRALO as well we're so diverse in our regions, our participation in the issues is also diverse. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fouad. You've touched on a number of points. I know that the Technology Task Force is working on these things. We really are running out of time. It's already top of the hour. We were going to treat four subjects. We've only dealt with one and we have so much more to deal with. I think everybody's card is up at the moment. I've got Evan, Holly, Wolf, and Alan. We've just been given five minutes

very kindly by Siranush. One minute for each comment, please. Evan? You'll yield. Okay, thank you. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Love the technology solutions. Hate the fact that we get links to issues, and then there's nowhere you can find them. So I keep trying to contribute and I can't, so then I really get angry about that.

In terms of policy development, I think—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As in, the link is broken or…?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I can't find the link.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's nothing on the page.

HOLLY RAICHE: I go to the page to find stuff and lost.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: On which page?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: On any ICANN page.

HOLLY RAICHE: I go to the policy page to see where the link is for something else and—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This one? At-Large policy development?

HOLLY RAICHE: I spend time on that, but when we're asked to do other stuff with a link, I don't know where it is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's usually several layers dep. That's the thing.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I know. It's several layers deep and by the time I… I'm just saying I wish we could actually – because Maureen knows what I'm talking about. I get so frustrated, I spend 20 minutes. I don't have further time.

                           The other positive thing, anybody working on a working group – and this is a talk to myself as much as anybody – a short paragraph that says, for instance, [ITRPD]. Now, nobody is going to read that. But if you say, "This is about if a registrant loses a name, under what circumstances can they go where," and what that does is it then says to everybody else who doesn't understand what the title is why it's important to their constituency. And if we do that as a discipline, we might get more comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. We actually had a plan – an action item – to do that in the past for this. We tried, but it's so much work. Well, Ariel's going to have a – we'll have to follow up on that. I've got Wolf and Alan.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just think that's the only way to do it.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Olivier. Among the other points I mentioned, which most of them are rather structure problems, I think one we can do immediately. It's a question of quality and sorting out mailing lists properly in case that all ALSes are subscribed to Announce, why the hell are you bothering with the same information on the regional lists? This just [duplication] and this happens so often, and this is so simple and annoying when you have them on the Announce. Do it once on Announce and forget spamming the regional lists. Just a very simple, practical example.

If you go through your distribution system, you can easily find out much less [infos] or [inaudible] application of [infos] will increase more attention of the few. Very simple factor. So this can be immediately improved causing less troubles and negative responses from members. As I said before, it's the most often heard complaint by our members the last one or two years. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolf. Action item: check that all ALSes are on ALAC Announce.

Alan Greenberg, you've got the last word.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have three very short points. Jose made an impassioned statement on impact of decisions, but he made one mistake. He talked about impact of decisions on the board. If our process is working properly all the way through, we are impacting working groups and other things and the board doesn't need to be advised because they're not making stupid mistakes. So it's impact of our decisions and it's easy to look at our recommendations to working groups and see how that has impacted their change – impacted their decisions. It's much harder at the board level, very easy at the working group level. Our changes, our comments, do have significant impact and we need to document that. Jose is right on that. It's just the target. If things work well, we never have to advise the board on anything. Good luck.

Number two. On the mailing list, I did an analysis a year or so ago and I'm willing to do it again. The use of our mailing lists is quasi random. There are an infinite number of combinations of which lists are you on if you're an ALS member or you're an ALS rep and there is no consistency. So it's not as simple as just not sending to some list because they're already getting a duplicate. We need to look at the lists as we decided then but never did, revise what our lists are used for and make them somewhat consistent. They're not.

And by the way, although I love wikis, there are plenty of people within our group that don't have easy access to online tools and mailing lists are push technology. You don't have to sign on to look at them.

Last thing: space. The space on our various web and wiki pages is, in my mind, horrible. No matter which of our pages you go to, you have to scroll down way to the bottom to find the substance. On our policy development pages, for reasons I don't understand, we completely replicate what is on the ICANN page, but do it in a [worse] format. It is almost impossible to find the salient information. Even our policy development page, the one listing the policy development issues has a one-page. When you go to it, you see nothing except some pointers to random other places, including a list of the top ten ALAC issues, which is dated 2008.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Forget about the At-Large website. We know that.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the wiki, too. It's not just the website.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well then we need four more staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Some of what we do is make work that didn't have to be done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. I've been given the green light to give the last words to Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Just to follow up some comments, quickly. Fouad, the item behind a policy newsletter would be that would be less e-mails coming in. So because the e-mails are consolidated, they would have a link to the At-Large wiki page immediately.

Second, I think what also consolidation would also do is that when the public comment is launched, I think development working group chairs has to really put a little synopsis to say, "Why shall I care?" If you hear IRTP Part D is the PDP process results, wow…what am I going to do with that? It has to have a "Why should I care?" and why we should get involved.

Regarding the structuring of the policy development page and so forth, I agree. I think we could look to make things better. Technology Task Force is trying to look at this, but it is kind of a difficult thing to do, and of course more eyeballs, more hands on deck would be appreciated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. Since we're running out of time, a show of hands. How many of you are on myICANN.org, which was supposed to be providing all this filtering based on topics? I note that half the people are on myICANN.org. That should provide some way of selecting the topics and so on.

Second thing. How many of you read the monthly newsletter, which Heidi writes? Heidi and her crew. The monthly policy newsletter? Policy update. Okay, everyone does. That's at least one thing. Not the ICANN one, the At-Large one. This one, the one that's on the thing – Update

14th of March At-Large has got four points in it, 10-14, in all the languages.

Okay, that's all for today. Thank you very much. We've missed agenda item number two, three, and four. Cheryl is next to me. I don't think we can go into these. We'll have to follow up at a later date, with apologies to those people who were here just for two, three and four, this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]