
KATHY SCHNITT: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the ICANN Accessibility Taskforce call on Wednesday, 20 August 2014 at 18:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Ken Hansen, Glenn McKnight, Gunela Astbrink, Anthony Niigani, Klaus Stoll, and Judith Hellerstein. At this time, we have no apologies. From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Terri Agnew, Joe Catapano, and myself, Kathy Schnitt.

I would like to remind all participants to state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Now, back over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Kathy. Welcome, Laura, and other very key people in staff. I appreciate leaders in teams who are able to make change amongst all the various very important issues that this taskforce is looking at also being part of the conversation and development. It makes a huge difference if we all own these things.

It goes to one of the issues that we're going to be briefly discussing in today's agenda. I know the agenda has only been out for a fairly small amount of time. That is, of course, building what Gunela has frequently talked to us about and that is the culture of awareness. Having key leaders and people who are in a position to actually make change, as Laura is in the Web space, makes an enormous difference. So we wanted to particularly value the time and effort that staff from ICANN are putting into this.

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.

We also note for the record that, of course, we have a much wider set of staff members who have indicated a keen interest in these issues. I believe this workgroup moves on with great confidence that providing human resources, monetary resources, and proper project planning allows us to that ICANN has drunk the Kool-Aid and is, in fact, very keen to make sure it becomes a best practice example for accessibility in all sorts of ways.

With that little bit of welcome, I want to also note a couple of very pleasurable things from my point of view. I've been very pleased to see some of the interaction that has started up again, and particularly since the informal gathering that some of you had in the London meeting. The chat space is being used a little bit more. The e-mail is being used.

I wanted to remind you also that you do have the wiki space. The wiki space is yours. If you do not currently have a login so you can access our space in our accessibility wiki, please let Silvia know and she or staff will be able to help you organize your logon so you can also start making contributions in a more permanent method.

E-mails, of course, are always archived, but they do tend to be a little transitory. If some of what is going to the e-mail lists – and, Glenn, some of the material that you've put forward and, indeed, some of the conversation that you and Judith have had recently with staff is probably high points that should be captured for the public record for our work in the wiki as well.

One of the things in today's call I'd like to do is discuss with you how we can best capture those things so the rest of the ICANN community

knows about good conversations, the good plans, and the good things you're all doing.

That said, are there any apologies that anyone wants to bring forward? I know of none that have been sent to me, but now is the time to let us know for the record if there are apologies.

If not, let's jump straight into the work at hand. Talking to one or two of you, I've described today's gathering as a focusing exercise, a taking stock exercise. We, back in our Singapore meeting, had a very large and very interactive and very open and welcoming group discussion where certainly in principle – we didn't take a vote – but it seemed to be very much a consensus of the room that the offered key points, the mechanisms for building a culture of accessibility and ensuring minimal barriers to participation and engagement in ICANN were outlined by Gunela.

I've captured the points of those issues in today's agenda, but I've also as you may notice and if you are on the wiki page you will be able to see a chart which has four columns where I've captured each of the specific tasks as outlined in our agreed documentation, our high-level aspirational documentation.

Then there are three more columns where we will fill in, perhaps not complete today, but start the work of filling these comments in today with your opinions, with our opinions on what the strengths and weaknesses and opportunities for each of these particular tasks are, how simple, measurable, achievable, and timely, etc. we can make them.

In other words, give them what's called a SMART score and, more importantly perhaps, give them a priority based on how easy they are to do or how far along ICANN already is or how much experience we may be able to bring to ICANN to help it to achieve something if it has already started to by also giving each of these tasks a priority.

That's my proposal to put to the agenda that we do that for each of the tasks that go towards building a culture of accessibility and also each of the tasks which go towards minimizing barriers to participation and engagement.

That is actually quite a lot of work. In a short call that we have today, I do not believe that we will get all of it done. This is probably, in fact it would be nice to see some of it done, it's probably going to be an ongoing action item at the end of today's call for us to all continue working on that.

The reason I've suggested we do this mechanism is it allows people like Laura to see where we as an advisory group think the priorities are, and so she can argue when it comes to slicing up budgets and looking at resource allocations.

She can look to this type of documentation, this type of metric and say, "Well, the community's priority is that this particular task needs to be done as an absolute matter of urgency." They're all urgent. We'd like them all to be done as soon as possible, but we do have to live in a real world. That's the intention of that.

I want to now put that as a concept to you for discussion. That methodology is one that you may or may not be familiar with. I've used

at least three different methods: the SWOT, the SMART, and the Priority for us to play with. You may or may not be familiar with one or all of them. I'd like now to see what you all would like to say about how this slicing and dicing of how we do what and when might go along.

Gunela, over to you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think this suggested way of moving forward makes a lot of sense. It's very systematic. We have a lot of potential action items on the list, and we need to prioritize and do it in a systematic way. We all probably have our favorites on the list, but we need to be realistic.

One of my questions is before we start we should look at short-, medium-, and long-term. We need to decide what is short-, medium-, and long-term. My suggestion, and I'd be interested in other people's opinions, short-term might be six months, medium 18 months, long 18-36 months. That's a starting point. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Gunela. That's very wise. I will actually edit that table to indicate the short-, medium-, or long-term allocation as well. Let's see what everyone thinks about those times. Is that six months short, 18 months medium, and 18+ months long a good one? I'd like to hear not only from those of us who have the aspirations and desires but also those who hold control. Laura, here's a good opportunity, Silvia, a

good opportunity, and Heidi, for staff to make some comments on what those timelines perhaps would be.

The floor is open. Noticing Laura is agreeing in the chat that those timeframes seem reasonable. Would like to add an “LOE,” lot of effort. Very wise woman, Laura. We’ll make it a [inaudible]. Okay, so I’ll do a degree of difficulty then.

Laura, your hand is up. Over to you.

LAURA BENGFORD:

Yes, thank you, Cheryl and Gunela. I think this is a good start in terms of putting all the tasks and ideas down there together, and having a good sense of priorities from the community will definitely help us at ICANN also prioritize and also start working on things based upon what those priorities are.

I was just suggesting the level of effort because it might be helpful to get a sense of what the level of effort is to feed into the prioritization. In other words, if there are things that are a very low level of effort but a high priority, we might move those up the chain a little bit faster versus some things that may appear to be fairly easy but they’re a high level of effort. We might want to move them down the priority chain just to get some near-term quick hits done and move things forward a little bit quicker.

I just wanted to say thank you for putting this matrix together, and it will be very helpful for us here at ICANN to prioritize work as we move forward on these initiatives. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Laura. If we can make your job easier, that will make our objective much easier to reach.

LAURA BENGFORD: Very good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Anyone who is actually in the wiki space will notice that I am actually in there editing as we speak. Obviously, if we were using an interactive whiteboard – at the moment it's capture, it's a still that you've got – if you're in the Adobe Connect room, what you're looking at in the shared whiteboard space is a capture of what's on the wiki, but I'm actually updating the wiki now so that we don't lose all these good ideas and it can, in fact, be done in real time.

One of the things I'm doing based on our conversation just then is putting in a key which also allows us to define what a level of effort could be measured as. There I don't think we'll finalize that today, but I think that will need to be a continuing discussion between now and our next meeting and perhaps [settled] online. If we can establish some classifications to use for level of effort so we all use the same and commonly understood terminology, that would perhaps help us as well. Laura, I might need to get your help on that as well as everyone else's.

If you're all in agreement, I will simply adopt the proposed timeframe suggestions that Gunela came to the table with if you're all happy with that of the less than six months, the six to 18 month, and the 18+

months. Okay? There we are. That's something very important we've actually done. Well done.

Glenn, over to you.

GLENN McKNIGHT:

Great. Thanks, Cheryl. Just another point, and I like what I'm seeing. This is great stuff. The only thing that I'd like to suggest, and it's going to get a crowded space here, is possibly using some footnotes tying a topic to a policy document or something that has been developed. In the chat, I mentioned that the ATLAS II declaration every single user group mentioned the importance of reaching out to disabled communities. So I think there are policy documents, there are community within ALAC and elsewhere that say, "Yeah. It's an important thing." I guess I'm trying to say in a mind map, there's a line that connects to something. You know what I mean, Cheryl? Since you've got it, it's a very simple concept, but just it gives credibility. This concept is just not hairy-fairy; it has a legitimate basis. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alright. Thank you very much, Glenn. What I might do is put that as an "add mind mapping and other 'visualizations.'" How would you like to describe the others? ICANN-based references?

GLENN McKNIGHT:

Yeah. I would say the historical policy documents, the position papers, that this is just not an abstract navel-gazing group. This has a history; this has credence within the ecospace.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, then. Now that's not going to make things too untidy, which I think you started off saying it would get very crowded because, of course, we can imbed hyperlinks to single words within this type of matrix. I'll just make a little note here "link to other frames." Okay? Because we do still need to keep what people are trying to look at and digest as simple and as unconvoluted as possible. Okay, so we'll do that as well.

Back to Gunela and then Judith. Well, Judith, I'm not looking at the order. Gunela, according to my listing is higher, but that may mean she put her hand up second. Who was first? Judith or Gunela?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think Gunela was first, but I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. If you're going to cede that anyway, Gunela, over to you and then Judith.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Okay. Thank you very much. I think this is good. We are being very systematic. I suppose the next part is where a lot of people might dive in and say, "These are my short-term preferences and medium-term and long-term."

I'm just wondering what is the best way to do that in the available time? Do we go down the list one-by-one and vote on that? Or do we concentrate on the short-term ones and just have gone through the list

as we've been speaking and saying, "Okay, these are the short-term ones that we believe we can work on first"? I'm just looking at the best use of the time now. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Let me see what Judith wants to say now, just in case it is germane to exactly the same issue, and then we'll come back to that point, Gunela, because that will need a group discussion. Over to you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I guess my question is I see where the agenda is, but are you taking notes? You said you were taking notes, and I don't see that. I was just wondering where that would be. That also goes to the question the notes when we're taking them it may be if we're trying to adopt an accessibility culture is not necessarily the best way for people who use screen readers to work. Because from what I am told is that they can't really see what's on the screen at the same time they're looking at the call because their screen editor has to drop out. It doesn't have the ability to do two different things at the same time. That is something that we might also want to think about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Park that for a minute, unless Gunela doesn't mind holding the conversation on her questions until we deal with yours. Gunela, do you mind if we deal with Judith's issues first?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: That's fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thanks for that. Okay, Judith, first of all, if you refresh the wiki page that you're looking at now, you will find that there are changes. Whilst someone is editing the wiki, it will show you visually that the wiki is being edited by someone and who that is. I believe it would say that I am editing it.

You won't actually see the changes until I press the save button. That's a limitation of the tool. It's an imperfect tool, but that is where I have chosen for today's meeting. We can switch it around and use other tools at other times to capture your conversation. Only because it is a large screen and I'm working in a dark room at 4:25 in the morning, and that happens to suit my current environment. That's only one way that we could capture.

Regarding the screen readers, yes, you are right. What we have cobbled together for today's call is a mix primarily of audio using the telephone bridge or the audio from the Adobe Connect room, recognizing that our call is recorded and that the audio from it can be listened to at a later date as well. We also have it transcribed, and the transcription of that will be much easier to be reviewed by screen readers at a post-meeting date, recognizing that is also imperfect and not real time. It is at least a reasonable effort to make sure that what we're doing as a group is accountable to the community and that we're not restricting in any way access to how we're working as best we can with the tools.

Our tools, however, do have a number of limitations. Another issue, particularly under I would think the ensuring minimal barriers to participation and engagement, is to probably look at working particularly with the Technology Taskforce that already exists within the At-Large Advisory Committee work group world to make sure that accessibility and maximizing opportunity for minimal barriers with whatever tool they are proposing for use is one of their checklists as well.

I note just here, and before we go back to Gunela's point, that you and Glenn have raised with staff the opportunity that does exist within Adobe Connect to use captioning. Of course, captioning is a costly exercise, and unless we required it just the same as if we required this teleconference to be interpreted into Russian in real time or into Chinese in real time, that would be because we have a number of members of the work group needing that.

At the moment, we will do our best to make sure whatever tools we use meet the needs of our work group. But that's not to say we don't want to make sure that the tools are better for wider community use.

With captioning however, Judith, because I was going to bring this up as any other business, you and staff's conversation does need to be brought up to date with one additional point and that is that even when enabled in an Adobe Connect room, captioning only shows if you're using some platform. If you're using the mobile application – and you often have to use the mobile application if you're running Linux-based or Android-based systems – the captioning at the moment still as a module does not operate.

At a recent meeting, I had three frames open, and I could only see the captioning out of one of the rooms, not the other two. We need to try and change that as well. ICANN has a role there because they're a bigger client of Adobe. If they say, "Can you fix the module?" it's quite possible that it's more likely to be fixed.

Okay, back to you, Judith, and then we need to move on.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, Cheryl, that's a good point, although I do think we should find out about the captioning pods that are used in Adobe just the same for everything. The transcription is often not available until weeks later. It's not very helpful, although the transcripts from Adobe chat are available immediately. The transcripts are not. That's also something that we should look into.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi will be very interested to hear that because she and her team have worked really hard to make sure that the transcripts from meetings – the audio files from meetings – are transcribed.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: The audio, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right. The audio is then transcribed quite promptly these days. If we're finding there is a delay, we do need to watch that. But unless the

transcription services are under a lot of pressure immediately after a major ICANN meeting, they've been really good in terms of time. Heidi, would you like to comment on that or Silvia or someone?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I think there are two types of meetings, as Cheryl has mentioned. We have the At-Large meetings like these, the working groups where the transcripts are provided very quickly. Our team can help ensure that. Then the other types of meetings are those public meetings. Again, keep in mind that they have over 160 just from policy and many more from other groups. So there is a bit of delay for the ICANN meeting transcripts.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

No, I guess I was looking on the Web for a couple of these transcripts beforehand and I didn't see them and the links would not open, so that's why. The links were not clickable.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I think those may be just some very rare examples. If you could send those examples to staff, we'll make sure that those are corrected right away.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Alright, yeah. Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've raised a really important issue and that is there would be a benefit – and we might need to ponder the best way of doing this – to have some sort of repository that is monitored for issues reporting like what you're raising, Judith, so that staff who is keen and enthusiastic to make sure that things do work well are aware when something may have either been delayed or incidentally fouled up because of a broken link. Okay?

Alright. Now we've got some really good things happening in the chat. One of the limitations of working in the modalities that we have here is that when we're trying to make sure that things are able to be captured in a number of ways – and you'll notice I'm trying to speak particularly clearly and particularly slowly – is that if we leave some of these good ideas just in the chat, they won't necessarily be in the audio files. So people would have to look at the chat transcript as well as the audio transcript.

Any of you who have got particular points that you've made – and you've made some brilliant ones, can I just say – in the chat that you would like to make sure is captured in the audio file, I would encourage you to put up your hand and do a small speaking for the record section. If possible, at the end of the call, I will take the time – or actually I've got an end-to-end call I think. I may not be able to be doing. I will see if one of you could take the time and actually read it to the record because we have, I think, a very good opportunity here to show how even important things out of chat can be also captured in the various files and mechanisms that we have available.

To that end, whilst we have some issues such as [inaudible], etc. and refreshing and minor problems that we all can make better, if we can get back to the macro point which Gunela was raising earlier. We have a huge list in front of us, and with no way as I said at the beginning of our meeting that we would get through this complete list in the time available to us today.

You now need to discuss and decide how you want to approach this. Do you want to all start here at the meeting giving some short-, medium-, and long-term rankings and some prioritizing? Do you want to do a read-through and just get a general feel and then take some more time offline to develop them? Or do you want to deal with perhaps some of the other administration issues that are on our agenda today and spend the rest of the time getting as far as possible through the list? Or some other method?

Over to you first of all, Gunela, and then back to Judith.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thanks, Cheryl. Yes, we have about 25 minute left. To make the best use of the time, I would suggest that we look at the short-term priorities because we want to start moving. Then maybe in between calls we can work on the wiki to do the SWOTs and the SMARTs and the LOE so that we are all on the same page. I have gone through the list and penciled in my priorities.

I will start the ball rolling by saying, first of all, I very much support what Ken Hansen has said in regards to doing a stocktake of any current ICANN accessibility actions so we are very clear where starting point is.

That is also a good way for ICANN staff to consider some of these accessibility suggestions that are on our list. Maybe I could suggest that if we do go ahead with that one, that ICANN staff may wish to refer to the list and see if there are any being done or under consideration. That would be number one as a very good, basic starting point. And then...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Wait. Let's deal with them one at a time, Gunela. I just want to double check. Otherwise, we'll have 15 minutes of you going through your list and everyone might not be able to remember the first one when you get to the third. Let's just stop there with the proposal of the stocktake. Do you want me now to add that stocktake concept as the first task above the toolkit that is currently listed, Gunela, so I can be clear what you're asking for?

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Yes, that would be my suggestion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Okay, I'll do that. Is everyone else agreed with that then? If you disagree, put up the big red X if you're using the Adobe Connect room manually or yell out and say, "No." If not, I'll do that if everyone is agreeing while then Gunela goes on to her next point. Although I see, Ken, your hand is raised. Did you want to speak to this particular issue? Ken? We can't hear you if you're using your audio connection. Silvia or Kathy, if you could assist Ken so we can hear him. Back to you, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you. Alright, that's great. Then my next suggestion for a short-term priority which should be something that would require relatively low level of effort is number four on the list now: "keynote speakers at ICANN meetings to include representatives from a disability community." That could be a very good way of raising the culture of accessibility, creating awareness in a general sense. I know already that I think Garth and Glenn had suggested some names for the Los Angeles meeting.

I'll stop there with that one and ask for any responses. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. We're just going to see if we can sort the connection out with Ken. If you're on now, let's go with you, Ken.

KEN HANSEN: Yes, hi. I was just going to mention inventory of the ICANN current accessibility capabilities. I wanted to add that we should likely make that broader, meaning we should also look at registry and registrar websites and what is currently being done to address accessibility.

I believe that ICANN, registries, and registrars should be educated on what they need to do but should also set the example for the registrants and the websites that they're currently supporting.

A good place to start is not only what is ICANN doing to address accessibility – and I think of that very broadly. It's what are they doing to make meetings accessible, for example? That could be live participation. It could be remote participation. It could be access to the

venue with ramps and things of that nature or transcription, whatever it is they're doing. It's also what they're doing on their site.

Also to take an inventory of what the registrar and registry community is doing to make the information on their websites accessible to users and the services they offer available to registrars and registrants as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, thank you, Ken. One of those obviously is a short-term, which would be the ICANN stocktake. The stocktake of the wider domain name industry, if I can use that term, would probably be a slightly longer and perhaps even medium- or long-term. I suspect to get them to prioritize that themselves to cooperate and to give answers to even a simple questionnaire might actually take enough time to put it in our long-term, our post-18 months [line].

If I may, can I make that a second line in our task list that goes, perhaps, underneath the disability awareness toolkit aim and before the training one. Because it makes sense, at least to me, to have it sandwiched between those two activities although probably running in parallel. That would be something that we could start soon but not necessarily finish as promptly as an ICANN one.

If that meets that secondary need, I'll do that if you all agree. If you disagree with that, let me know. Seeing as I'm typing and trying to look at two screens at once, if some of you have put something into the chat, make sure you bring it forward. [Ken], is there anymore from you?

KEN HANSEN: Yeah, I agree with the timeframes that you've outlined for those various things, but I think there's a long-term as well. The long-term would be the production of a guide and tools for registrars to implement these capabilities.

There would be some period of time to investigate what their current capabilities are, what they've implemented. But then we would come back with a set of recommendations and even a toolkit for registrars and perhaps information they would share with registrants that would make them aware of what they can do to make their sites accessible to their users. That would be a long-term.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Ken, looking at the tasks we have which say "disability awareness toolkit to be developed" and "disability awareness training to be provided," would what you proposed for the domain name industry perhaps be a subset of those two things? Or do you see those as standalone?

KEN HANSEN: I don't know that they would be the same, but there would certainly be significant overlap.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alright then. If I can, I'll bracket. I don't want the tasks to become such a long shopping list that none of us gets through it. I'll put it in brackets at the moment to say that we'll also need to look for domain name industry separately. Okay?

KEN HANSEN: Very good. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Ken. Gunela, back to you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Cheryl. I think we need to be also clear when we're talking about short-, medium-, and long-term as to does short-term mean starting in the short-term and finishing in the short-term, or does it mean starting in the short-term and then progressing then into the medium-term for completion?

I think there might be a little bit of confusion there. I think we need to clarify that because certainly when it comes to the disability awareness toolkit, I totally agree that would be a priority to be started in the short-term, but it might not be finished within what we have classified as the short-term. We just need to be clear on that, especially if we're talking about several toolkits in effect.

When I wrote this objective and action list, I was looking at the general disability awareness toolkit: talking about what disability is, statistics, the importance of the Internet, etc. That's what I would have classed then together with the disability awareness training.

What Ken and Glenn are raising for talking about how to raise awareness amongst the registry industry – very important and I totally support that – but that requires probably a different type of toolkit

starting off with a general one but then going into some specifics. Those specifics can include guidelines to assist the registries and registrars. But that move into more the medium-term for completion.

I just needed that to be clarified. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. I see your hand back up again, Ken. I'll give you the microphone in a moment. To address your point on the dichotomy or the two different ways that a timeframe could be measured, if we've got a class A (which is less than six months), a class B (which is six to 18 months), and a class C (that is 18 months or longer), it is possible for us to do on our charting both start and completion aims.

For example, you could have an A saying you're getting it started in less than six months and it is expected to be completed in six months, so that would be a class A:A. It might be that you're starting it in six to 18 months, but you realize that it will be running for 18 months or longer, so that would be a class B:C. In that way, we're not multiplying the classification. Rather, we're just charting it differently.

Would that help, Gunela, to address those issues?

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

I put in "yes" in the chat. I think that would be a good way to go. Maybe now, when we are talking about some starting point in the short-term, we can just state that, yes, this is short-term or A but it might be A:B when it comes to completion so that we're clear right from the start

that we know that some things will be quickly done and some will take longer.

Certainly, having keynote speakers at ICANN meetings I would have thought would be A:A because it's something that can be started and completed within six months. That does not mean though that we only have a one-off of speakers talking about disability topics. [inaudible] contacted in the future. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much for that. I'm very aware that our time is rapidly coming to a close for today's call. I want to make sure if we're all comfortable with using this particular grid or mechanism of prioritizing and sifting and sorting our objectives.

I noticed, Gunela, you've added a couple of extra objectives even just today. They're subsets, but they're still different tasks. We probably want to make sure that anyone who wants to edit the wiki page can do so. But if you are not comfortable with editing the wiki page, if you could just tell us in the e-mail list or any other way that you'd like to let one of us know who are comfortable editing the pages, we will do that for you.

You could put it in the comments at the bottom of the page, and we will put it up into the chart. You could e-mail it. However you get the message across, someone can proxy – staff or myself or Gunela if she's comfortable with doing that – just to make sure that we capture everything in the grids.

I saw Anthony's hand up briefly. What did you want to say, Anthony, before I go back to Ken?

ANTHONY NIIGANII: Yeah, you actually answered my question before I even asked the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's just scary.

ANTHONY NIIGANII: When I heard the answer, that's when I put my hand down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, well, we'll have to work on that so we don't need to interact over the telephone at all. We can just think it to each other. That would be really good, Anthony. While Anthony and I work on mental telepathy, let's go to Ken.

KEN HANSEN: I was just going to suggest that I think we're on the right track with some short-term, medium-, and long-term objectives. For the domain industry, what we're talking about is the overarching objective is to improve accessibility for the domain industry. Then there would be short-term tasks and objectives, medium-term tasks and objectives, and long-term tasks and objectives. Those would have to be detailed.

The only other point I wanted to make – a quick one – is L.A. is happening very soon. Is there something we can do now to engage with the people who are organizing the event to understand what they're doing in terms of accessibility and to volunteer our help and support to work with them to make this, I guess I would call it, the most accessible ICANN meeting ever?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, Ken. I'm going to punt that last question back to Heidi, and she can work out which is the best staff interface to offer our services. I know that Heidi and others, like Gisella, have worked long and hard to try and make the meetings people more and more aware about these issues over the years. That's one of the reasons they're so motivated to be involved with us as a taskforce.

I guess the short answer is yes. We've just got to work out how. We've got a couple of other things, including responding to what we need to do at the L.A. meeting on our agenda. I'm going to draw a line under our conversations now. Sorry, Gunela, and we're going to pick up all of the other work intersessionally and at our next meeting.

Let's go to the other matters of the agenda. The next item, recognizing that our item two is going to be a work in progress and we're going to keep working on that, which would be looking at the role of the working group and how it can act jointly or severally and the possible use of "Sub" or "Specialty." Here I was thinking "Advisory" and "Focus" groups. I'm going to suggest that we park that one for now, we start thinking about that. That would make a quite good conversation for us to have

on at least part of our agenda in Los Angeles. That gets rid of that off my agenda.

The next thing is the outreach and engagement opportunities. We've had a number of reporting back to the list that's been done. That's great, but what I think might be useful is if we have evidence of how ICANN can be showcased as actually giving or attempting some best practices in accessibility. We probably need to capture that somewhere on a wiki space and also look at other ways of promoting that. But let's start first of all by having a dedicated place in our wiki so that we can capture that sort of thing.

That doesn't mean that you don't send these things to the list, but it means that we also have it in a second view. That's something that we all need to do. Again, if you're not comfortable with wiki work, just send an e-mail, let one of the staff know, let me know, and we will put it on the wiki for you. But staff, AI for you is to create the space that we can house all of that in.

Moving to the L.A. meeting, who is going? Klaus, sorry. You have to go? I hope we catch up with you in Los Angeles. Yes, I have to go to another meeting in less than 60 seconds as well. I'm going to ask anyone who is going to be attending Los Angeles to let the list know so we can work out who is going to be on the ground.

I'm going to ask you all that you do still agree that we will have a face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles. If so, I will work out a time for that with staff in the next week. Is that in agreement? We will, of course, have

remote participation for the Los Angeles meeting. Okay, we will work that out. Great.

We will develop an agenda for that on our list, perhaps at our next meeting. I think we should have our next meeting. Would you like to do that in two weeks' time or in three weeks' time? Or would you like a Doodle to be sent out? Los Angeles is in October, and it would be nice to get at least two meetings if not more between now. Doodle for two weeks says Anthony. Let's do that then. Ken's saying, yes, two weeks. Alright, we will send out a Doodle for our next meeting in two weeks.

Between now and then, there's a lot of wiki work for you to all do. At this stage, if you just focus on the priority, the timeframe, and the level of effort. Feel free to do some of the other SWOT and SMART analysis if you're comfortable, and feel free to add or suggest to be added some subsections.

We'll meet in two weeks' time, and we'll get a whole lot more work done. One other thing: if you are not on the list and you are at this meeting, please make sure staff has your e-mail address so we can add you to the e-mail list because there are certain things like I'd like to have an introduction space so that members of the team have a little "about them" wiki page space. There's a whole bunch of stuff we need to do to make our wiki world more accessible and more friendly as well.

Thank you all. Sorry about rushing at the top of the hour. Let's talk again in two weeks' time. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]