

---

LONDON – ALAC & Regional Leadership Working Session  
Monday, June 23, 2014 – 14:30 to 17:30  
ICANN – London, England

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ladies and gentlemen, we will start very soon. We have a little technical problem, as sometimes does happen. Anyone has their tent cards, there are some spare tent cards that Gisella has for those people that have not got a tent card. This is a tent card, this thing. And when we will be having interactions and discussions, if you wish to ask a question, could you please put your card up? As this.

And then I'll be able to put you in the queue. And then when you have finished your question, put your card down.

And this is an ALAC and RALO officers meeting, so all ALAC and RALOs, RALO officers if you are sitting behind, you have to come up to the table as well please.

Okay. We'll start in one minute.

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Is the recording on? That's the first question I need to ask. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. This is the ALAC and Regional Leadership working session, number one, which is usually the session that takes place on a Sunday, but due to the At Large Summit, we have shifted this session to this afternoon.

We have an interesting schedule, which you will find linked to the agenda that is on the screen, but also that is linked to the At Large weeks agenda. And we will start first with a few of the ground rules and

---

*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.*

---

the outline of the week. I understand that we're running a little bit late, so we might go a little bit faster through this section than we usually do.

First, the ground rules. I'm going to ask Gisella to please provide us with details of that. If you wish to have a microphone, there is one here.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Welcome everyone. Just to remind you that during this session, we'll be here for three hours, please remember to state your names when speaking for transcript purposes, and also for our interpreters here behind us, to be able to identify you. They're not able to see your name tags, and their not able to identify your voices.

And if you could also speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation and make the most of our interpretation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Gisella. And this session is one of several sessions that the ALAC and regional leadership are going to have. We actually have ALAC working sessions that will take place tomorrow, and just to put this on your calendar, the first one is, let's see we've got... I'm scrolling down.

After the general assemblies for the different assemblies, we have ALAC work part one, and that's called work because we used to call it policy work, and we have now, because of the current schedule, have had to mix the two together. So we'll have ALAC work part one, from 14:30 to 16:00 tomorrow. And then from 16:30 to 18:30 we'll have ALAC work part two.

---

Tomorrow we'll be able to take a break during the afternoon. Unfortunately, today, due to the scheduling difficulties that we're having, we're having to take this in one go. So I don't, I expect that some of you might be able to pop out to get a quick coffee at some point, but please come back quickly because the afternoon is very packed with a lot of things that we need to cover.

Without any further ado, first thing I would like to do is also welcome our At Large structures that have come to London for the At Large Summit. They are sitting around the room, so welcome.

For many of you, it is the first ALAC meeting. Some of the discussions we're going to have will probably involve acronyms such as SSAC, and we will have the people using these acronyms available afterwards to explain them. And to give you further information. Of course, we've got a number of people coming in and coming out, and you're very welcome, if they don't have an immediate meeting afterwards, to go and talk to them and engage with them.

Now, joining us to my left, are Patrik Fältström, with two T's, not just one, so this main title is wrong. But Patrik Fältström and Jim Galvin, from the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. And I'm going to hand the floor over to Julie Hammer, our SSAC liaison, who is going to be running this...

Another rule, don't press your microphone before previous people... person speaks because it cuts you. Go ahead Julie.

---

JULIE HAMMER:

Sorry Olivier. Yes, welcome everyone. And I would also like to acknowledge another SSAC member sitting behind me, Danny McPherson. So, thank you for the opportunity to give this briefing. We only have half an hour on the schedule, and probably less than that, given that the meeting is a little bit late starting.

So when Patrik begins the briefing, you'll find that we have a range of topics that we are able to brief on, but you might need to have a look at them and give Patrik some indication as to which topic you would like to be briefed. So, without any further ado I will hand over to Patrik. And hopefully we have the slides available that we forwarded through earlier.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you very much everyone. Patrik Fältström, chair of the Security and Stability Advisory committee. To the left of Julie, we have Jim Galvin, my vice-chair. So we have, next slide please. So the agenda is, if you ignore the number of minutes there, that's not really how long of a time it takes to go through the various issues.

But the more important thing is that we can talk about SAC 66, the comment on the JAS report, an overview of our region achievements. What we are actually doing at the moment, talk about, give an update about where we are with IANA function stewardship, talk about what we have in the [pie plan] to potentially work with.

And then we have some questions to you in the community, by including you, and I would like to spend at least one minute on that or 30 seconds. Given now that we now have 25, or let's say, 20 minutes

---

to, let me check if anyone in the room, do you have a specific interest, or some specific topic in that case, can you raise, can you flag or let me know?

Is there any topic that is specifically interesting of these? Because I don't think we can go through all of them, otherwise I will choose. Please.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks. I'd really like at least the amount of time, possible truncated on the IANA transition, but I'd also like to know what else was happening, and possibly we can contribute. Okay?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

So if I understand you correctly, you are interested in number four and number five. Is that correct? Okay. So, can we go to the next slide please? Next. So, we are, for the newcomers here, we are the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. It's here to advise the community as a whole, not only domain names and DNS.

We are currently 40 members, appointed by ICANN Board for three year terms. One-third of SSAC members are reviewed every year. Next please. Next. So, since Singapore, we have published one report, SAC 66, and you can find the result of that in this slide deck.

Since ICANN 48 in Buenos Aries, we also published, and the first one SAC 66, was on namespace collision, it's comment on JAS phase one report on mitigating the risk of DNS namespace collisions. Since Buenos Aries, we have published SAC 65 on denial of service, distributed denial

---

of service attacks that uses DNS, and also an advisory on search processing.

Next slide please. So, SAC 66, a comment on a report on namespace collisions. This is something that, this is the JAS was caused by ICANN, based on a report that we wrote in SSAC on looking more into detail into namespace collision issues. We, in SSAC, found that we had an interest in actually commenting on that report from the AS.

I will not go through these slides. People interested should be aware that is a session later today, starting at 17:00, that is just talking about the namespace collision issues. So I encourage people to go to that one, if they are interested. Even though I understand that you will continue the meeting here at the same time, so there is slight collision.

So can we jump forward a couple of slides please? There. Next one. So the work that we're currently doing is that we have one work party looking at the IANA functions stewardship transition, I will give an update on that. We have a standing committee on the membership of SSAC, where we are currently in the middle of the review of one-third of our members.

Jim Galvin, to my left, my vice-chair, he is the chair of the membership committee, and I would like to explicitly point out to everyone that one rule that we have in SSAC is that, even though myself, Jim as chair and vice-chair of SSAC, and also [Ro-mo-nan], our liaison to the Board, although the three of us are members of the membership committee, we are non-voting members.

---

Only the sort of, it's only the SSAC members that are part of the membership committee, that do not have any formal position in SSAC, which are the ones that do the review. They are proposing a result of the review to SSAC as a whole, that then they agree on the result of the review, in which might also include evaluation of new members.

We also host a DNSSEC workshop. We have both the workshop on DNSSEC for all, and we also have a workshop on the Wednesdays, and we will have that this week as well. We do have an outreach program to law enforcement, that's an ongoing outreach and coordination with law enforcement, and that meeting is ongoing in parallel with this meeting in ALAC.

And we find from a SSAC perspective, and also law enforcement, we have very good communication so also that they feel trust in talking to and communicating with the ICANN community. Quite often, that results in us helping them and referring them to who they should really talk with in the SSAC community, but we are sort of helping them channel that information.

We are also working on a workshop on the Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul. The workshop will be on various blocking, on various services that when using those services, will result in blocking. For example, blacklist for email, for spam catching, etc. and those kind of providers of services. So that's the discussion that we have in the Internet Governance Forum.

We also have a work party on public suffix lists, which are sort of adjacent and we're close to the work that ICANN is doing on acceptance of new gTLDs. It's sort of similar, but at the same time different, but so

---

next slide please. Future milestones. We envision third quarter 14, release an advisor on principles for the transition of the stewardship of the IANA function.

And also, of course, have the IGF workshop and advisory that is tied to that. In Q4, we hope that the advisory on public suffix lists will be ready, and also a final advisor on the IGF workshop topic. Next slide please. So if we move into the... Let me just pause there and see if there are any questions.

Okay, good, because we are sort of up to where we are supposed to be in the agenda. So, IANA function stewardship here. So, some background. As you all know, in March 2014, the US Department of Commerce announced that it intends to end the IANA functions contract. And different people that were around in '97/'98, they do remember that the US government in those days said that they envision this to end not 2015, but maybe in the year 2000.

So we're only about 15 years late. But anyways, that means for those of us who actually were around in those days, not only me, but I recognize some people around in this room, we are not surprised that the US government actually made this announcement because that is what they have told us they do anyway, one day.

Instead it's at last. Anyways. So what they did is they are soliciting a proposal for assuring both proper operation and oversight of the IANA function, in the absence of the US governmental contract. So it is... So what's happening here, to remember is that it is a contract that is no longer extended.



---

We do in SSAC here that people talk about moving something from A to B. That's not what this is about. Okay? But it's also that kind of misunderstanding that triggered us in SSAC to decide to actually write something here. Because those kind of misunderstandings are things that even though this is a contractual issue, and we in SSAC don't really deal with that, that kind of misunderstanding might have an impact on organizational structured contracts, question of who is responsible for how auditing is done, which in turn, have implicit impact on this security and stability on operations.

And that's why we felt we needed to sort of straight out a few things. Next slide please. So as we announced in Singapore, we established a work party to consider postulates, principles, and technical considerations related to the transition of the stewardship of the IANA function.

It is focused solely on the security and the stability of the IANA functions, during and after the stewardship transition. Next slide please. We will not provide conclusions or recommendations concerning the operations of the IANA functions, except when such mechanisms have direct impact on the security and stability issues.

So the charter of the work party very explicitly excludes those kind of issues, instead we are trying to, as you will see in the next couple of slides, we've tried to come up with a framework, and a terminology, and a taxonomy similar to what we did for the WHOIS, for the work related to WHOIS, that we will help the community move forward in a way so that there is, the quality of the result will be stable. Next slide please.

---

So, we are not done. The work party is ongoing. But we have promised to explain at this meeting where we are. So here is the temporary, the sort of status of the work party. To inform its work, the work party has conducting a rough analysis of the roles of NTIA, ICANN as the IANA functions operator, Verisign in the context of root zone maintainer related to the IANA root management function, the root service system as it pertains to the IANA functions.

So this is sort of the scoping. And just because, as people who are sort of working on these issues in this room know, there are multiple contracts here. And the actual IANA contract is only one piece in the puzzle, so the scoping here is a little bit delicate. We also have done an analysis and looked at how the IETF and the NRO as policy providers to IANA, how they have implement, how they are looking at the system at IANA.

Because the policy that IANA follows, or implements as we in SSAC are saying, is coming not only from ICANN, it's coming from ICANN for domain names, but it's coming from IETF and NRO for other things. And some people might think that IETF and NRO has a more mature relationship with IANA, and the questions where that we can learn something in ICANN from that or vice versa.

So we felt it's important, when looking at IANA issues not only to look at the ICANN PDP's relationship with IANA, but also other policy development processes outside of ICANN relationship with the IANA function. Next slide please.

So one thing that we're doing is that we are developing a terminology to help describe the various roles of the IANA function. And the primary

---

roles that we have is the policy provider that hands over policy to the policy implementer for implementation. And the policy implementer, which is the party that accepts and that implements the policy developed by the policy development process, and handed over by the policy provider.

And the relationship between the policy provider and the policy implementer, and the separation of the two, is one of the fundamentals that we have so far indicated is very important. And then if you go to the next slide, you see a chart that illustrates the various roles. So you see in blue, at least if you have good eyes or a good screen in front of you, you see in blue the flow of establishment of the implementation of a policy at the policy implementer.

The policy development process, passes the policy to the policy provider that negotiates with the policy implementer of whether the policy is clear enough. When it is, and then the policy provider also might appoint an appointed expert that takes care of subjective decisions, where the policy implementer is staying by doing all of the active decisions.

So when later, according to the red path, you have a requester that sends a request to the policy implementer, the policy implementer might, if the policy includes such steps, request for evaluation to the appointed expert that gives back the result. And if everything is positive, in that case, it might be the case that the policy implementer process request for action to a third party, which is acting on that request and then the response is given back to the requestor.

---

So separating the two flows, give the ability for the policy implementer to have external parties, and have everything driven by the policy development process. This is the, a model, a generic model that we feel from SSAC, to some degree a lot of people saying, this is better than butter. On the other hand, as all of us know, when trying to apply this to certain mechanisms that are ongoing, it actually helps to identify what are the flaws, things that need to be clarified, and where various relationships should be.

Things that obviously are missing on this one, as you can see, has to do with auditing, appeals, and various other kind of things. But those are things that are pretty easy, or relatively easy to add, given that you have clear roles like this. Next slide please. So the next steps that we have is that the SSAC will provide an update of the progress at the ICANN 50, which we are doing, for example, here, but we are doing it specifically on Thursday at our public meeting.

Our goal is to publish the principles in the third quarter. And it might also be the case that we are going to begin work on a technical issues document, that is still a bit unclear. It depends on the outcome of the first document that we are writing. Any questions on that? Yes, please.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Holly Raiche for the transcript records. I have read the NRO submission to the, I suppose, the larger accountability page, and their view was, look, from a technical point of view, there are sort of no problems now that, in fact, that the technical aspect work because NRO and the various RIRs have contracts in place with the service and so forth.

---

So, that bit probably doesn't need much changing, possibly some tweaking. And I guess my question is, is your, what you're talking about, the policy, the kind of on top of that or aside from that, are you actually looking at the technical aspects as well?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

We are looking at the need to clearly separate the policy development process, from the policy provider, from the policy implementer. We leave it to at least, as the status is at the moment, we leave to the reader to evaluate whether the current PDPs related to protocol, numbers, to IP addresses, which [inaudible] is working with, protocol parameters that the ITF is working with, and domain systems with specifically GNSO and ccNSO are working on, whether the situation is as clear as we in SSAC envision.

We are, at the moment, not going to make that judgment ourselves. That is something that we think is really, at the moment, I think it's good if the community is thinking about that. The important thing at the moment is, from our perspective, to think in those terms, to make the roles clear. Anyone else?

Okay. So let's move forward. Thank you. That was, no. The right slide was actually the one, questions to the community. Let's see. Okay. It was not, I was the one being confused. So, questions that we're here, let me just summarize to give you some answers. Three typical questions that we get has to do with, how does SSAC prioritize new work?

---

Answer: we prioritize it ourselves. But, of course, if we get questions and here interests from parties like you and ALAC, or from the Board, or anyone else, then of course, we do understand that for us to give a response to those questions, is actually kind of important for the community. We have the ability to respond to maybe six questions, work on six items, a year, and not more than two, or three, or let's say three in parallel.

So the question is then, what six should we work with? If you send a question, the more precise it is, the higher the chance is that we are able to pick it up. So please, think about whether you would like to send us questions. Next question, how does the SSAC address requests from the ICANN Board and community?

Well, as we said in the previous, how we prioritize, it gets higher priority. We are primarily, we are formally an advisory committee to the ICANN Board, which means that if we get a direct question from the Board, we do get the highest priority, but it's the same kind of prioritization process.

Last question, how does SSAC communicate its work? We are issuing the reports, for example, SAC 66. It's also the case that we have various presentations at meetings like this one. It's also the case that we are now starting a program where we are going to produce more like video blog posts and other kind of communication, which is hopefully a little bit more easily digestible than the SSAC reports themselves.

And we already said before at the last meeting, I think, we agree that we would use you in ALAC specifically, when thinking about how we are going to, what we're going to translate, evaluate whether our, the

---

reports are easy enough to digest, etc. And that's something that we are going to start with at this meeting, together with Duncan and the communications groups.

And I saw on the chart that you're actually going to meet with Duncan at the next session, so you will understand how good person he and his group is. Don't grab all of these resources, because, leave some to us because that will down the way help you. Next slide please. We can actually skip questions to the community, here.

So things that we're asking ourselves at the moment. And things that, a kind of feedback, you don't have to answer these questions now, but things that we are interested in knowing are things, for example, whether our publications are accessible and understandable, regarding length. Are they too long? Are they too short? Are they just right? Right about the level of detail?

Is it enough to read the executive summary, which we hope... And the reason, it's not only here that some people are joking around the room, the serious part of this is our goal is to, in the future, translate the executive summary to multiple languages. And then pick a few reports, but very, very few to translate the whole report. So we're trying to get like more broad instead of picking sort of more reports, we are going to spend our money on, just do the executive summary, but of course, then that must be self-contained.

How can their side do a better job for the community? I think I would like to see more questions from the community because to some degree, we are sort of walking in the dark room and see what is happening when we are throwing a report on the table.

---

We also would like to know what you believe that SSAC could do differently. And if the response is, well, we have no idea what SSAC is doing, maybe that is an important answer. And then you see on this slide deck previously, I jumped by it because we don't have time, what is missing from the currently list of work parties, so please come back with that as well. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

So, I might just remind everyone here that at our last ICANN meeting, we actually took onboard an action to liaise with the work that the SSAC is doing with the communications team to try and better highlight some of the work that SSAC has done in the past, that might still be relevant to end users and to ALAC constituents.

And so that has been taken onboard through Steve Shing, who is the staff member liaising with Duncan Burns to do that work. That work hasn't yet progressed to the stage where there is any outcome to report back to you, but certainly that action item was placed on me to keep linked in with that work being undertaken. And when we do have something to report back, I'll certainly do that.

So I just would like to ask if there are any other questions on what's been covered today for Patrik or for Jim or for myself, or on any aspect that hasn't been covered today. Yes, please.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ:

Yes. Carlos Gutierrez. Patrik, from what we listen from other supporting organization and advisory committees, there is always the question of enough resources to have people here, or to choose a new



---

chairman for the GAC, or to choose representative to the Board in the case of the GNSO.

So SSAC seems to be working perfectly well. You have all of the resources, all the people, all the needs are covered. It seems to be just a perfect case. Thank you very much for your comment.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you. Of course, all of us want more resources, of course. But I think we, as Olivier correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we, as SO AC chairs, we actually do have, compared to three years ago, four years ago, we have very good communication between each other. We also have good communication with senior staff at ICANN regarding pooling resources, so that we don't have any gaming between each other on what kind of resources we get from ICANN.

Inside SSAC, we have four volunteers. We have decided quite some time ago, to separate my job as chair, Jim as the vice-chair, and have a separate liaison to the Board. And that is something that helps us enormously to separate those tasks. For example, that Jim is taking care of everything that has to do with the membership, and that kind of like membership work.

[Inaudible] is taken care of, as a liaison to the Board, everything that has to do with interaction with the Board. I can concentrate on, as the chair, the process and then the more formal human resources interactions and resource interactions like budget with ICANN itself and the finance committee.

---

So that's one example of how we managed to divide the work inside SSAC. So, of course, so I think we are actually in pretty good shape at the moment. So, thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

And I would just add that just as in ALAC, the staff support that ALAC has is excellent, so it is in SSAC as well. We're very blessed to have wonderful staff support. There was another question from...

MURRAY MCKERCHER:

Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. It's Murray McKercher from the North American Regional At Large Organization, also known as NARALO. And I simply wanted to make a statement as a newbie to ICANN. And I found a domain name server security open session some years ago, that talked about beginner's, like a beginner's guide to domain names, security.

And I'm aware that there is another such session happening today at 5:00. So for any new folks who want to get their heads around what all of this means, it was an extremely useful explanation from my perspective, so I would highly recommend that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks Murray. And I've been told by the boss that that's the end of the session. We've run out of time. So thank you very much for your attention, and thank you Patrik, thank you Jim for attending.

---

**PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:** Yeah. Thank you very much for inviting us. I think this time, again, I think we should have more than half an hour, so can we please try to have that next meeting? I would like to end by saying that you might have heard that the GNSO council and ccNSO have initiated a work on chartering cross-community working group to develop a transfer process for the IANA stewardship role.

I just want to announce to all of you as well, so you are aware of that from SSAC, in this chartering work, we have appointed Julie as the representative from SSAC to work with that catering, that might be interesting for you to know. With that, thank you very much.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Patrik, and thank you very much Jim. Actually we had one last question which was related to Murray's question, the beginner's guide to domain name security. There is a beginner's guide to domain names, are you aware whether it includes the domain name security aspect?

**JIM GALVIN:** So that session, since you asked for clarity, is really about DNS security. So it's really a beginner's, it's a separation from the DNSSEC workshop, which normally happens on Wednesdays, and it's really just about DNSSEC security and adding signing and validation to domain names.

So it's not DNS security, name server security in general. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Jim for this. But I'm speaking about the printed material. There is printed material, beginner's guides that, there is a beginner's guide to At Large, and to ALS participation. I think we've mentioned, there are, there is a printed beginner's guide to domain names. And so the mention of Murray of a beginner's guide using the actual term like that, could there be a beginner's guide to domain name security.

And this is something which we might wish to explore next time we see you. However, we are going to see Patrik later on this week. Here is a beginner's guide to ALSs. We are going to see Patrik later on this week. Patrik, if you remember, on Wednesday morning, we are seeing you at some point between 7:30 and 8:30 for 15 minutes, and Patrik will be able to answer more questions about SSAC and all of the world of SSAC, etc.

So thanks very much again for coming to see us.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And as I invite our next group to the table... Now, with a little bit of a delay, we're about 10 minutes late now. We have a discussion with the communications team who have joined us. We have Duncan Burns, vice president of Global Communications. And Chris Gift, the VP of Online Community Services. And they're going to be with us for 30 minutes.

Welcome gentlemen.

---

So I'm not sure who wishes to start and whether you have a little presentation queued up or it's just a question and answer, interactive session that you would like to conduct.

CHRIS GIFT:

This is Chris Gift for Online Community Services. We're just sorting out the waters. I do not have a presentation. I thought since it was a brief session, I would just have some talking points, and then a Q&A, and then followed by my coworker Duncan Burns.

So very quickly, I just want to take a moment recap what we've been focused on over the past year. I have been at ICANN, I think, a little over a year and a half. And when I started at ICANN, when we started this group, we really wanted to focus on newcomers. We thought that newcomer engagement was the most important and pressing problem at ICANN, at least when it came to information and to digital tools.

We didn't want to do this work at the sacrifice of veterans, but nonetheless, we thought that that was a pressing issue. And over the past year, I think we have done quite a bit to try to address that. We started with ICANN Labs, we launched ICANN Learn, we revamped and have a new Fellowship application for people to apply, and that's a good thing since we are doubling the size of that program, or have doubled the size of that program.

We have increased the number of social sharing sites and the quality of those. And then obviously, we launched a new website that hopefully, at least for newcomers, it is an improved experience in terms of them being able to understand what ICANN does. So what's next? The next

---

thing we need to do, so we sort of think that, or I somewhat believe that the theme of newcomer engagement, focusing on that, is not while by no means done, It is time to shift. All right?

It is time to shift back to veterans and to helping, at least from the digital tools, support the people who are the active members within ICANN. So there are a few things that we're going to work on over the next few months. First on ICANN dot org and then I'll touch a little bit about the At Large website and activity. First is we're obviously going to work on search and navigation.

We need to improve the search as it now stands. We had committed, and we remain committed to working on translation. So last time we had spoken, I said that we would take that up after London, and we will do so, and the same with accessibility. So that is, I know we have a working group already, so we are going to start taking that up for accessibility of the website.

And by accessibility, I mean, you know, mobile as well as any kind of visual or any other impairment in terms of accessing content and the website itself, content on the website. And then lastly, we're going to look at how we can improve access to services within ICANN. If you'll notice, there is nowhere on ICANN dot org where you can go, there is no menu item that says, you know, services.

What can you do at ICANN dot org? Specifically around GDD, or what can a registrant do at ICANN? It's still confusing to find those services. So, we really want to spend some time with the community on how do we help people navigate to them? So that's another area of focus for the website specifically.

---

For At Large, we did commit and we have a budget for reworking that large website, and we promised that. [APPLAUSE] Not a minute too soon. And we did promise we would take that up immediately post London, so we definitely, we need to do that. We want to take up that work. And I just spoke briefly with Dev, so we need to understand how we're going to work together on that.

We have the resources. We have the budget. So what I will need from you are basically three things, a group of people to work on three things. First, the requirements, right? Or the scope, what we are attempting to do. Second, to work with us then on wireframes and design review process, right? We'll have to go through that.

And then third, beta testing, right? We'll need somebody and a group of people to actively test the website, much as we did with ICANN dot org, you know. We'll bring up a preliminary site and start testing it and develop from there. So we'll need a group that can help prioritize, you know, your wishes and desires and needs and that we can interact with directly.

So whenever you guys, whether we can sort that out here in London, you know, or immediately post is entirely up to...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Chris. Actually, we did have a group to start with. I think we'll probably start with them as a core group, but if there any other further people who wish to be part of these different groups, then they can contact staff separately and we'll add them to the table and to the group. Garth Bruen, you have your card up.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much. Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO. Definitely the issues of language, accessibility, in terms of the website in general came up in many of our thematic discussions in the last two days. Specifically in our globalization thematic group, we actually opened up the website and looked at it in terms of language.

And I know that you've acknowledged that there is still a lot of work to do. But one of the things that we found right away is that the links in the five UN languages at the top, only go to introductory information. And it was brought up by many people in our group, that we know that there is a volume of translated information that ICANN has, that is not made available here. And just as a matter of presentation, even when one clicks on the Spanish, French, Russian, Chinese, and Arabic, all the menu navigations at the bottom and the top remain in English.

So that's a problem. And number two, in terms of accessibility, and dealing with, especially the visually impaired, I met with a visually impaired user group in Boston, and I showed them the ICANN website, and they have special equipment, special devices, special software to use to navigate the Internet, and I asked them, is this website usable to you?

Universally they said no. So if you're going to have people evaluate the website for this kind of accessibility, you need to have a blind user group part of your working group. And this working group is actually, this particular group is now a North American At Large structure. Could put you in direct contact with them. I think it would be a big mistake to not have a blind user group as part of this team. Thank you.



---

CHRIS GIFT: Garth, thank you very much. Please put them in touch with me. The other thing that we're going to do on the... I fully acknowledge the site, on the accessibility, has issues. What we're doing is, there is a firm that specializes in evaluating websites on accessibility, and then helping them achieve, I want to include the user group as well.

But there are firms that... Because from the technology perspective, how you implement that there is special technology tips and tricks, and how you implement CSS and HTML, the code itself, and there are firms that specialize in that. So we're going to get some help for that.

GARTH BRUEN: The actual blind users tell me that a lot of those tools are wrong.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We have a queue in operation, and of course we don't want to take too much time. So I'll close the queue. I've got a number of people. Tijani Ben Jemaa, Gunela Astbrink, and then Murray you wanted to say something, then we'll move on afterwards. Well, the queue is closed now, sorry. So Tijani is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I will speak French so please put your headphone on.

Thank you very much please. I really appreciate your department for the work you made, but there are a lot of things to do as we said before. I don't want to speak about the e-learning, we are going to speak about that later. But I'd like to speak about the language program, the translations problem.

---

I need to speak about the links that doesn't show any translation. You have two lines of introduction and that's all. And worse, for the text that are translated, when it is translated in Arab or Russian, sometimes it has nothing to do with your original text. The translation is bad.

And it happens a lot. So I have proposed that we use the community to do some, to check the translation, and we do it here. And I think it's a good thing to do it, to have the people from the community checking the translations. I think automatic translation is no good. It doesn't work. It doesn't work. We can't use that.

And even when we have a human translation, as culture change, if we have an American translating into Arabic, it won't make a very good translation. So we have to use our community. And I know that in the case of Arabic it's true, and for Russian it's true. Okana told me that Russian translation doesn't meet the original.

So it is very important because if we pay money, yeah, to do the translation, it's a lot of work. And if people think that clicking on the button, we are going to have the text in the other language, and if people doesn't understand this translation, it is a problem. So we have to do something about that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani.

MATTHIEU CAMUS: I'm sorry. I'd like to add something. I'm Matthieu Camus from the Internet Society from France. I'd like to speak about the French

---

translation, and I want to say that normally the French translation is very well done. So I want to congratulate the translators because the technical translation is very well made.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Matthieu. Next person Gunela Astbrink.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Hi. With my name it's Gunela Astbrink. Thank you. From APRALO and the At Large Accessibility Taskforce, a brand new working group. It had its first meeting in Singapore, wanted to have a meeting here but hopefully at the next meeting. And we brought forward three key objectives with a number of actions.

And one was increasing web accessibility. And that certainly the ICANN website is the key. And then of course, what happens in the wider ICANN community. As an example, when it comes to how the website should be checked, I actually support using a company to do the evaluation, but it needs to be done not only with automated tools, but with people who have those disabilities, be it a blind person or a person who is deaf.

Because we're also talking about caching of videos here. And an example of why it's important to have that combination, is on ICANN's home page. And I have an automatic tool to check accessibility, and it says there are two accessibility errors, but actually there are many, many more. And the one is with the alt tag, so it means the description of a photo.

---

I just want to give this as an example. There is a photo of Fadi speaking with At Large members, and it doesn't say that in the particular description of the alt tag. So for example, a blind person using screen reading software, that person would have it read out to them, this is a photo of Fadi, from screenshot 2014, 01 17 at 5.14.14.14 PM.

I don't think that ICANN wants a person to have a person of Fadi reading that out. So it's an example of how important it is to use real people, but it's great to have a company, because there is a fair bit involved, so I appreciate that there would be a web audit, that will be done thoroughly. And the accessibility taskforce would be very happy to work in general terms.

I'm speaking as only a member of a taskforce. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is the chair. On behalf of a taskforce, I put forward a very short two page web tips, web accessibility tips, which is available here today. There it is. Thank you. So I'm delighted that ICANN is working on it, but there is a lot to be done on accessibility. Thank you.

CHRIS GIFT:

Just a quick response, thank you. I do thank Laura [Bangford] who is one of our product managers, attended the Singapore accessibility. I think she was one of the participants in the meeting, I think. And we would very much like to engage with that group on this.

I would to just also reiterate that, you know, absolutely we want to do an audit, and we will. But I also recognize that, you know, when it comes to the design and the implementation of the website, that it's a lot of process change that must happen as well. There is technology

---

training that has to happen with the development teams, which they don't have, which we need to do.

And then it's quite a bit of process change. And we recognize that, and just be a little patient with us as we, because it's going to be a long time. It's a lot of work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Next, and to close the queue, Murray McKercher.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes. Murray McKercher for the record, from NARALO. So Chris, know that it might be helpful that the World Wide Web Consortium, which sets standards, and Tim [Burners-Lee] oversees that I believe, from MIT. But there is a part of W3C called introduction to web accessibility. So a lot of these standards have been set in regards to design for accessible websites.

So I think it's important not to test it after the fact, but to implement the design of the site from the conceptual stage, that understands those design principles. So I think all of the tools are there and I'm happy to share those.

CHRIS GIFT: Sorry, thank you Murray. We definitely look at, we obviously look at the W3C standards. The trick though on the web, and I don't want to get too technical, A) because I don't know all the technologies. But there are issues around the actual implementation of the standard, you know,

---

and that's where it gets tricky and we need to train the developers more.

Some developers are very fluent in that and others are not so, and our group is just not there yet. That's where I need to invest in that.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Christ. And just a couple of more things. As far as the user group interviews are concerned, I think you should have details of those interviews which have been performed in the past, a couple of years ago, of At Large user groups. So you pretty much have all of the needs that we need from a new website already.

Just making sure with staff, will you make sure that Chris knows about that please, and has access to all of these details. That was one thing. Now, there were a couple of more people to make a comment, and unfortunately we have to cut this short.

The first one was accessibility points made by Tijani. That's a comment made from Jean-Jacques Subrenat in the chat. Accessibility points made by Tijani are also important in the context of the debate we just had on ATLAS 2. We must, or ICANN must place more emphasis in the user, on the user perspective, and that includes people with disabilities.

And then I note also from Alan Greenberg, who reminded me that the ATRT 2 noted that there were some significant problems with Spanish and Russian translation. And that's not a new issue, so it's something that has been touched on already. Back to you, because I realize we only touched on the website so far.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Good afternoon. Duncan Burns here. I'll be fairly quick. I don't have a presentation. I thought, following on our conversation in Singapore and BA, I'll give you a quick update and then I'm very happy answering any questions. Two particular ones. In terms of our team and making sure that we have a regional presence, and also tackling some specific issues tied to communications, we've been talking about a bit in relation to the website.

We've just hired a head of communications for Europe, Middle East, and Africa, Luna Madi, who is currently based in London and is going to be moving to Istanbul. She's here. I'm very happy to introduce you. Her job is really going to be working very closely with, by her peer Michael and Jean-Jacques, as part of the regional strategies, in each of those regions, making sure they have what they need much closer to the local communities that we're working with and partnering with.

That we're able to get ICANN's multitude of stories, and that's not just sort of central ICANN, but also community groups, ALSs and others, into local press, into language, etc. So I'm very happy to introduce you to her, and encourage you to partner with her and with the RVPs, of course.

The other person we just hired is a head of content in social media. And I think this is a recognition that, as a content strategy for ICANN, which touches so many areas of what we do, telling our narratives in a simple and accessible way, from a content point of view and a subject matter point of view, isn't always that easy.

---

It's not straightforward. We've got a lot of technical content. But also can sometimes be inconsistent. And that goes from everything from how we tag, you know, photographs on Flickr so people can find them. It's easy to benchmark. It's easy to add to the site, help with accessibility from a different point of view.

Then also once we create all of this content centrally, that it can then be really delivered through the right channels, to the people who want it, who might be looking for it. Not just leaving it on the website and hoping people know exactly what to look for through Chris's new and ever increasing search capabilities.

So those are two. The other area, and I know we've talked about this, and obviously we've been partnering with the ATLAS PR working group for this meeting, has been really trying to be a support in a shared service for the policy community. So, I think you heard, having to be in the room when Patrik and SSAC were here.

Earlier, we were talking to them about how we can help, you know, share a bit about what SSAC is doing, help make it more digestible, accessible, transparent as possible, recognizing some of the limitations. In the same way with ALAC and with content, you know, really trying to tell the story and the point of view of what you're doing.

I hope you've all had a chance to see if you've not had enough of Olivier, whose video which is on perma run in the lobby of the hotel. We can make him famous. But it's not just, you know, it's across the board. So if there are stories, if there are ways of explaining ICANN from the point of view of the end user and its role, and in domain policy.



---

Let us know, because that's something we can do and I'm really trying to focus on creating, whether it's the video experience, the radio experience, the digital infographic experience in our team to help enable that. And working with policy groups in the SO and AC structure to provide that service.

And then, I think that was just actually, I've been through my notes. But I'm very happy to take any questions.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Duncan. And in the meantime, whilst people think of questions, I might add that Olivier did such a bad job on the first two videos, the third video will have a much more handsome person in the person of Eduardo. So, and perhaps you'll be able to speak Spanish as well on the video.

Okay. First question, we have Garth Bruen.

**GARTH BRUEN:** Sorry to jump in again and repeat myself. Garth Bruen. As you're searching for people in regions to do outreach, can we get disabled employees? Can you have a disabled employee pool who will do the research?

**DUNCAN BURNS:** Yes, in as much as, you know, they are willing and that's their job function. But yes. I mean, in some ways, all ICANN staff are doing some type of engagement. But I agree. That's not something that is

---

formalized at the moment, because there are some HR aspects to that. But yes, that's a point well made. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you Duncan. So I had a question with regards to post ATLAS 2. There has been a very good coverage of the At Large Summit, and of course we had Fadi today also welcome the At Large Summit participants. Is there some kind of follow up strategy post ATLAS 2 to continue keeping this user centric interest and focus on these user centric interests?

**DUNCAN BURNS:** Very much so. And I think, perhaps one way to think about it, you know, we're priming the pump or the pump is primed. Sorry. By creating video content, by having Eduardo, other languages in BA or Singapore, I felt when you were doing your Board nominations, you were looking, trying to get community members, and they didn't have to be in leadership positions.

You know, really who is interested, there is a particular story to tell. And it doesn't have to be about the whole of ICANN. It can be a particular aspect of the paper that comes out of ATLAS. It can be, you know, experiences coming from this meeting, what the follow up is, telling the story of ALSs. We're trying to build the channel and the tools to help you tell the story, to provide that amplification and scale that's important, and some expertise as needed, you can draw.

So yes, very much. I would be frustrated if we stop, you know, on Friday.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Duncan. I also think we could take the opportunity now to thank all of the people in At Large, all of the volunteers who have been involved in both building the website and building our communication strategy as well on this. As you can see, we've got Twitter, we've got Facebook, we've got the website itself, and it all seems to be integrated quite well.

And maybe Ariel could let us know how many more Twitter followers and so on we have? Because she was like, wow, it's going on so quick. Gone up 200 in a day, that's not bad. Yeah, sure. Stop fighting for the microphone.

DUNCAN BURNS: Duncan. I think this came up even before ATLAS. You and your groups are the best advocates for the role of the end user, and for ATLAS and what ALAC stands for. And as much as my team, and sort of the ICANN staff can do in terms of retweeting or talking about what we're doing, you and your networks, and your activity on social media is one of the greatest values in terms of communicating what this community, its values are all about.

And I just encourage you now, you know, I know Dev and Ariel have a strategy. I implore you, if there are areas that we can help with, let us know, but it's a really good, very thorough strategy and very impressive.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Since we're interrupted with the microphone now, how many, just a quick updated.

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. Before ATLAS 2 started, we had about 184, and just in the past three days, we have increased about 54. And on Facebook, I probably can share with you this inside page, which shows the trend. So, don't look at this [laughs]. But compared to the beginning of June, our engagement rate increased about 1,000%. And we have so many new likes every day, and before we started implementing the strategy, the likes was about 800 something and now we're also gone up 50 just now. So it's very good improvement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So a round of applause to all of you for...  
  
Last question then, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. To both vice-presidents, this morning I was really impressed by many things, but among others by the way Fadi illustrated his presentation with these views of the beginnings of the Internet involvement at ICANN. And that slide which showed the chair of that, and behind her, there was a slide with transparency.

I mean, that's very striking. So building on that idea, and because I was very active, like most of us in the ATLAS 2 exercise for the past two days, could we establish a sort of link between this kind of presentation,

---

which is very vivid and vocal on the one hand, and the user community aspect on the other hand? Because the whole ATLAS 2 exercise was centered on a central theme, which was the user perspective.

So, we know all about, and it's very valuable to know about, the pioneers, the [inaudible], and the etc. But what we now have to work upon, and make more apparent I think, is the more modest role, but very continuous and hugely increased these past few years of the volunteers in more modest positions.

And I'm speaking about those who are working on the user perspective. So, we all have ideas on this. Our chair is extremely representative of us and very helpful, but we can all help give you ideas on that. Thank you.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Duncan Burns here. Thank you. And I think as you heard Fadi say during opening session of ATLAS, and something he talks to us regularly about, you know, how important the voice of the end user is, and making sure that we're doing ever more to represent stories that we're telling in, you know, our online efforts, etc.

So I think if you have ideas, do share them. I think that would be very valuable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much. And we are, as usual, running a little bit late. So I think we'll move to the next person in our agenda, but first, thank you very much Chris and thank you very much Duncan.

---

And whilst our next guest takes position, there was a question on the chat which asked, how can one continue to be involved after ATLAS 2? I gather, my interpretation is, continue to be involved in the communications of At Large after ATLAS 2. There are two working groups which are dealing primarily with communication and technology around it, and they're both headed by the same person, and that's Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Technology taskforce and the curation working group, which of course has got another name. Can you just say 30 seconds on each please whilst Theresa takes position?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Olivier. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. So there are two working groups. One is the At Large social media working group, which helps curate content for the At Large social media accounts, which has been in full swing since earlier this month.

And the technology taskforce is also a working group that looks at how the technology needs are for the ALSs, and well, the links can be posted on in the chat, on how you can join.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Dev. And anybody who is interested in joining these working groups, just email staff at At Large dot ICANN dot org. And there will be adding you to the respective mailing lists of these working groups.

---

Joining us at the table is Theresa Swinehart, senior advisor to the president on strategy on IANA stewardship and ICANN accountability and globalization issues. I believe that should have had a comma somewhere in the sentence. Somewhere in between . It's probably, senior advisor to the president on strategy, and she's going to speak to us on IANA stewardship transition, and also the IANA accountability and globalization issues.

Two very, very hot topics this week. And Theresa, you have the floor.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Wonderful. Thank you very much. It took a little while to find the room, but we'll sort of figure all of this out over time. So on ICANN globalization overall, there is obviously a lot of components related to that. You heard Fadi this morning talk about the locations, you heard Duncan and Chris obviously talk about initiatives that is going on in order to do that.

It's certainly not a new topic, with all the different elements to it. And of course, the NTI stewardship transition of the IANA function, and the strengthening of ICANN accountability are two major processes underway right now for that. But so in relation to this, I'll give a quick update of where things are with the two processes, and then more than happy to engage in discussion.

And I know that Olivier and I have been in close contact throughout these times, and have had the opportunity to do a webinar as well. So all these updates are very useful and very helpful opportunity for continued dialogue.

---

So on the NTI stewardship transition process, as you know, we kicked that off in Singapore. Had a huge amount of input into the dialogues, the number of emails, and email exchanges on different lists, but then also, of course, directly submitted to the process were around 700, and then there were about 60 specific process contributions overall.

On the sixth of June, we posted the process document, which proposes the coordination group with an adjustment to the both name of the group, which originally has, was called steering group but that seemed quite inappropriate, and the feedback indicated that, instead calling it the coordination group in identifying the seats of the different stakeholders on that group overall.

And the total is 27 are representing 13 different stakeholder community groups. And adjustments were made based on the feedback that had been received, which was very useful, during those discussions. Some other changes were made, which were based also on the community dialogue, was that there was no role for the chair of the ICANN Board or the chair of the GAC in the selection of members.

It's also for each of the stakeholder groups to do the selection themselves. So I understand that you're very likely also in the process of identifying candidates, and we certainly look forward to receiving the names for that. The deadline for that would be the second of July, in order to be able to convene the coordination group. Either in person and with remote participation by the middle of July.

Now another part of the work that was undertaken and feedback was that ICANN itself, being the facilitator, should certain not be prescriptive in any way. And that it was very important in the context of the



---

coordination group itself that it had the responsibility for processing both its working methodologies and how it intended to conduct that. And then second of all, how it was chartered and what it was going to be doing as part of its responsibility of coalescing the input in order to come up with a proposal to meet the NTA criteria.

So with that, ICANN continues to play the neutral role on this. It will continue to be the facilitator. It will provide the resourcing for any secretariat support that is needed, as identified by the coordination group, and we hope that that will also be a topic of their discussion when they meet in person.

The responsibilities to the coordination group are of course to work out in the scope of what the area is. And in that context, one of the key themes that has come up over the discussions has been the area around the broader ICANN accountability. So, obviously the respective customers of the IANA functions have their own policies and mechanisms around accountability.

But what happens to the broader accountability of ICANN with the change in its relationship and historical relationship with the US administration? So a process was launched for that, also based on community dialogue. It was posted on the sixth of May, with an outline of what existing accountability mechanisms already exist, with a suggestion of a possible working group kind of mechanisms or a methodology for looking at accountability, utilizing expertise in the community, obviously, and also external expertise, in order to identify if there is any gaps or any need for strengthening the areas around

---

accountability for the ICANN process in relation to the change in the historical role.

Now, these two processes, while they're being run in separate mechanisms because the one that we're facilitating involves stakeholders very much outside the community, we've heard this also out of, coming out of Brazil, it's important to be engaging stakeholders outside of the direct ICANN community as well. And we obviously heard it both yesterday in a briefing I did for the GAC and we heard it this morning also in the briefing we did for the high level meeting.

So that's an important area that we need to be obviously very cognoscente of. And I do hope that this group here has the opportunity through your networks, and your very broad network to end users, to also ensure that there is a good reach to communities that are not always directly involve in ICANN, but may be interested in how these processes are running, and to become involved in them through Internet work abilities as well.

The accountability process will be strongly informing and relevant for the NTI stewardship process, and hence while we appreciate the timelines are difficult and moving, it's important that they're running parallel to each so that the interdependencies of these that have been identified by the community, can be directly addressed and managed in that way as we move this forward.

So those are the two overviews. The comment deadline for the accountability process is still underway. So the draft proposal that is out there is still open for comment until the 27<sup>th</sup> of June. On Thursday, there are two public forum style discussions with remote hubs on both

---

of these processes. The one for the coordination group and the NTI stewardship is being organized by the representation of other stakeholder groups, and the other is being organized together with SO/AC leadership, with members who have been part of the ATRT 2 process, and then also with just an overview of accountability mechanisms existing to date.

You'll be seeing in the hallways, the opportunity on post it board and other things, to provide input into some of the accountability discussions, and that input will be compiled and a brief summary and overview of that will be provided also on Thursday morning. So we received a very, very good input into the processes, obviously from this group, from ALAC, and in that context I thought I would just touch briefly on some of the things that had been captured, if that's helpful.

There may be footnotes or not footnotes, sometimes things were footnoted sometimes not. But that doesn't mean that everything wasn't read thoroughly and captured. Obviously, on the open end inclusiveness aspect that was addressed and captured in the diversity requirements, inclusiveness, global and multistakeholder and core principles and the multiple forum for dialogues occurring.

I know that there have been some dialogue also around a cross community working group style in order to have a bottom up mechanism in process, and appreciate there is some discussions here happening about that. I think those are all very important opportunities to have dialogues in order to provide input into the coordination group process.

---

The coordination group itself, again, is to take the input from both the direct customer party, so the IETF and those affected by the protocol parameter spaces, IP addressing space, and obviously the namespace, and take those and put them together in what can be a proposal that meets the criteria set out by MTIA. But of course, all other input should go into that group as well, and then that can also be compiled into part of what the proposal can be composed of. With regards to end user representation, obviously ALAC has two seats.

We know that and are aware that there is, end users have a broad reach, and you have the opportunity also, I understand, many ISOC chapters are also actively participating in ALAC activities. And as you will have seen, the Internet society also has two seats. So that could be an interesting idea to also see whether there might be some chapter interest from there as a partner in the context of end user representation from that standpoint.

Again, security and stability, bottom up and multistakeholder consensus driven, all of those aspects have been captured as a fundamental DNA as to how this should function. So I think with that, I'll end and then maybe I can answer any questions for engaging in the discussion.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you Theresa, it's Olivier speaking. This is a room where you don't need to turn your mic off. The moment somebody else touches the mic, it cuts you off. You'd love it. It's a bit crazy. Anyway, thanks very much for this update, Theresa. And I think one of the first questions that has come up was to do with the number of people on that steering, well

---

what used to be called the steering committee, which is now called the coordination committee.

I have had some, several discussions with the other chairs of SOs and ACs about the matter, and I think there might have been a misunderstanding as to this committee making decisions, and this committee basically being the people that will decide on the future of the transition of the IANA contract. Could you elaborate a little bit on this? To dispel any such thoughts maybe?

THERESA SWINEHART:

Yeah, absolutely. Coordination group is to coordinate. It is to pull together. But in order for any proposal to meet the criteria as set out by NTA, obviously there has to be a supporting consensus. It would be my expectation that representation on the coordination group, from its own communities, would have a strong responsibility of continuously constant dialogue with those respective communities.

I would also take the guess, if I could be presumptuous, based on the feedback on inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, all the elements around the principles that the community had identified both in the lead up to preparing the process, but also other aspects around multistakeholder models and our expectations of multistakeholder models. But the coordination group in whatever they're pulling together as to being a proposal from the community, would absolutely be required to go out for rounds of consultation, and outreach, and dialogue, and input, and feedback.

---

So what I'm trying to say is that one needs some mechanism to move work forward and to pull things together from a broader community. But I think decision making would probably be too strong of a terms. Coordination, compiling, facilitating, pulling it together, bringing it back out to the community for input, in order to bring to a final proposal that would meet the criteria would be my expectation of their working methods.

I think it's important though that in the Thursday session, some of those points are raised, because I would see the Thursday session also as an opportunity to reinforce the expectations, the principles, the methodologies to demonstrate transparency and accountability that would be placed on the coordination group, and that they should be taking into consideration, along with all the other input that had been received, and into working methods during the comment period, as far as how they're going to be moving forward.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Theresa. And yes, with discussions with Patrik Fältström, who is one of the people that is putting that session together, we understand that it will be, primarily the people on that committee will have to have a strong communication component back with their communities, and the work will take place in the community.

And we'll come onto that immediately after we see you because we have a hot session, or hot topic session that deals with this. Now, we have a queue for questions. First, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. Nice to see you Theresa. Jean-Jacques speaking. So, I have a simple question. I have seen the timelines and I've read the papers. I was wanting to ask you if the discussions this time in London, for instance the high level ministerial meeting which started this morning, if that has impacted the timeline of your exercise, or is that still what you expect to be achieved? Could you say a few words about that? Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yeah. The timeline is still where we expect to stay. At some... The timelines right now have been quite focused on process, but at some point we also need to be moving into, not we as ICANN but also as the community, into the substantive discussions, and the issues on the table that need to be addressed. I think you heard from Larry [Strictling] as well, his observation that, you know, the September 2015 is obviously a goal.

We have an unique window of opportunity here. It's not, you know, it's not the endgame at that point, but it would be an unique opportunity to try to complete something during that time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Theresa. We now have a question from a remote participant, and then we'll go back to the table. Ariel Liang, could you please convey the question?

---

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. This is remote participant [inaudible] has the question. Going forward in the transition process formulation, it is expected that the coordination team will look to involve the larger community as much as possible. This will mean leveraging on technology means that allow for collaboration as much as possible.

There is also the history, how busy, delayed ICANN tech could be in responding to technical need of At Large, for instance, how prepared is the tech team for the challenges ahead? Will there be a tech team dedicated to ensuring that the technical needs of the coordination team is met in a timely manner?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Stop touching the buttons. Just one of you touch it.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. Thank you. We won't touch the buttons everybody. The answer is yes. We're fully prepared for this. We've anticipated this. We've anticipated that obviously this, in anybody's planning, that, you know, there is work areas that will come up in this. And so as we've been looking at the planning purposes, yes we are prepared on the IT and on other sides of this as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You can touch it to turn it off if I don't touch it before you turn it off, because otherwise you'll turn it back on to you and then it will turn my off. Is that clear?



---

THERESA SWINEHART: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

And someone has touched it again [laughter]. All right, everyone, keep your hands up in the air when I speak so you don't need to touch it. Yes, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: Maybe we should establish another process in working to solve this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Theresa. Johnny Laureano is next.

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Johnny Laureano is speaking. Theresa...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...your headsets on.

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Johnny is speaking. Sorry. For the third time, it might be convenient to take into consideration one of the most significant outcomes of NetMundial, which would significantly contribute to expand the participation of the community of Internet end users. Until a few months ago, since 2005, the Civil Society was considered to be quite extensive segment, but NetMunidal...

---

As an outcome of NetMundial, it was amplified, it was divided, it was noticed that, and in the declaration pronounced in that event, it was seen that Civil Society is now represented as another class, or actually four additional classes, [inaudible], the technical community, Civil Society, and Internet users, Internet end users, that obviously all of them intend to represent the interests of end users.

But on many topics, and this might have been seen in previous days, and we will certainly be discussed in the following days, several of the topics are common to the Civil Society, and they eventually follow a logical trend. The development of ideas from the technical community might be quite different from the feelings, or the perceptions, of the end users, a grass root end user, as we would say.

And this could certainly be the case for the academia, the Civil Society shows some lack of understanding in some areas. So I would like to have your opinion, what strategy or do you think that this new situation could be considered in the strategies and methodologies to be implemented for this transition? And I hope, in ICANN itself, within ICANN itself, considering the high level of participation ICANN had in this event. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thank you very much. Sorry you had to start a few times. I think the, obviously in NetMundial and as we've seen in some of the other processes, the division of the stakeholder groups is often times a little different than what we see in the ICANN model specifically, namely with the Civil Society, academia, technical, government, business, sort of categories.

---

I think ensuring that Civil Society is fully represented, is obviously a very important part. And I would hope that the outreach, and I know we have the non-commercial constituency as well and the work of different constituencies within the ICANN process, very much. So with regards to these specific processes, I think one element that we certainly received in the comments, and I would expect that the coordination group, as part of its working methodology, would seek to ensure, again not speaking on their behalf, but that was some feedback that came in and hope will take that on, is the importance of very strong outreach and very strong mechanisms of engagement, whichever way that they are, in order to ensure that one is reaching all of the communities, and academics, and Civil Society, and all of those, whether or not they're specifically represented in one of the stakeholder groupings that's at the table, whether it's the non-commercial, or the ALAC, or a chapter.

I hope that helps the answer. But yes, it's very much on the forefront of the mind, and obviously something to keep an eye on. And I would hope that there is feedback on a regular basis to see how the collaboration is working on that.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thanks very much Theresa. Any other questions on this? Yes, the lady behind in the second row. Do we have a mic, a flying mic somewhere? And then if you can introduce yourself when you take the floor, please.

**LAURA TAYLOR:** Good afternoon. My name is Laura Taylor, I'm the president and CEO of Native Public Meeting, very brand new to ICANN. But I have a question.

---

This morning, Laura Strickland mentioned that there was a possibility of a renewed contractual relationship. So I'm wondering, before September 15<sup>th</sup> of next year, is there a threshold date of when that might become an actual consideration in this process?

THERESA SWINEHART;

It's a good question. For a proposal... Working backwards... First of all, welcome, and it's a delight to have new participants at every event. Working backwards from the September date, and in order to allow both adequate time for the proposal to have consideration by NTIA, and to operationalize it, having something that the community has agreed on, the coordination group, can put forward in fulfilling the criteria set out by NTIA, it would seem that a timeframe of, you know, April or something like that would be good to try to strive for.

Again, realizing that, you know, working with the community can take some time. I think it's another reason why the work around the processes at some point needs to go into the phasing of actually beginning the work, because there is still quite a bit of work to do within the respective communities themselves. But there is also then within the communities themselves, building consensus, and then through the bottom up process getting that to the coordination group and allowing it to go out and make sure that whatever is compiled is done.

So at some point, we do need to start the work in working backwards, we are looking at an unique window. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Theresa. One more question, there are several groups that are being created. We mentioned the coordination group, but there is also the accountability and transparency working group that is separate from the coordination group. How do these two things run together? Or do they run separately from each other?

I know that Fadi this morning mentioned that they are all interlinked, but are they all interlinked time wise? Are they interlinked as far as the members of the group are concerned? Or are they logically interlinked?

THERESA SWINEHART: I think they will be interlinked as in informing each other and keeping an eye on what's happening with each other, right? So, the, it's very clear that the issue around the broader ICANN accountability, which is broader, by the way, than merely than the specific relationship of the IETF let's say with the IANA function, or the regional Internet registry relationship with the IANA function itself, is a very important element.

So I would see that the work there as being very closely aligned, and also through its own transparency mechanisms, that it will need to operate under very clear, on how they are working the information there, which of course, then is because it's public also available to the stewardship process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. It's Olivier speaking again. If the coordination group is one that just coordinates things, and then gets the various communities to do the actual work, is that the same process by which the accountability and transition, sorry, accountability and transparency will work? Or is

---

the work actually going to take place in the accountability and transparency working group?

**THERESA SWINEHART:** So, in the proposed approach to dealing with the strengthening of ICANN accountability, that working group is actually comprised, being proposed to be comprised of experts in very specific areas around accountability. So what is being sought there is expertise around specific subject areas that are relevant for accountability, in order to look at what exists. Are there any gaps? And if so, can they be solved for by strengthening existing mechanisms? Or do other things need to be put into place?

So there is really a subject matter expertise focus then with whatever the experts come up with, that obviously going out to the different stakeholder groups for input.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thanks again Theresa. And then final question from me and then we have a question from Alan Greenberg. The coordination group shows some seats that are occupied by organizations that are not part of ICANN itself, so we have external organizations. Does the accountability and transparency group also offer such a thing?

**THERESA SWINEHART:** So the strengthening of ICANN accountability is really about ICANN. So let me go back to the NTIA stewardship transition. ICANN was asked there to facilitate and facilitate obviously with the broader community,

---

and that would include representation from entities that are outside of the immediate ICANN family, if you want to put it that way, or structure.

On the strengthening of ICANN accountability, that is being run as looking at ICANN specifically, so with that, it's asking the SO and ACs, with their community input on identifying experts to put forward, experts names specifically there. And then also the opportunity for identifying other subject matter experts from outside the ICANN community to help compliment in areas where that would be useful.

So that is from that... That's looking at SO and ACs specifically, identifying experts from within the community, and then, you know, obviously there is people who have experience with governance and organizations that may be useful to bring in to help compliment that, but it's not looking outside the ICANN structure.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thanks Theresa. And every time I think of another question, one last one then. Is there a limit a certain number of participants per SO and AC on that other working group?

**THERESA SWINEHART:** There is not a limit, however having said that, to have an effective size of a working group, and again, focused on identified experts of certain areas, you want to have something that's manageable. So I would encourage, in order to be able to do that, also to be able to move within the timeline that we're looking at, and also to really leverage that the legitimacy of all of this is then the engagement with the broader community and the working methodology.

---

That we try to be cognoscente of keeping it to a size that's efficient and effective. And also, you know, I've been involved in some discussions around this with other SO and AC leadership and community members, there is... Each SO and AC is unique, and has a very unique composition.

And at some point, one has to try to find parity among all of them. And so if one SO or AC goes with a very high number, it may put pressure on others to do the same, and that would be a dis-balance. So I would encourage trying to achieve parity and also trying to achieve numbers that allow for efficient and effective focusing on accountability aspects, but then can easily and need to go out to the community, and the stakeholder community for input.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Theresa. Of course, ultimately, if we do our job well, we can go up to three billion on our side. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll never get that good. You've already addressed part of what I was going to ask, I think, but I'm going to try to do a sanity check. In terms of Olivier's earlier question on, sorry. It's okay. I'll wait for him to finish. He's my boss.

Okay. I won't be long. In terms of Olivier's original question on the relationship between the two groups, my take has been that in our presence and skill, we had solved the accountability and transparency problem already, and we were internally and completely trusted by everyone, the IANA coordination, the stewardship transition group would have a lot easier time.



---

But we don't have that luxury of having done that in that order. In terms of the coordination of the accountability and transparency coordination, the composition of the, of that group. You said you want to populate it with experts, some of whom you're going to get from outside to fill gaps, and some of whom you expect to be named by the ACs and SOs. Did I catch that right?

THERESA SWINEHART:

So that is the proposed... Okay. I just want to be clear. What is out there now is a proposed, it's still up for comment. So it could be that the comments suggest something completely different, Fadi mentioned that this morning as well. So the suggestion was the expertise in the community, obviously within the respective SO and ACs, please identify that.

And the, also for then other additional expertise to be identified to either compliment or add additional information that the working group would find relevant. And obviously, the Board has a relationship with that, because it's ultimately also [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

I quite understand that the rules may change. I was trying to understand what we think they may be today. So, since few ACs and SOs within ICANN have true subject matter experts on accountability and transparency, I presume that is somewhat modified to say accountability and transparency in the ICANN context, to, you know, to extend their needs, not true subject matter experts but modified within our context.

---

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes. And what I mean, it doesn't mean that one has to be an expert on how ICANN works in that, right? It means, for example, in the listing there is things around, you know, expertise around Internet consumer protection or global ethics, right? It could be that in one of the constituency groups, there is people who have expertise around that, either from their day jobs or past life or whatever it might be.

So that listing is a good benchmark of the kinds of things to be looked at. Now, to one of your points earlier, I just wanted to... And by the way, again, this is the draft being proposed. So again, you know, I want to be clear that the deadline for comments has not ended yet, and so in no way does anybody want to be presumptuous about it.

But to an earlier point you made about the accountability areas, and I know you've been on the ATRT 2 part. One of, I think, of the opportunities we have here is that there has been a huge amount of work around accountability and the ATRT 2 report is just one prime example of some very good recommendations that have come out.

And in taking a holistic look at this, it could easily be, I'm not anticipating or predicting anything, that pulling everything together, one actually has what's needed in place. That could be, or it could be that additional areas are strengthened because that historical contract with the US is no longer there, and there is a view that certain elements may need to be strengthened on that.

But you would highlight it and I think it's an important example of all of the work that has gone into things.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just one quick comment, because it came up yesterday. The accountability and transparency reviews associated with the AOC, are somewhat, or where somewhat constrained by the wording of the AOC. So there are issues, for instance, that we raised within the ATRT discussions, which we felt were accountability and transparency issues, but they were out of scope because they weren't in the numbered items referring to our transparency.

So there may well be things over and above.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Yes, if I may say, yes, AOC 9.1 A to F, as some of our colleagues around the table that have been on the ATRT 2 will remember. Okay, I think that we have no more questions for you at the moment. I really thank you for having spent the additional time with us Theresa.

The next two sessions after yours were actually for us to discuss our response, and it's great that we've been able to engage further with you, and that will greatly help us in forming our response. And I believe Alan is already drafting something, I'm sure. No he's not. Well, he will be. That can be arranged.

And we have Evan next him to coerce him to writing something. Thanks very much Theresa for coming to see us.

So we have a few more minutes to discuss this, the follow up. As Theresa Swinehart just mentioned earlier, there is a page, there is a public comment that is still opened at the moment, regarding ICANN

---

accountability. And I will ask staff to put this on the screen for us please.

And the question is really, what are we going to write in that...? First, do we need to make a statement, draft a statement and then, what are we going to write? We've heard... We've had a chance just now to ask questions, and we might have already put our finger on something, but the question is, what do we do next?

Through the corner of my eye, I can see Evan Leibovitch with his hand up. So I hand the floor over to Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks Olivier. This is Evan speaking. I think part of the problem that I have with all of this, and one of the reasons why I didn't say much during Theresa's time here, is because I think it's actually, the timing of all of this is really, really strange. My instinct suggests that we really shouldn't be acting until we see how the Board responds to ATRT 2 in full.

And that we should be guiding our reaction based on how much the Board is committed to executing all of the ATRT. It's really hard to make a judgment on how to go forward. If the Board does not completely endorse what the ATRT did, because then, if it's not taking that seriously, how seriously will it take any future efforts we put in?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Evan. We've got Alan, I saw Rinalia moving her hand before you. So Rinalia Abdul Rahim first and then Alan Greenberg. Rinalia, you have the floor. And the microphone should be on.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Can you hear me? Okay. Great. I would suggest that you don't waste any more time. Proceed with the assumption that all of the recommendations will be approved and taken onboard by the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Get to action, get to work. You can't get out of it. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: You made a very strategic mistake by letting her speak first, because I was going to say, my assumption is they don't have any choice but to pretty well accept everything, and then it would have sounded marvelous if Rinalia made her announcement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so where do we go? Because I guess, Evan that pretty much resolves the concern that you had. And so that goes back to you at the moment as to, if the ATRT 2 recommendations are approved and move forward. And I guess probably that's the only answer we are going to get so far, because I haven't seen any implementation.

I've seen a start to some of the work, and some of the recommendations being acted on. I certainly know the

---

recommendations that relate to the GAC are proceeding with discussions and a lot of processes and so on. But the rest, relating to the Board, appeared to also on track somehow, so where do we go next? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In light of what I said to Theresa at the end, but that was just a technical detail, all of the ATRT 1 and ATRT 2 recommendations, if they were implemented with a snap of the fingers immediately, would not address the perceptions of accountability and transparency regarding ICANN, that are present both within the organization and outside of the organization.

So I think these other entities still have relevance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Alan. Any other comments? This is your time. ICANN accountability and transparency is, I guess, pretty much core to many of the concerns that our community has, especially when I speak to people at IGFs and EuroDIG, and local Internet governance forums. There are often concerns. ICANN is not transparent. ICANN is not accountable.

Well, any comments? It seems like everybody is okay with ICANN being accountable and transparent. Great. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I said the exact opposite. I'm agreeing with what you're hearing other places.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Evan, Alan. Evan. I'm getting wrong because of those microphones. Thank you Alan. Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, is it better if I sit at a different part of the table so you're not looking this way? Okay. This is Evan speaking. Part of my problem in talking to other people has been that ICANN is simultaneously transparent and also extremely opaque, looking at it from different viewpoints.

At a matter of sheer volumes of information coming out of this place, ICANN is extremely transparent. There is huge amounts of data, reports, papers, webpages, meeting minutes, and agendas, and transcripts, and so on. There is huge amounts of data coming out, and most of the meetings are open. So at that level, things are very transparent.

But the process of easily being able to figure out actually what's going on, I think is what stymies people. And the concept of being buried under so much, that it's easy to hide when things are actually happening, is what I'm hearing when I talk to people. So you have a situation where there is massive amounts of transparency in the terms of pure, raw flow of information coming out.

Little seems to be deliberately hidden, while at the same time, that same volume of information, appears to make it really, really difficult to discover what's really going on. Thanks.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Next is [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi. It's working? Yeah. By the way, I would like to say, from different point, everything is so transparent, but it takes you three years just to understand how ICANN works and the way that we can find things to understand what's going on.

And even for old timers like me coming back, it takes you three years, maybe just to get back, catch up with what happened. Anyway, the point I wanted to make, it came up also in our thematic group discussion, in part also the plenary, is the fact that At Large is in fact one of the main accountability mechanisms, so that ICANN has been creating in its structure.

And so, part of the issue about accountability could be how to further increase the role and effectiveness of the At Large. Have been [inaudible] ...so to us the decision making points in ICANN, and also the bottom, so how to increase the participation, and especially meaningful participation so to ensure people who want to participate and are unable to make meaningful input, which means that they are actually informed on how to make it, and where to make it.

And so even maybe understanding whether there needs to be an effort to increase participation especially in parts of the world that are not fully involved yet and so on. So anyway, that could be something that could be raised in the other comment.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you [Victorio]. I was going to ask, where you in the thematic working group that dealt with ICANN transparency and accountability?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No, actually I think also it was number two, but in the end I think, the group started talking about everything, at least it was to a certain extent. So the one on globalization. A part of the globalization is of course increasing the difference in participation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. I was going to ask, who was the moderator or chair, could anyone who was in the working group on ICANN accountability and transparency gives us a little feedback on what the group concluded? Okay. In the meantime, we'll have Johnny Laureano and then we'll try and find...

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Okay, Johnny Laureano...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll do it if the chair isn't here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have lost your chance at the moment. Johnny Laureano, please.

JOHNNY LAUREANO:

Johnny speaking. I will express out loud a question that is probably made by users, users of ICANN services, of Internet service providers. ICANN, is it just the offices? Is it just the administrative offices? Is it the constituencies? Is it the At Large? Is it ccTLDs? What is ICANN? When we say ICANN, because whenever there is a claim from any user on a domain, any communication should be conveyed to ICANN, considering that ICANN is going to sort the promise, which might be the case sometimes.

So when we speak of transparency, and now we're also speaking about globalization, we are extending ICANN's responsibility even further towards the entire world. And I wonder, if this accountability could be met, this new responsibilities could be met only by these offices? The office in Istanbul, or the United States office.

Let me give you an example. Will ICANN have any responsibility over the transparency of the Peruvian ALSs? Where I come from? Likewise, any other ALSs we represent, almost none of them use ICANN's logo. So I think that the statement that should be made should consider all of those parties, both direct and indirect that are related to ICANN, otherwise it won't be transparent.

The ALSs have a lack of resources, and we do not get resources from any other entity. So transparency, in a way, could be manageable. But those of us who administer resource, ccTLDs, those that get resources, and that creates a responsibility of shared management, shared with ICANN, and now with the IANA function transferred to ICANN, I think that this statement should consider...

---

I didn't have the chance to read it, and I apologize for that, but if there is any chance to include any sentence, any words, also considering, or comprising, of this units of representations, globalization of ICANN all over the world, this should be in the writing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Johnny. And I hope that whoever is holding the pen, and I realize we haven't actually told anyone yet they're holding the pen, perhaps Alan has got a wonderful memory for everything that has been said, or we will be getting the recordings of this.

I was going to ask Holly Raiche, who has, I think you were chairing or moderating the thematic working group on accountability and transparency that we had over the weekend. If you could suggest a couple of words with regards to, I guess, the findings of your working group and how that could be perhaps, a couple of these could be folded into this public comment request.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Olivier. Yes we did actually talk about it, both accountability and transparency. Came up with a definition of accountability as simply the responsibility to answer for the way that you have achieved what you have achieved. And for transparency, the openness and accessibility of decision making processes and outcomes.

The default mode of operation for ICANN should be with complete transparency. What we did was first of all note ATRT 2 came up with recommendations, we said yesterday should be improved because that's about internal accessibility. So what we concentrated on, just a

---

few recommendations for accountability and transparency, from a general public which included not only more ability to participate on an issue by issue basis, as well as being part of the ICANN community, but also things like clearer and easier ways to participate, clearer and easier access to information, a complaints mechanism that not only handles complaints but tracks the issues that have all not been dealt with and then find ways to deal with them.

And finally, does to just a sort of a committee across, and we spent a lot of time cross-constituency, cross-community, we won't go into that debate. But something that has the ability to actually look at and do something about either Board action or inaction. Obviously, on the significant and sever instances, but rather than having some external body to be accountable, having something that reflects the community as a way of having some kind of external accountability for the Board.

To summary and it will be posted. In fact, it is being sent to be posted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Holly. And one more thing, since your working group has got Alan Greenberg as a reporter, turning to Alan on this side. I guess this is the report from the thematic working group that will go into the overall At Large Summit working, At Large Summit report or document. We need an answer for this.

Could you fold some of the input from your report into a statement, and then release this as a statement? And also folding some of the other input that we've heard here?



---

And I would suspect we have some comments on that, but I don't think they're the right ones. I think you're one level ahead of the game. So, I would not suggest submitting that as the comment to this, but there are perhaps a number of issues which I could review, or anyone could review in terms of the other comments, and I think there are a number of things that have been said that we may want a second, in terms of making sure that this group is in fact going to be able to do the job it is expected to do in a reasonable timeframe. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. We are now passing the end of this session. So we'll just have one last comment from you, and then...

HOLLY RAICHE: That's so I could finish my biscuit, which is still in my mouth. We had like nine hours of discussion, so I'm sure somewhere in some of that, there would be appropriate things to say. Maybe I could work with Alan to look through what we said that is relevant, okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. I was going to suggest actually, Alan you and Chester as well, as Chester has taken on the reporter role, and that's a new face. Is Chester around the room somewhere? You're over there. There you go. So there you go, you've been volunteered, well done.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest... If you hold your finger down it might work better. I don't know. I would...

---

Got it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was only testing it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Got at my own game, okay. In preparation, there has been, I believe, although I haven't looked yet myself, a large number of comments made. It's probably worthwhile scanning over those and seeing the kinds of things other people are saying.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. And we'll also remember to fold the input from this session. There has been some good discussion on this. All right. Well, let's go over to the next part of our agenda, and that's the hot topic number three, universal acceptance of IDNs.

IDNs are internationalized domain names. Domain names that do not use the Latin character scripts. We're speaking here about Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Cyrillic, etc. They're quite a few, and in fact there is more and more use of these IDNs since they have been launched. And we have two experts from our IDN working group, who are joining us at the table.

Welcome Edmon. Welcome Rinalia. And we also have the blissful appearance of Sarmad Hussein, who, I understand, has recently been appointed. So I think maybe it's time for... Sarmad, for those who don't know him, has been an expert in various scripts, but primarily, I think, is it the [inaudible] script, an Arabic script, for quite a number of years.

---

I first met Sarmad in Kenya during the ICANN meeting in Kenya, and he was doing an extremely webinar, not webinar, sorry, seminar for the fellow at the time. So it's really great to note that Sarmad is now working for ICANN, so welcome.

And I was told, I didn't see this... Oh yes. We also have Han Chuan Lee, from staff. Where is Han Chuan? Oh, you're here. Perfect. I must be absolutely blind at this time. Please, you have the floor. Rinalia, are you leading this or Edmon? Rinalia, you have the floor.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Olivier. Hello At Large. Glad to be in the At Large room again, finally. May I also invite Ed to take a seat at the main table? Ed is also on ICANN staff and he's responsible for universal acceptance. And since we're talking about universal acceptance, it would be good to have a response from the staff side.

When we talk about IDN hot topics, there are two large categories of issues. One is universal acceptance, the other one is the label generation rules for the root zone. So Edmon will describe the problem related to universal acceptance of IDN, and of course, this problem applies to both IDN TLDs and non-IDN TLDs.

And Sarmad and Han Chuan will come in on the label generation rules for the root zone issue, and what is needed in terms of support and assistance from the community side. And then we'll have Ed respond to issues related to universal acceptance. And that is how we're going to proceed. So Edmon, take it away.



---

EDMON CHUNG:

Thank you. Seeing that, or anticipating that there would be a number of new faces in the meeting, I prepared something, I guess, a little bit more, kind of like a starter. Anyway, just keep going. Next slide please. I was just going to quickly talk about what IDN is, so people understand what it is.

So it's internationalized domain names, and we call it IDN. Next page please. So, this is really what it is about. So domain names that existed in alpha-numeric characters before are now being accepted in different languages. Here you see it in Hindi, if I'm not mistaken. And behind the domain name that you see, in fact, it's being converted into an alpha-numeric string, x and dash, dash, something, something, something.

And this is how the DNS works. And therefore, this kind of innovation that's introduced to the DNS have some ripple effects on how other applications are handling it. Next page please. I promise that was the only technical slide, actually some more are coming, sorry.

But in the real world we know that, in order to get a sense, in the real world, the world uses their own language. In the Internet today, we are still somewhat restricted to alpha-numeric characters for domain names. Next slide please. And we're not only talking about domain names, but also email addresses, and both in the user name part, which is the name before the at sign, and the domain name part, which is the part after the at sign.

And it is an issue not only for Asian languages, it's also issues for European languages, and how systems take it. Next slide please. And if you think you still don't use a lot of IDNs, think about how search patterns work. Perhaps today, people are still not used to typing in IDN

---

domain names, but they are very comfortable typing in their own native language for search.

And that is going to transfer into usage for IDNs into the future as well. So this is the background of what's happening. Next slide please. And so, come to what really we mean by universal acceptance and the issue, next slide please. Yes. So one of the issues is that when you see a signup sheet, sometimes it happens that the top level domain, you have a drop down box, and if that drop down box doesn't include a top level domain, you're, you know, you're out of luck.

And so, right now very few of those drop down boxes would have an IDN or, you know, different languages, or support for that. Next slide please. And the other ones are, when you sign up, for example for a social network site, when you give your email address, whether the system will take it, or you know, it will come back and say, "Please enter valid email address."

That is a failure where the application chokes up because it's not expecting IDNs, not expecting different languages in your email addresses or domain name. Next slide please. There are other areas, and even within search, there are different areas where domain names are used, like the search add, the search results part, the ads on the side.

Different areas take domain names and therefore, what seems to be a simple, you know, change in the system, sometimes becomes very challenging for providers, including Google or other providers where they have multiple databases that are storing this information and displaying this information. Next slide please.

---

And of course, when you try to send an email, when you try to type in an email address that is in different languages, and that chokes up and fails. Next slide please. And why is that the case? I mean, I guess it's pretty simple to think about it. That the applications didn't anticipate it. But here are some cases where this is the reason why. Next slide please.

So, it was supposed to have some animation, but I guess when it's converted into this format, it doesn't put that up. So, there are two main cases. One is that sometimes applications hard code, they have a list of the top level domains or the type of domains that they're accepting, or they have a length of the domain limited.

So they think that all top level domains are only three characters long. So if your top level domain is more than three characters long, then they think it's an invalid situation. Same with the hard coded list, if you're not in the list, you're not a valid domain name. Next slide please.

Another situation is the use of other types of lists. Like this one, it's called the public suffix list that many applications use, and it's maintained by Mozilla. And sometimes what happens is that if it's not fully synchronized with the ICANN root, then even when a top level domain is added to the ICANN root, especially for the IDN, it's not reflected immediately in applications that depend on these lists. Next slide please.

And of course, abuse blockers like spam blockers, or phishing detectors, they may choke up on non, what they might tend to view as non-compliant email addresses, or non-complaint domain names. And they

---

kind of try to block it out, and that's another area of why this is happening. Next slide please.

And this is not going, you know, this is not ending. In fact, this is just the beginning of what we're seeing. There are going to be many top level domains because of the new gTLD process, that IDN top level domains are being added every day. So this is a growing problem. Next slide please.

And next slide please. And this is a problem, not only for gTLDs, but also ccTLDs, country code top level domains like in various countries. And this is also an issue which means this is an issue for the entire, pretty much the bigger part of the ICANN community at this point.

So next slide please. And so, there has been some work being done, just a quick note back. The joint working group looked at this, between the ccNSO and GNSO looked at this issue and created a number of recommendations. Next slide please. And the recommendations, there were four specific recommendations, yeah, next slide.

There were four specific recommendations that were put forward. The council has adopted it and it has been sent to the Board for consideration at this point. Next slide. There is a lot of work on that, but it translates to these four items. First one is the recommendation is get our own act together. I'll come back to this.

The second one is to be more strategic about the issue, asking ICANN to do that. C, the third one, is to create best practice documents for top level domains and also for users. And D, to be, again, proactive and

---

reach out beyond the ICANN community. And I'm coming to A, next slide please.

What I mean by getting our own act together is about ICANN's own systems and registries and registrars. Today, there may be cases where we are already selling IDN top level domains, for example, next slide. And when you try to put in a name server, or an email address, with those IDN top level domains, that system fails. Registry or registrar or even, in some cases, perhaps, ICANN systems.

I don't know whether they are fully fixed by now, but there are cases like that. So we've got to get our own act together first. I think that was the main, well one of the first recommendations from the [jig] working group as well. Next slide.

And so, sorry this is a redundant slide so the next one. And building on [jigs] report, actually I'm quite happy and excited that the staff team, ICANN staff team has now put out a new document, putting out a roadmap on universal acceptance, and it just came out a little while ago, and the public comment period will end on July 18<sup>th</sup>. I'm sure Ed will add to that in a bit.

But just quickly, next slide. Just quickly, the roadmap identifies, I guess for the first time, an establishment of ICANN having a strong role in bringing together an active, and being the active facilitator and catalyst, to bring together the community at ICANN, and beyond ICANN, to look at the issue, to create the sense of urgency and sustaining the momentum, and also fostering relationships between the stakeholders.

---

And also having a kind of platform to set reports of problems, and also successes. So this is what, I guess, very, I'm probably not doing Ed justice in, you know, in summarizing with such few words, but this is, this very encouraging direction that the roadmap is saying.

But just as a few preliminary comments responding to it, I think the overall roadmap, there are a number of comments that I want to let people know. From my point of view, perhaps the emphasis on IDNs should be more, and a little bit less on asking new gTLDs. The reason is because if we emphasize on IDN, we get the support from the ccTLD community as well, and they are able to connect with their governments to make this effort more stronger.

And we want them as our allies. So the emphasis on this whole issue should be on IDNs, which bring the ccTLDs together. And also, if we solve the issue of IDN, the new ASCII TLDs issue would be solved as a result of that in fact. I think that another comment is that, in the roadmap, there is a sort of slight mentioning of engaging the community. But I think a consistent, a more consistent group that is being put together, maybe a standing group to steer the project forward from the community would be useful addition.

There is a little bit hand waving in terms of the problems and success of having a platform. I think that needs to be more structuralized so that we can proactively collect the knowledge from the community. And finally, one thing that's missing, I think, which I emphasize on the [jig] group port, is to get our own act together.

---

I think that's the first thing we need to do. To make sure that ICANN and registry/registrar systems are able to take IDNs properly and start from there. That's the quick...

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Edmon. Thanks Edmon. Perhaps Ed could also add and comment?

ED LEWIS: Okay. First thing, and one word to what Edmon said. This is... My name is Ed Lewis, ICANN staff. I was saying that... Well, first of all, this is a draft roadmap, number one. And it's a shortened version of all that we know. To encourage comments, let's keep it light and airy right now, to skip through the points.

I think everything you described in there is, are fine points. I think you gave a pretty good overview of what the draft says. We're also, we're going to have a session on Wednesday where I'm going to go through this again with slightly different terminology, but same ideas.

And I think that, probably right now is not a good time to discuss what's in there, but certainly I would say that it's open for public comment. I really want to hear comments from across the Board. People who have anything to say, this is a draft, it's short. Specifics can be suggested, in fact, we're looking for that. We have specifics we didn't put in there, to help join other conversation.

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Ed. Rinalia again for the transcript. Just for the At Large’s information, since this is up for public comment, there will be a statement from the ALAC coming in, and we would like At Large input to that. Satish Babu from APRALO has agreed to hold the pen. So whatever input that you have, he will collect and put it together in a draft and then perhaps you can provide more input to help finalize that.

As for comments from around the room on the topic of universal acceptance?

EDMON CHUNG: Sorry, I forgot I had a last slide actually, which I think is important. I just, proceed one more slide. Which is, you know, this is really the reason why I think the At Large needs to look at it. I think this is a matter of consumer trust, when registrants register the name and if it doesn’t work, they will be frustrated. If end users try to use them, they don’t work, they will be confused.

The overall trust in the DNS will be harmed, and that’s a very big reason why I think this community must look into the issue seriously.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks Edmon. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO chair. Edmon, we actually discussed this at length in our globalization thematic group yesterday, wish you had been in the room. One of the recommendations we had, sort of off the cuff recommendations, is that ICANN develop kind of a bar on its



---

website that has multiple languages, 50 maybe more, in a smaller type, where it just simply says the phrase, “I speak X,” in the local language.

So if anybody goes to the website can click on that, and ICANN can take a measure of how many people speak that local language, before we even, you know, try and translate everything into everything. Start keeping track of that. And if we have the IDNs in the root, or in development, we can gather more information about whether or not those are working.

And I think that this would be a good way for ICANN to put a public face on this, without having to maybe struggle with the complexities of having everything in every language immediately available. Just start with an introduction.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Garth. Ed?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Eduardo Diaz for the record. Do you have a feeling for how long this is going to take?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: You mean solving the universal acceptance problem? That is exactly my question and I didn’t get an answer. Perhaps Ed, do you have an idea?

ED LEWIS: No. This is going to be an ongoing effort. That’s the best thing I can say.

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: Okay. Edmon Chung here. I think it's very hard to predict when, you know, what's going to happen. And in terms of 100% acceptance, it's probably going to be very, very long time. However, I think the efforts hope to really tackle issues such that, you know, if we get 50%, and then we get to 70%, 80%, then we're almost there, then at least most of the people using the names have a good experience.

I think initially we've got to understand that, you know, it may be able to take for a very long time. But if we work strategically, we can solve the bigger part of the problem and I think that's what the, why we create the urgency, because if we let people know that, you know, if we make people feel that this is something that cannot be solved forever, then there is not enough motivation to get it done.

But it's just like the Internet overall. Every time we put out a new technology, because it's so distributed, we don't know how long it will take for that uptake. But if we reach a critical mass, I think that's really what ICANN's, and this community, can help do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks Edmon. Mark [Blanche] from the IAB.

---

MARK [BLANCHE]: I'm not sure I'm speaking on behalf of the IAB. But one of the key problems with this is, we all use very, you know, popular software called a browser. And the browsers, many implementation of browsers actually managed TLDs for very reasons, using a list, which is managed...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mark, we're just worried about your back, so that's why...

MARK [BLANCHE]: ...and so, my take is, or my suggestion is until the browser vendors are involved in this problem space, you know, there is a lot of things that won't happen, first. Second, the ITF itself has done, I was the co-chair of the D-BOUND, you can search for D-B-O-U-N-D, ITF last time, and Edward was there too. Probably others here.

So we had a good presentation from the [Mozilla] people that is actually managing this list. So I think that problem, you have to think about, you know, the browser vendors, how they manage this because it won't be resolved. Even if we try hard to educate people and stuff, we heavily rely on browsers, and they don't implement something, I would not say better, but something different, then we're stuck with the problem.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Mark. It's a two part approach. One of it is, ICANN reaching out to the browser vendors. The other part of it is whether the user groups want to reach out to browser vendors directly as well. You can think about drafting a letter and sending it onwards, saying that we representing user community really, really want this problem solved.

---

Can you please do something about that? That could perhaps add a strong push to what's a possible solution. Ed.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Eduardo Diaz again. This is a follow-up to Ed's timeframe information. I'm just curious, this has not been implemented anywhere you know about. So zero of using, I notice.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon Chung here. No, that's not the case actually. There has been a lot of implementation, and including browsers as well. Most of the browsers, fortunately, are receptive to the issues, however, what I just mentioned also is that, when a browser vendor look at an issue, often they focus on the URL bar, right?

But as they implement, they discover many more issues like bookmarks, like history, like, you know... These are some of the things that are creating setbacks as well, because for example, even for Google or Gmail, they're looking to the issue, they are trying to fix it in one particular point, but because domain names are so prevalent, I mean, URLs are so prevalent in many different areas, and there could be many different databases storing different bits and pieces of this type of information.

They're now realizing that it's a much bigger project. So, that's why part of the recommendation is for ICANN and the registries and registrar to do it first, do it right first, comb through our own systems, and to come up with best practices so that we can bring to the world. That's sort of the idea.

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Dev, I see your hand. Can I give it to Han Chuan first? Because I think he wants to intervene on this point.

HAN CHUAN LEE: [Inaudible] to intervene, but to add on to the point of the browser is, I think when you go out and engage the browser, then it isn't clear what it is that we want the browser then to do. As it is today, I mean if you look at the Chrome browser, by Google, the way that it handles the IDNs, or in the address bar is quite different in a way from, let's say, Firefox or even IE.

And Google had actually even published a set of explanation wide, how they handle the IDNs in the address bar, whether or not they display Unicode, or they display the Unicode itself. They do have certain rules to that. But what we want, I guess, at the end of the day, is a very consistent user experience, so that whether we use Firefox, IE, or Chrome, the user expectation should be the same, right?

It should be consistent kind of behavior across all kinds of browser. So we have to be very clear whether we go to the browsers, or go to the email clients, what is it that the user expectation is? And what is a good user experience?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks Han Chuan. Perhaps you could help the At Large identify what a consistent user experience could be described as before we go onto the vendors. Dev.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking. I was just curious, what you were touching on regarding the browser and so forth. A lot of the source code for these browsers are available for Chrome and for Firefox, so why is it that, I'm not really seeing, maybe I missed it, just from scanning the document, you know, that ICANN should probably contribute code that, as, you know, and make it available under an appropriate license that could be incorporated into a browser.

And of course, similar solutions for email and so forth. Because I mean, it seems to be that ICANN is uniquely positioned because it knows, it can know what the domain names that have been deployed and so forth, and could come up with a programming API to like to see whether a TLD is valid. That type of stuff.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks Dev. Leon, you have a question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Leon is in the queue.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Olivier. Thank you Rinalia. This is Leon Sanchez. Well I see this more as a cross-community problem because it not only impacts users, but it also impacts, I think, registrars and registries, because if no one is able to use the IDNs, then what are they going to sell? So I think we should reach out to them and try to make a cross-community strategy to reach out to these web browser vendors and application

---

developers, so they incorporate IDNs appropriately and they don't impact both the users and the registrar/registries.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Garth, you had a comment? Or no? Okay. If you don't mind, we'll just gather these inputs and then the ALAC and At Large can think about it some more and funnel it into the public comment for universal acceptance paper. I'd like to move on to Sarmad Hussein right now, because he has another part of the problem to present. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSEIN: Thank you Rinalia. Could we switch to the slides? Okay. So, I'm going to be talking about IDN variant TLD program. So, basically as Edmon also said that we now actually have, in the top level, we now have labels which are not just ASCII, but in local languages as well. And so, once we start having these labels, you can still remain on the first slide please.

When we start having these labels, there are two questions which need to be answered before we can actually, you know, start using these things. The first question is when we make a label in, let's say, Chinese or Arabic, what are the characters which are allowed to form that label? And for English, obviously, it's very clear. We say it's LDH root, the letters of ASCII, the digits and hyphen are allowed.

And then the top level is more conservative and more special, and it only allows letters. It does not allow the digits and hyphen. So the first question which comes when we start dealing with IDN is, and especially

---

top level domain names, is what are the letters for each of the scripts which are allowed at the top level?

And when we start going into the scripts, the recommendation is to use Unicode standard. And the way Unicode standard works is that when you start making labels, sometimes it is possible to make two different labels. As far as Unicode code points are concerned, but those two different labels are somehow confusing to the user, either they look exactly the same, or they mean exactly the same and users somehow believe that those two labels are, those two labels force are inherently equal to each other.

So, this program, the IDN TLD variant program, sets forward to actually solve those two problems, which again, are characters allowed for languages for top level, the root zone, and which set of labels are variants or equal to the other set of labels. Can we skip two slides? Number five please.

Yeah. So this is some of the homework which has been done. And this has been really a community led effort because, so in the first, the previous phases of the project, what was done was that they were case studies initiated for multiple scripts, including Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, [inaudible], Greek, and Latin. And basically, the communities look at how variance are equal and labels were defined in those scripts.

And they were integrated into collective definition of what variants perhaps are. And based on formulating the problem, then in the third phase, ICANN proceeded to develop a process to actually, how to handle those variants. Can you skip to slide number 10 please?



---

Thank you. And this is the process which was eventually defined. There were two sets of panels formed. There is a community based, script based panel, sets of panels. These panels are called generation panels. These are community experts, linguistic experts, and technical experts, from the communities of those scripts like Arabic and Chinese and Cyrillic and so on.

Who are supposed to formulate a recommendation on which characters are allowed in top level? And also which of those characters may confuse users and therefore should be variants of each other. Those are recommendations from each of the script community. Go to what is called an integration panel, which collates those recommendations from each of those communities into a singular, what is called a label generation rule set, which will eventually be used to define how labels, which characters from across the globe are allowed to formulate a label.

And if there are two labels, whether they are variants of each other or not. So the processes again, each community develops a recommendation for their script, and that recommendation gets integrated into one single table for the root zone. Now, next slide please. Next slide please.

So, that project has already been initiated. It's called implementation of label generation rule set. And there was a call for subject matter experts for integration panel back in June 2013. Some of, and also call for generation panels for the communities to get involved so that they can start working for their own scripts. The integration panel was initiated in September of last year.

---

Some of the integration panel members are here in this room, if you have eventually any questions for them. And then the Arabic community organized themselves and formulated the first generation panel in February of this year. Another part of the process is that before generation panels can go forward, the integration panels checks the minimum, sort of the starting point of what characters can be considered.

And that is done especially to ensure that nothing in the root zone, no code point which is, which can possibly be a thread to root zone can go in it. So the maximum starting repertoire, MSR1, is the starting point for label generation panels to base their work. And then they chose a subset of the code points in MSR1 for their recommendations.

Chinese generation panel has already recently submitted a proposal of MSR1, was released for public comments and has recently been finalized and published just before the London meeting. And it's online. Next slide please. Next slide please. This is just a definition... These are just some of the details of what is in the MSR.

In the first phase of MSR, the focus was on those scripts for which we've received daily applications in the first round of new gTLDs, current round of new gTLDs. And what it did was looked at 97,973 code points and recommended 32,790 code points, so that's significant code work done by integration panel, for further consideration by generation panels.

Next slide please. So as the focus, as there was need to do this quickly, the focus was just to, for the scripts, which are currently being applied for, but that doesn't mean that the work stops there, so there is now

---

going to be work on MSR2, which will focus on the remaining scripts. That will complete the MSR process.

And the integration panel is now waiting for generation panels to formulate and to give proposals for their own scripts from within the MSR, the subset of MSR, which should be included in the label generation rule set. Next slide please.

And this is the status. So currently only Arabic generation panel is formed, Chinese generation panel proposal has been received. That is being finalized. And we still are waiting for many more scripts to organize, script communities to organize themselves, and submit proposals, do the work, so that we can proceed and finalize this work.

So I actually wanted to stop here with the call out to the community. We were going to request ALAC to reach out to the relevant script communities, to please organize themselves, make the proposals so we can finish the MSR process and move on. Thank you very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Sarmad. So the point that needs to be communicated and understood is that, we really need language communities to provide input on the work of the integration panel, otherwise it proceeds without the real life living experiences of language communities and that could be a problem.

Any quick comments around the table?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

There is a question on the chat. I'll ask Ariel to read it please.

---

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel for the record. The question is from a remote participant [inaudible]. Would there be a conversion of these new domain names in English to benefit non-locals of the languages?

SARMAD HUSSEIN: I guess the short answer is no.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Edmon?

EDMON CHUNG: The long answer is very long. I think it's... I'm not going to give it, but look into... I would encourage the person who put in the question to look into the background of IDN and all of that. I did want to raise one item. As you can see on the screen right now, to the right, there is a list of the languages that we are waiting for volunteers to come together and help build the table.

And I specifically point out, for example, Latin is there, which means French, Spanish, and you know, many Latin based languages. And so while this is about variance, we, in this whole process, we also need languages that perhaps do not have variance to come out and say, you know, first of all, which characters you need.

And then also, you know, whether there is variance. Even if there is none, we want that confirmation. There is Greek, there is Cyrillic, there is also some other languages there. So that is something that I think is

---

important for this community to understand. It's not only about some of the languages like Chinese and Arabic, where variance are eminent, that this project is about.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I see two requests for the floor, and then after that, I think I'm being asked to wrap up. So Ed and then Jean-Jacques.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Rinalia. This is Eduardo. When you make a call to the community, I mean do we need experts? Or just can be any of us can get together and work on this? Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSEIN: So the call of generation panel lists multiple roles to be included in a generation panel, which does include linguistic experts. It also includes technical people, policy people, community representatives, so there is a whole set of roles which have been identified and listed in the generation panel core document.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Sarmad. And everything that is produced, goes out for public comment. And that's where everyone can provide input to the process. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Rinalia. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. I'd like to make a remark and put a question about the future. I think one of the big

---

trends in the coming years, maybe sooner than we expect, is that many keyboard based applications, or tools, or instruments, will be replaced by voice command.

Now I know it's a very long distance between what you have done, what we have done also, because I was at the beginning of this team as well. It's very important for script. But I think that in a way we should anticipate the taking over of voice over keyboard in many types of works and applications.

I know that you cannot use the script work that you have done here, but rather the methodology, because what it says to me is that there has been great care taken in consulting, the process of consultation, language specialists, communities, has been an example of what could be done in other parts of ICANN, and indeed of the Internet world.

So, I would very much like a summary, a sort of very high level, almost philosophical summary to be drawn from this experience, so that it could be used later on for voice based orders to machines. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. I think Sarmad will take note of that as a recommendation. There will be sessions on Wednesday that will go into the issue of TLD universal acceptance, as well as the root zone LGR project workshop. If you are interested in the topic, please do attend those sessions and ask your questions.

And then please do provide input to the paper on universal, the roadmap on universal acceptance as part of the ALAC statement that would be quite helpful. With that, thank you very much.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. Thanks to Edmon, Sarmad Hussein, Han Chuan Lee, Ed, the second Ed, and [inaudible] and Mike [Blanche] as well. So thanks. And that's been a very good lesson into seeing how much there is, how much work there still is with regards to IDNs. I know that we have a lot of people in our community that would be able to help. If you can, first thing have a look at the At Large universal acceptance on top level domain draft roadmap workspace.

That has all of the details of the current public consultation that is starting up, in which the IDN, the At Large IDN working group will be working on. I also ask you to consider joining that working group, especially since, as you can see, there is more red than orange, and indeed then green on that slide.

So if you speak one of these languages that are listed on this slide, please join the IDN working group. That's pretty much... I think we can probably cover most of these languages in this very room. So that's really great. One last thing, there was a question with regards to the slide decks.

Two of the slide decks for this afternoon's work are already on the website, on the ICANN website relating to this session. This slide deck is currently not on there. Are we okay with having this slide deck also added to our...? Okay, thanks very much. Well thank you. We have just a few minutes left, and we're running behind schedule.

We have two more things to deal with, and the first one is going to be quite fast. Selecting representatives to Thursday's session on enhancing

---

ICANN's accountability. The people that are dealing with this session are Patrik Fältström and [inaudible]. Finally I remember the names. And we've discussed it, and I think the best person to probably deal with this could be Carlton Samuels.

I was just going to suggest that Carlton deals with this. He's well versed in the issue and will be able to introduce a little bit of diversity, and otherwise, unfortunately, very Anglo-Saxon male dominated world. So that's one thing. The next thing was the wrap-up itself, and that's to do with the London reporting.

This time around, we have 150 At Large structures that are in London, and that means we can cover pretty much every single meeting that is taking place at ICANN. If you are in another room than the At Large sessions, which of course, we already are reporting on, if you are in any of the other topical rooms that are, of topics that are taking place, do take notes.

And if you take notes, you can input your report. It doesn't need to be 100 page report, it doesn't need even to be an one page report, it could just be a small paragraph about the main topic that was discussed, and any of the findings that were there.

That really helps later on, people finding out what they might wish to replay back and forth. This is just like a little summary of what's going on. It helps those people who are back home, and who might wish to think, "Well, I'm only interested in this topic." Then they could go and look at the summaries on that page, and say, "Ah, that's a session that I would like to watch, or listen to."



---

They could then go onto the main ICANN website and download it and see it. So it's really helpful. Think of the people back home. Thomas, you had...? What did you do with it? So it will be put on that workspace, and it will be just published effectively, and afterwards we will be able to let people know of the location of those reports.

Email it over to staff or put it directly on the wiki page. If you don't have access to the wiki, then email your report to staff, and so staff at At Large at dot ICANN dot org, and it will be put there. If you have any pictures that you have taken from some of the session, then that's also helpful, because it also shows the dynamics of the meeting.

Remember, you all are very lucky to be here, but there are plenty more people that haven't made it, and thankfully they haven't made it because the hotel is so full already. I don't know where we would be putting them. As a result, help the people back home.

Finally, a few housekeeping announcements from Gisella so as to know what happens next.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you Olivier. Gisella for the transcript. There is nothing more happening today. We are finishing this, formally, formally nothing happening except for football, depending on how you are supporting. I've been told there is a Brazil camera playing. So I would be very careful of who you choose.

And that was Sylvia Herlein Leite telling me yesterday that if you do support Brazil, you might get a chocolate. We know where your loyalty lies then. Tomorrow morning we start at 7:30 to meeting with the SO,

---

AC, and SG chairs. This is very important session for the ATLAS 2 ALAC RALO leaders. Do come and meet them.

We don't have this planned for every At Large meeting, not for every ICANN meeting, so do make the most of it. It's in Bellmore, which is level three in the west wing, 7:30 to 8:30. Then from 8:30 to 9:30, we have the meeting with the Board. Do attend that as well. We have this at every ICANN meeting.

Opportunity again to listen to the interaction with the Board, and that is in [inaudible], which is on the same level, the other meeting room. We have the ICANN Academy working group tomorrow, for those who are part of that working group, and anyone else is obviously more than welcome to join that. That will be here.

Very important tomorrow for all of those who are not only here in the room but also listening remotely, the NARALO and the EURALO generally assemblies. I mean, during this week that is one of the meetings that all of the ALSs please do attend your general assemblies. We don't always have you on the teleconferences every month, but we are all here together and this is the opportunity to meet each other and to have a very fruitful discussion.

So please make note of where your general assembly is. If you don't know, staff is here, Heidi, Ariel, Sylvia and myself, to guide you through the meeting venue, which can be a bit of a maze. We then, tomorrow afternoon, have the two ALAC working sessions, in this room. The agenda is available on your wiki page, which I'm sure you've all bookmarked by now.

---

And last, but not least, tomorrow night is the ALS, sorry, the ATLAS 2 Fayre of Opportunities. That is for all of the ALSs to come and to have, we've got a great program lined up, not only fantastic guest speakers. We've been working months on this program, so please all come. You can go and visit the Tower of London afterwards. Trust me.

The Tower of London and the Big, Big, Big Ben are not going to move, but the Fayre of Opportunities is only tomorrow night. There will be entertainment. There will be free drinks and cocktail. That is how I should have started it. Free drinks and food if you come. If you don't come, you can't eat remotely.

Please look at the program, and please all ALSs, wear your colors. Us staff will be neutral, we'll be wearing the ALAC color, maybe with a little [inaudible] for some of us, but very well hidden. But please wear your, I mean, ties, scarf, earrings, anything. Just grab something that's in the color of your RALO.

And the colors are, you may have know now, if you have picked up your folders, AFRALO, orange; APRALO, red; EURALO, blue; LACRALO, green; and NARALO, yellow, even gold if you want. Just wear a variation.

So that is our program for tomorrow. Very busy day. We do start early. We do end late, but it's all worth it and that's what we're all here in London for. So thank you very much. Back to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gisella for all of this information. I think we just have one more item, which is to thank the interpreters because they

---

have done an excellent, excellent job all afternoon. Three hours and 18 minutes, yes 18 minutes. Three hours and 18 minutes, well done.

And of course, a round of thanks also for the tech crew, with the sound, with the video. As you noticed, we've got the video that's running and we've all appeared on the video when speaking. That's made it very, very good for remote participants.

And in fact, we've had some very good feedback from the remote participants, as if they were still here. So a round of applause for them as well.

And Heidi has been timing in and out all afternoon. Just has just asked me, "Did you thank the technical staff?" Earlier, she asked and said, "Did you let Dev speak?" Yes, Dev has spoken for two minutes, Heidi. Now go for another coffee. Thanks everyone. Of course, thanks to Heidi and her staff. They've done fantastically well as well.

And thanks to all of the people who have been following us remotely. I've noticed there are quite a few, so have a good one everybody. Take it easy this evening. Relax a little bit, a part of course, from the session moderators and drafters who have to get drafting. This call and this meeting is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**