

---

LOS ANGELES – At-Large ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce  
Monday, October 13, 2014 – 17:00 to 18:00  
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good afternoon, everybody. This is the Monday afternoon session. The At-Large ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce is meeting for the next hour here. Welcome to everyone around the table. Welcome to our remote participants. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

Rules of the game: when you speak please say your full name beforehand. Today we're going to be speaking about the ATLAS II Implementation. The ATLAS as some of you know is the At-Large Summit, the second one of its kind. Well, 150 At-Large Structures came up with set of recommendations – 43 recommendations – some of which were recommendations to the Board, some recommendations to the ALAC, some to the wider ICANN community.

We have a meeting with the Board tomorrow – I believe tomorrow morning – and the Board has come back to me I guess and asked whether we have started moving on these recommendations and what was the next steps. As you know, some of those recommendations are a little bit thin. They were of course compressed to as to all fit in one document and so as for the document not to have 200-300 pages, but certainly some leave much for interpretation.

On the screen and also linked to the agenda you'll find the post-ATLAS II Implementation wiki page which looks at each one of those recommendations that we have and have put them in a table. The first pass of the post-ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce was to first look at

---

*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 recipients of those recommendations and that was done based on the recommendation itself. And then afterwards – no, no, no. Did I ask to click on this? Let’s go back please. Scroll down, please. Yeah, thank you.

Looking at the recipient of the recommendation. And then the next pass was to basically look at what group or what part of At-Large, whether it was the ALAC, whether it was an At-Large Working Group – who would be in charge basically of expanding on that recommendation, on refining it, on perhaps clarifying it if clarification was needed or on implementing it if implementation was possible within the At-Large community.

The last line, the last column on the right-hand side was a first pass trying to explain the process by which we would be passing this recommendation onto the working group so that for the working group such as let’s say recommendation number two, three working groups being assigned a task to work together on this. Then on the right-hand side you’ll see defined programs that brought value membership to the community. That seemed to be a part that was unclear to the Implementation Taskforce and then another bullet point: “Need to think of ways to optimize the budget.”

And of course, when you look at the recommendation in which says, “ICANN should increase support (budget, staff) to programs having brought valuable members to the community,” the aim really here is to flesh out the details of that recommendation.

---

The Board is very attentive at the moment to the At-Large Summit follow-up. We were well aware that the document itself that we transmitted to the Board was of particular importance so that was a good point forward. There are other communities in ICANN that are currently looking at the recommendations. If we have the time, we might be able to touch on the recommendations with the Government Advisory Committee – the GAC – have held discussions with the member of the GAC who is in charge of the follow up on this.

And as I understand, yesterday a little discussion took place on the GAC mailing list about the recommendations and the questions that they might be asking us. There appears to be some recommendations that also fall in line with recommendations that the GAC might wish to support.

So, this is the process moving forward. For now, the time-sensitive process that we have is to do with the recommendations that are directed at the Board since we are meeting with the Board tomorrow, and the majority of the time that we will spend with the Board tomorrow is going to be about the post-At-Large Summit activities.

Now, recognizing this and recognizing that arriving empty-handed in front of the Board is not a very good idea based on previous experiences, the At-Large II Implementation Taskforce has worked or some members have worked with Ariel Liang – who’s sitting to my right – on producing a small PowerPoint presentation that would (1) just keep the recommendations that are aimed at the Board and (2) be quite simple so you’d have one or two recommendations per slide. So the early slides would be showing what process we’re using as a follow up

---

and the slides afterwards would be giving the Board a helicopter view of the status of several recommendations.

In fact, we took all of the recommendations for the Board. The first three that appear to be immediately implementable by the Board are going to be presented to the Board, and we'll see this in a moment. And then others will be put on the screen and the different chairs of the committees dealing with the follow up so that the chairs of the working groups dealing with the follow up will be able to provide a helicopter update.

For those people that don't know what a "helicopter update," it's an update from a very high location, so not expensive at all. Not at all. You could call it a parachute update, but that doesn't work too well. But certainly not going into the details of the recommendation itself but just providing a status – where we are and what should the Board expect in the future. It is hoped that we will be able to flesh all of these recommendations out by the meeting that we have in Marrakech which will be in February 2015.

So let's have a quick look I think as a first start at the PowerPoint presentation that we will be presenting to the Board tomorrow: ATLAS II Recommendations to the ICANN Board. So shall we go to the first page? Four parts to this. First, post-ATLAS II activities. Secondly, recommendation highlights. Third, progress update and Q&A. Recommendation highlights are of course the recommendations that we believe are now ready to be presented to the Board.

---

First, let's explain the process. So post-ATLAS II activities. And so we have a beautiful diagram that Ariel has prepared. I was not aware we had a Leonardo da Vinci relative in the house, but we appear to have so. And effectively, this really is a slide to explain to the Board how the whole process worked, how the At-Large Summit had five thematic working groups that produce the original recommendations on the variety of topics that we have in this – would you call it a flow word box or something? There's a name for this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Flowchart.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, it's not a flowchart. No, the box in the middle with words. There's some funky name for it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Cloud.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cloud! That's it. The funky name, cloud. Being in L.A. of course you forget about clouds because there are no such thing. But the cloud on the screen, the word "cloud" which effectively shows what topics we had then went to At-Large assignees into the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce – and the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce is the group that produced or that is currently working on the follow up for the

---

recommendations to then go to the Board, to staff, to the community, etc., seeing the ICANN recipients as being there.

Of course, we're not showing the non-ICANN recipients. But when there are non-ICANN recipients those recommendations we're actually called "observations" because the ALAC is not able to make recommendations to anyone else but ICANN and its component organizations.

So that's the first page. Are there any feedback on this? There's still time to change things. No discussion about the color, please. The colors are fine. Just the content. Okay, next slide then.

The next slide will show the interrelationship between the working groups that received the assignments. You will have noticed – in fact, the Board will have not noticed by then but some recommendations required action by more than one At-Large Working Group.

Of course, being able to cheat by looking at the right-hand screen and seeing the recommendation number two, it was decided by the Implementation Taskforce that both the Outreach, the Capacity Building and the Finance and Budget Subcommittee would have to be involved in this recommendation.

Obviously, recommendation two involves budget so the Finance and Budget Subcommittee would have to be involved. And with regards to programs having brought valuable members to the community, while bringing valuable members to the community is classed as outreach and that's the job of our Outreach Working Group. And Capacity Building is all about getting the people that we bring from outside into the ICANN

---

At-Large and basically teach them what's going on and help them out in their travels through ICANN.

So with this you have a diagram on the left which shows you the relationship between the different working groups. You'll notice the Future Challenges Working Group is one that is looking usually at long-term projects, more strategic projects as such. Social Media I think is self-explanatory. Outreach, I've just spoken about. Capacity Building too.

We have a Technology Taskforce that is headed by a very bright chap. I was going to say "young geek." Just as what I used to be in the past but I'm not young anymore – still a geek. The Technology Taskforce is there to test all sorts technologies. And certainly as far as Capacity Building is concerned, as far as Social Media is concerned, there is a significant amount of innovation that's involved in this.

And also we have found that some of the recommendations that will come out of the Outreach and the Capacity Building Working Groups will definitely require financing, and therefore our Finance and Budget Subcommittee will be working with ICANN Finance and with the relevant departments – and this is not just casting stone but working with relevant departments to actually put a cost to the recommendations that will be presented. Next slide please.

I'm not going to spend that much time with the Board on this tomorrow, by the way. This is just to explain to you the process. Are there any questions at this point? Actually, backtracking one, Ariel. Any comments or questions on this? Eduardo Diaz?

---

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. Thank you, Mr. Chair. In this box, were there some recommendations for ALAC as a whole? I don't remember.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Eduardo. There were recommendations. There were recommendations for the ALAC but the recommendations were for the ALAC. They're not involved having to work with other groups. So we will touch on the recommendations for the ALAC. We actually have a list there. But they don't involve actual bilateral discussions with other working groups. I see we have to share a mic, okay? Heidi Ullrich?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. I'm just looking at this chart and I'm just wondering if we could confirm that, given the way this is set up, is it that the Future Challenges Working Group then feeds back and forth with the Social Media which feeds back and forth with the Outreach which then Outreach Working Group feeds into the Finance and Budget Subcommittee? Or is it that all those groups feed into that in the same blow? Because given the current structure, it looks like that is the way that's running.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Heidi. That is the way it's running. I looked at the charts that we had and if you look at Finance and Budget, Finance and Budget only has connections with Outreach and with Capacity



---

Building. It doesn't have connections with anyone else. So that's why it only is connected to these two.

Tijani Ben Jemaa and then Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Tijani, you have the floor.

**TIJANI BEN JEMAA:** Yes. To answer Heidi's question, you [can] remark that the rows has two [sides], two directions, so it is in both directions.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Yeah. Thank you, Tijani. But you're speaking about the Social Media and Outreach and the other ones. There's only a one directional arrow with Finance and Budget and that the request are made for the Finance and Budget Subcommittee to provide pricing information, etc.

Dev Anand?

**DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:** Thanks. I'm now going touch on the topic on a breeze. It's regarding that one directional arrow to the Finance and Budget. I mean, what will happen is that it would be a back and forth between the Finance and Budget. Let's say like, "Okay, you know what, that idea with the million dollar computers and thing, that's too much. Take it back and scale it down a bit."

---

So I think it might be better to have as a collaboration, the Finance and Budget being two [arrows] because you'll be going back and forth and not just sending it to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Dev. Any thoughts on this? Please, Seun Ojedeji.

OLUWASEUN SAMSON OJEDEJI: I just want to get some clarification. Are we looking at the first level alone of those charts? Because for instance, the second item says Outreach, Capacity, and Finance is involved. So I was [opposing] no because I think perhaps there should be numbering on the chart. So maybe number two can put right inside the one that concerns Outreach, Capacity because they look connected. Maybe they are disconnected that – because the arrow is looking like, “Okay, we’re actually going to Future Challenges to share.” [inaudible] is not looking at this. Just looking at chart alone will actually lose the understanding of the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Seun. You’re making very good point. Actually, the next slide is a slightly different type of diagram. This is just to show the general relationship of the different working groups and how they work together. I think that because there are – well, not 43 but is it 22? Twenty-two recommendations for the Board. If we started putting all the numbers of the recommendations on this chart, I’m not even sure

---

Board members can count to that level, so it would be a bit confusing for them.

I did not say that! Oh we have a future Board member here. Counting down from 22, Rinalia Abdul Rahim at number one.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Still a member of the community. I just want to say in the first slide it might be useful to replace thematic one, theme two, theme three with the actual theme because those was substantive and that would convey a very good impression of the At-Large.

In terms of this slide, I would ask you to be careful because it raises more questions than it can answer. So think about really whether or not you want to present it or if you want to present it this way. It could just be one sentence from the presenter to say, “The interpretation of follow up of those recommendations involve collaboration across several working groups that involved seven of them.” And you could list them or whatever, but rather than you know. This could get you off track and both members are easily off track when they don’t want to deal with the issue. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Rinalia. I didn’t quite hear the last part. Could you say that again, please? For the record, Rinalia Abdul Rahim. No, I’m kidding. Thank you.

Good point. Any other thoughts on this? Tijani Ben Jemaa.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, since we had a lot of remarks about this chart, perhaps we have to remove it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Tijani. So we'll keep that chart and we'll move on to the...

I've heard you. Okay, so let's scrap this then. Let's take this one out because it obviously appears to be producing more questions than answers, and really what we're here to do is to try and give answers to the Board rather than questions. So this one will have to go. Let's go then to the next one and hopefully we could keep one of them.

Where is the – not the flowchart, the other one? No, there was one with different circles.

ARIEL LIANG: No, we don't have it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We don't have it, okay. So that was the one I was hoping we would have. Why don't we have it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What? You mean the Venn diagram?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Venn diagram. Okay, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. I mean I did attempt to try to do the Venn diagram but in looking at it, it looked very confusing. I mean, I could share it with you, but think lots of circles with lots of recommendations and lots of intersections and try to put it in there. And after looking at it [inaudible], “This is not a good idea.”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I thought it looked rather artistic but coming to think about it now, yes, it might be very confusing. So then we go directly into the recommendations themselves. Let’s go to the next slide please. Recommendation highlights. And now we start with the ones that we will be presenting to the Board for implementation.

The first one is Recommendation 11 and that’s for ICANN to implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria (gender, cultural diversity) and user needs (disabilities, etc.). And this was given to the Accessibility Working Group and the Technology Taskforce and we just happen to have the chair of the Accessibility Working Group and the chair of the Technology Taskforce here. The one faster on the trigger was Cheryl Landon-Orr, so you have the floor, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That takes years of practice, but I’m managed to get it fairly quickly. What I thought Dev and I would say – no. Before I

---

get to that I would like to suggest that if we're keeping things simple, I probably will only add another two or three URLs there and hope anyone who is actually interested enough to go to our wiki and look at our somewhat extensive documents on priorities and things like that will do it. I think I've heard the message to keep it simple stupid principle – I think is a good idea. So I'm just going to say really clean and I'm just literally going to add a couple of extra URLs, but we will talk to it. Okay.

So how do you feel, Mr. Chairman of every other work group, about taking an approach that says, on recommendation 11 we have considerable advantage because of the pre-existence of the Technology Taskforce and the Accessibility Taskforce who have even before ATLAS II looked at a number of enablers and facilities and baseline requirements that mean this is actually well underway. That type of intro. Feel comfortable? Okay. Tell me if you're not. Don't change anything, but tell me if you're not. So to that and then we can say, for example, and take a look at the captioning and say however this [inaudible].

Now I'm going to bitch about the fact that we have to deal with the captioning and it doesn't work across all platforms. And you deal with the fact that Technology Taskforce is constantly testing things. Things do upgrade, things do change. This is the sort of thing that you've got to have the finger on the pulse of. And maybe a recommendation may come out of the taskforce at some future time that says, "Before ICANN upgrades its XYZ software that we use, some of these questions need to be asked," whatever. That's up to you.

---

So then I thought we would give them warm fuzzies and say how amazingly engaged, keen, and cooperative key staff are on this event and let them know that, because by then we will have had our 7:00 AM meeting tomorrow morning. We will again have key staff in the room and key staff by then will have informed the community about their own audit and their own ability to now try and network together and that they're taking this very seriously and the aim is to have it baked in in an ICANN remit bounded way as much as humanly possible. And we probably don't need to go too much further than that. What do you think? Over to you, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, it depends on how much time is going to be spent discussing it. That sounds like a good three minutes there, four minutes there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. No, I'm told to read, to listen, to watch, to do everything together and there's a question from Dev here. Rinalia – no. Was it Holly? You need a tent card, but okay. Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. A question. So when this recommendation is presented, you would be ready to provide some quick examples of what kind of services would apply and you are stating this recommendation as a recommendation to the Board. It is going to be implemented by staff. So you want the Board to direct staff to do this?

---

CHERYL LANDON-ORR: The Board to continue to support staff and allow them to continue on the excellent pathway plans they have.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Excellent. In those exact words, please, tomorrow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia, for this good feedback. And so indeed yes, if those exact words could be said without the rest of the fluff beforehand that would be great because it has taken three minutes or four minutes and we have quite a few to go through, so we'll have to do this. But yeah, I know you'll adlib by the time and I'll know you'll do an amazing job of it.

CHERYL LANDON-ORR: I won't pick on Dev to begin with. I'll publicly do that here but not in front of the Board. It's all right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next one. The next one is Recommendation 27. Oh, just coming back to 11. You mentioned having a couple more bullet points underneath with more locations or...? Because I heard that.

CHERYL LANDON-ORR: Mr. Chairman, just some URLs to other – that's a high-level page that just takes you to the Disability Taskforce space. I'd like to take them right to the chart with the recommendations and the priority list orders



---

that we're already doing for what the taskforce has come up with. It's just rather than them having to hunt once they go to there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank very much, Cheryl. If at the end of this meeting you can come to see Ariel to add those bullets, that will be fine. Next recommendation, please, is number 27.

“The Board must implement ATRT 2 Recommendation 9.1, regarding Formal Advice from Advisory Committees.”

Now, one has to remember this was a recommendation that was drafted in June. That was before the Board actually voted to implement all of the ATRT 2 recommendations. However, since that time we have seen a recent implementation plan. This obviously is just a support and might even be seen as a quick win for the Board if it was to implement it fast enough. So that's the next one. I don't think it requires anymore explanation for it.

Next one, 35. “The ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large Community in between ICANN Public Meetings.”

And this really is a recommendation that aims at enhancing communications between the Board and the At-Large community. There is just so much that goes on in our community having to wait three months to then have one hour with the Board at an ICANN meeting and tell them everything that we've been doing is totally impossible.

---

And as a result, I do get asked questions from Board members, “Do you guys have conference calls between ICANN meetings?” Obviously it would be great to have at least a conference call with the Board to explain that we do have conference calls.

Now, the response that I have already had from Steve Crocker, the chair of the Board, giving him advanced notice of some of those recommendations is that the Board doesn’t conduct that many conference calls as the Board, but Board Working Groups do.

So it might well be that this recommendation could be met by a counter – well, our hope I guess is for this recommendation to be met by a counter proposal that maybe the Board leadership or the Board chair could hold a conference call with the At-Large community and effectively promote communication or that other means of enhancing communication between the Board and the At-Large community could be looked at.

Any comments? John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Could I make an alternate suggestion? Perhaps that one Board member – and there’s a bunch of them – could be invited to each of our conference calls on a rotating basis, so at least some members have sort of broad insight into the community on a regular basis.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, John. Yes and no. The reason is as follows. We have, as an example, on Friday morning the At-Large Leadership Team

---

has invited Board members to come and join us and one of the concerns that Board members have is being asked questions when they actually join us.

In theory, the only Board member who is allowed to actually speak on behalf of the Board and not just as an individual is the chair. And so we have had at least one occurrence where another Board member was invited in the absence of the chair and wasn't quite sure what they were to answer and how they were to answer. It was a bit of nerve-wracking experience. It probably has to do with internal Board. I wouldn't call it politics but Board recommendations and so on, how that works.

We could ask – we could suggest it, but I think keeping to just helicopter view and letting them come up with a counter proposal will probably be the right way forward, not giving them too many avenues. We don't really know what goes on the Board, do we?

Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Olivier. I mean having said all these, we do have open meetings and in fact we've had Board members, one of which is actually sitting at our table, having attended our meetings. Sebastian has been at many of them and we've occasionally had another Board member or two come in and attend. We haven't made any special effort to keep them out.

So if a special written invitation is what it takes, well fine. But the information is there, and if there is a specific topic that we think might be of interest to the Board as a matter of collaboration, then we could

---

act on I think a case-by-case basis. I don't know if this is a problem that needs fixing. We have already been going through this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Evan. Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. I think in general you can extend an invitation to Board members if they would like to participate in any At-Large call. It is open and they are welcome. I think that you should try to push this because when the community has specific issues that they want targeted at the Board, it would be useful for them to have this interaction.

And I recall one very useful interaction with selected Board members over the selection of Board Directors – the election process where you wanted to know what's the role of the Board etc. That was a very useful call. But that was very targeted and very focused. So I would say give them a general invitation but also have a specific one because you want them to pay attention to you.

I have to say just from observation that it is good to have one or two Board members who are aware about At-Large activities and concerns because it strengthens the case when issues are being discussed in the Board itself. So don't target the usual suspect. Go beyond it.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia. And of course, the response you will be given as well since you've been selected by At-Large, you go and find out what At-Large is doing but you're not allowed to tell us afterwards because you are Board member, so you're not relating things from your community. Try and work this one out. Okay. Next one then I think we can move on.

So, progress update. These are the recommendations which are not yet fully cooked, which there is work required, and so what we've done with most of them is to give the recommendation and then underneath a quick update.

“Recommendation 1: ICANN should continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.”

That was assigned to a number of individuals in the At-Large community. You can see underneath there that the efforts to bring new people should not be limited to people in developing countries but also in underrepresented regions as well, or underrepresented community members in developed regions. So the programs which are currently serving underserved communities in developing countries should be extended to be dealing with underserved communities across the world.

Just an example of the expansion of the recommendation – it basically just explains the recommendation itself. Of course, work is still required to refine this further.

Next one. Two – that's been assigned to three working groups. And effectively, the Capacity Building Working Group now is working with

---

the Outreach Subcommittee to identify the so-called programs and the Finance and Budget Subcommittee to evaluate the resources used so far and any needed additional funds.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is in different colors, so does that mean it's targeted at a different level of ICANN? Just to make sure I understand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. We had a bit of a question on this. We put the three first recommendations as those which are ready and actionable. So I think they're in orange. Is that correct? They're in orange color. Those ones are in blue because we're still working on them, so they're not fully cooked. It's a bit like a steak. When you don't cook it, it's blue. And then it becomes more cooked.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. Good to know the difference. Please be explicit about that tomorrow. Are you ready to describe what "valuable member of the community" is?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Rinalia. So because this is not ready for the Board consumption – we're working on this – one of the things that will be happening is finding out what a valuable member is, and maybe

---

defining what a valuable member is. So those three working groups have the task to provide a fuller explanation including all of the questions such as “What is a valuable member?” “Identify the programs,” and all of this.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, being the chair of the Capacity Building Working Group might be able to add a few words.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Yes, Rinalia. Yes, it was written like this. But when we say, “Identify the so-called programs,” programs for what? So it is to identify those programs and the valuable persons or valuable members. This is one thing that we will do with the Outreach Subcommittee. And then for the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, we will try to see what was the cost and if there is a need to improve the cost because it is about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. So valuable members – to recap, valuable members would be defined by the Capacity Building Working Group and the Outreach Subcommittee. The so-called programs would be identified by these two working groups and the costings would be identified by the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. That’s why the three work together.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I don't mean to give you a hard time, but it's actually training for you to be in the face of the Board tomorrow. I mean, when you think about valuable members of the community, some immediate things come to mind: those who engage, those who assume leadership positions, those who bring in interesting perspectives and from underserved areas. I think you should be able to say those things very simply and say, "We will deepen it further," rather than saying, "We're going to push it into a committee until we get something definitive and come up." They're going to say, "Are you serious?"

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Rinalia. That's the nature of bottom-up. It's the working groups that will define it, it's not the chair. All right, move on. Next one, please.

"Recommendation 26: Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable Policy Management Process System, available for use across the SOs and ACs, in order to..." and a whole number of things after that.

We've got three working groups working on this. This is clearly not a recommendation that can be done in a week. We're looking here at a much longer-term project where you would have the Capacity Building Working Group that would work with a Social Media Working Group and the Technology Taskforce to assess what needs are for the knowledge management system, for a policy development system, to actually basically design requirements document such as that, and then



---

afterwards work with the IT services in ICANN and find out how much something like that would cost, etc.

This is really a long-term recommendation. It's not something you would do in a year. It might require budgets. It might require a whole number of additional components. It's something that has been asked by a number of other organizations, SOs and ACs in ICANN. And it might well be that the initial first draft will then have to be shared with other supporting organizations and advisory committees, and maybe have them also bring what their needs are into that document.

So we're looking here at the real seed of a much larger consultation, but certainly the seed was one which was asked by our community. And so that's how it came up.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. So tomorrow likely what you will be asked is that "What do you mean by insufficient?" So you need to be able to describe that in a nutshell and then say that it needs deeper, more expanded work, etc. I think you tried to do that. That's good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Rinalia. I think it's pretty evident that many people are bunt out. And searching for information is probably one of the most terrible tasks anyone has to do with ICANN.

---

The recent discussions among SO, AC, SG and Constituency chairs that have recently taken place – and I don't know whether that has permeated back to the Board so far but the fact is that everyone is saying, "We can't find anything. The website, everything is just all over the place."

Dev Anand Teelucksingh and then back to Rinalia. Dev, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Just to confirm, so we're not putting the entire text of Recommendation 26 on the screen because it stopped at "in order to"? This is another slide but I don't think it was.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ariel Liang?

ARIEL LIANG: Dev, can you repeat your comment please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Regarding Recommendation 26, it stops at "available for use across the SOs/ACs in order to" and there was a series of bullet points to complete the recommendation. Is it going to be on another slide or what?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. It was me who put it like this. But Ariel, when she copied it, she copied the original recommendation. The last two words are – you don’t have to put them. You have to stop at “SO and ACs” because you say “in order to” and in order to what? There was a list of things and we will not put them here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So, Ariel, you know what to do. Ariel Liang?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I know what to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ariel. The answer could have been “affirmative” or “aye-aye, sir.” Warp speed. Let’s go to Rinalia Abdul Rahim please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. The concrete examples that you gave just now to illustrate the problem were excellent. Those are the kinds of things that will resonate. So if you say, “Volunteer burnout, not being able to find anything in the system regardless of which part of the system,” will definitely go far when you're trying to describe the insufficiency of the system.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. I just have to remember to mention both volunteer burnout and also not being able to find anything in the system. The immediate response when saying “not being able to find anything in the system” then gets met by the answer of saying, “Well, you don’t want something as complicated as this. You just want a document processing system,” which is of course a very small subset of what we’re really looking at here. That’s the reason.

Tijani, and then I think we have to move on. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Yesterday we had a conversation with – what is it? Ashley?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ashwin Rangan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: With Ashwin. And we understood that it something under work in ICANN, and I was very happy that they are working on. So even if we give a very clear detail [inaudible] [implementable] recommendation, it will not be done now because they are working on the subject. This is not an easy subject.

So I think that the recommendation is very good and we have to work on it while the staff is working also on the same subject.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I actually had additional discussion with Ashwin afterwards and it actually is just a document processing system they're doing at the moment or they're looking at and studying.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a comment. It's probably a follow on, but that says at least we're working on the ALAC site but what it doesn't do when we actually found out about it yesterday, the search function is not going to actually find everything else on the site which is actually impenetrable. So say we've done what we can but if you're looking at documents and trying to find a history – an ICANN history as opposed to an ALAC history – it's still going to be very difficult.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Understood. Thank you, Holly. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The words “knowledge management system” might be able to brought up in the conversational part of this because that does take it away from just document processing and to the ability to access archives materials. And we've asked for that before, too. Just about anybody with any executive power.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. That's well understood. We've got knowledge management there. So that's a good thing forward.

Okay, let's go to the next one if nobody else has any thoughts. Now we have four recommendations for the Future Challenges Working Group. What we do here is to just list them and I guess we'll let Evan say a few words about them as sort of the – that's your test now. We're doing your rehearsal. Full dress rehearsal on what you will tell the Board tomorrow about these four recommendations.

Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Olivier, and thanks for the opportunity to rehearse.

Essentially, the issues that the ATLAS brought up about accountability issues are generally higher level ones. They don't have too many very specific outcomes. They talk about general directions, general should-do-this and so on. They lead into the future challenges work, which by necessity is looking at a higher level of things. There will be outputs, there will be recommendations. But they're going to take more work, they're going to take more high-level strategic thinking and that's the approach we're taking on the incorporation of these particular issues. Good enough?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. And now, shall you all put your hand up and give a note to Evan from zero to ten with ten being the being the best performance. I think you did pretty well. Thank you.

---

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm wondering if it's worthwhile saying that there are probably two levels of accountability. Future Challenges is going to actually deal with the higher-level stuff and although we don't actually have the words yet, it may be valuable to say and the accountability issues as they deal with IANA is being dealt with in another way. And we haven't decided what that is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Holly. I see what you mean. Number five, for example, has the IANA issues thing. Well okay, that's a very good point.

How should we do this? Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Just so you know, Olivier, myself, Jean-Jacques, and Holly and some others involved in Future Challenges will be meeting tonight to try and see if there's a better answer we can give to how to address the immediate issues. The answer I gave sort of stands for the high-level ones. But for those that require a timely answer, we'll try and figure out a way to deal with that.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Just before I give the floor to Rinalia, do you think that there will be a need for the change to the slide, reorganizing? Because we have four and four at the moment. Might we need to separate those into two slides? So have the four not relating to IANA on one and the others relating to IANA on the other one. I don't even know what the other recommendations are on the next slide.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Could you go to the next slide please? Just so we can see the fifth one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the meantime, whilst Evan reads, Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that would make a better, easier answer for Evan so he won't have to rehearse the second bit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: As far as I see at the moment, out of the eight recommendations, only one pertains to IANA. Maybe we could move that one to the end of the second page and just at the point it will easily remind you and say, "The last one is on IANA and we'll be following a different track."

Evan Leibovitch?



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:                    Actually, if I could ask, put the IANA one first, separated out. And then the other seven. One is more immediate. The other ones are more strategic. That will flag to discuss to deal with them that way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Thank you very much, Evan. Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:            Okay. In terms of the flow of the slides, how you're presenting the issue is that you've put one recommendation per slide. So that focuses the Board's attention. And then you come to the Future Challenges Working Group and then you have a bunch of recommendations. So that's going to – I wouldn't say confuse – but somehow shock them a little bit and it will make them wonder where do you want them to focus their attention? Are you going to highlight specific recommendations? Are you going to go through them one by one? That's my question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Thank you, Rinalia. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:                    Okay. If the issue is a matter of dealing with Board confusion, which is I guess a factor that I hadn't considered before, then perhaps to try and put things into perspective, then perhaps just the Future Challenges things, even put them in smaller type – just bear with me a moment – put the seven on one slide and the one on another, which gives a clear indication we're not asking for immediate action on the seven. These

---

are the ones that Future Challenges is taking up and we'll put in a form that will be put to the Board at a future date, but we're not asking for immediate action.

This is just an indication. These have been put forward by the ATLAS. They're being taken under consideration. Don't worry about them at this moment. They will come back later. Is that a reasonable way to approach this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: That sounds good, but to emphasize, Evan should say what the recommendations are about just so that they know that – and I think you know. I think you can say it well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. I didn't hear her question. The recommendations are all [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] with a question mark afterwards, any response to Rinalia's. It looks like it's fine. I take it that it's okay. So we'll have one slide with the

---

IANA and the other one with the seven recommendations that are non-  
IANA with smallest [inaudible].

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Even if there's smaller print – I'm not even expecting them all to read through them at that moment. Essentially I'll speak over them to say that these have been put forward by ATLAS. They're being taken by Future Challenges and will be brought back to the Board. I'll talk a little bit about the nature of them very briefly, but essentially not going to them in depth saying Future Challenges is working on them. They will be brought back in an appropriate format at a later date.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Evan. So if you could actually explain that the smaller script is there for a reason and they don't need to be squinting their eyes to try and read it and to tell us, "This is a stupid idea to make it a small script." Just trying to prevent any criticism on that. That would be great.

I have concerns. We have five more slides to look at. It is the top of the hour. We have the new gTLD Working Group immediately afterwards. And as you are the chair of the new gTLD Working Group, Evan, is it possible for us to take another ten minutes?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Do I have a choice? Go ahead. Make it quick. Obviously the TLD Working Group has a good chunk on its own plate, so whatever you can do.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Evan. Next one please. And Ariel, you've noted what we're doing, yeah?

ARIEL LIANG: I'll [check this out].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. Finance and Budget Subcommittee, three of them on one page here. As we said earlier, the Finance and Budget – well, we will have not said that earlier since we will have lost that slide, but the Finance and Budget Subcommittee is there to help the other working groups in working on the costs of some of the recommendations.

So there are three of them which deal specifically with programs that will require costings and offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program is a case of short lead-time budget requests not related to travel. So what is that?

Let's say you have the requirement for a banner or for some material or a specific prop or something in a local meeting, any kind of material that you need for supporting an At-Large Structure. Maybe the rental of some equipment to be able to turn a local event into an event that we could webcast for this sort of thing. These are small requests which could be asked in the same way as the CROPP does instead of being requests that we would have to ask through an extra/additional SO/AC requests. We're not going to make additional SO/AC requests for \$500

to rent a camera for two days for an event that we don't even know is going to happen in FY15. That's the sort of thing.

“Recommendation 41: Working with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities.” We are specifically speaking about external sponsorship, for example.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just in the light of what Fadi has been telling us today and that being front of mind, I'm just wondering – I know that we're not talking about things like a major event that you wouldn't have to go through to community. But Fadi has been saying [inaudible] 41 that in fact working with the ICANN Board is not the things that's going to happen for additional funds for anything. Fadi's been saying working with the ICANN community is how any additional funding for anything, including future ATLAS, would be happening in the next four years.

So I'm just wondering about 41. Yes, it's one of our recommendations but I'm wondering if it is being overtaken by what we've been told today. Now if it hasn't been overtaken by what we've been told today, we may need to word it in such a way that it can't be interpreted that that's what it means. So back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. It says, “In seeking additional sources of funding.” Not additional funding. It's the sources.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood. But I don't think it's clear because the other is front of mind. I think we might need to reword it to make it clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: These are the recommendations as they are. It's cut and pasted. We might have to explain them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You probably didn't need to speak to it to underline the fact that we have been told there are challenges with external funding from other bodies and we need to work with. Anyway, just putting it out there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Cheryl, for this. Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I think that you might be required to clarify whether it's internal or external funding. If it is internal funding, then the new process that Fadi came up with may apply. But if it is external funding, then the Board may get into a discussion with you. They may be interested in helping you source external funding for aspects or activities that you're interested in. Or they may not. We shall see.

Final question is who is presenting this part of the recommendations?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. The last part – who is presenting this? The chair of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, I believe.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Which would be the chairman of the ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of course, if he agrees to do so. But it probably would be the case. We'll find out later. But all joking aside, I've also had a note from Heidi mentioning that we have gotten a lot of additional sources of funding from outside, external sources of funding for the ATLAS II and for the showcases that we organize every time – sponsorship, etc.

So we'll make sure that yes, when we mean additional sources of funding – there's only one source of funding in ICANN anyway. It's the Board Finance Committee. That's the bottom line. So, additional sources of funding is external. It has to be external.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think as soon as 41 comes up, the first thing you say is, "Like many of the statements that have come out of ATLAS II, we are now needing to gently rework some of the wording." And this is a good example where this is referring specifically to external to ICANN sources of funding and then it will be clear.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Then number 42, I'm worried about the time at the moment that's taking – Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. On 42, if you specify in concert with regional events such as RIR meetings, you might get additional support within the Board, certain parts of the Board.

Also, if you tie it to policy development processes in terms of the need to build capacity for policy development engagement, you are more likely to get this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Rinalia. It's a good point. I think we should take note of it because, of course, I remind you these are just rough recommendations. The Finance and Budget Subcommittee will be providing a much longer list. So that's a very good point that you're making.

I'm just trying not to get the Board to think that we want this now. This is an advanced warning of what's coming up in the future. But certainly what you have mentioned here is important.

We also have to remember that the RALO assemblies might take place depending on the new meeting strategy, as well. At the moment we have three ICANN meetings that are of the same size, very large per year. And the Board is working on new meeting strategy to have smaller meetings in the middle of the year, a long one at the end of the year, and that will obviously also make a change to the ability to have face-to-



---

face RALO assemblies. This is why this one is a long-term one again. Probably a year before we find out what the new meeting strategy is all about.

Yeah, okay. Next one. Nearly finished. And then the few for the ALAC itself speaking about maybe easy wins and these are probably the next ones that we will be sending over to the Board.

“ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost-benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where such growth is more likely to occur.” I have a feeling this is already somehow in place.

“Number 16: ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones.”

Something which the At-Large Advisory Committee will be working on. Certainly with regards to holding our conference calls, we operate some rotation on some of them, we don’t for others. So we’ll have to flesh this one out a little bit more. We just didn’t have the time to work on it for this meeting. But certainly for Marrakech, we’ll be able to expand on those.

Next. And then we’ve got the others.

“ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws.”

That’s one that’s assigned to me and so I shall be expanding on this in the near future.

---

“Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity and empowerment.”

Again, a question whether this is within the ICANN mandate or not but our Outreach Committee and Social Media Working Group, we’ll be working together to decide on this.

Finally, 23: “The roles and jurisdiction of the Ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.”

And again, Future Challenges Working Group and the Social Media Working Group would be looking at that and making a much better proposal or more cooked proposal.

Next. That’s the questions and answers. Any comments on any of these? Rinalia Abdul Rahim and then I think we can finish.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just one question. I think you have recommendations targeted at the ALAC. You might want to just flash it without mentioning it or reading it by saying, “These are our recommendations to improve ourselves,” and just leaving it for information.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Rinalia. I’m just mindful of the time. It’s taken us over an hour to go through the—

---

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: You're not presenting it. You're just saying that you have them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What we could do would be to show briefly – I don't know. Is it Ariel that will be at the controls at the time?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. What we would be able to do would be to actually indeed show the PDF copy of our overall page which is all of the ALAC recommendations, as well. So we're just looking at a subset and you can see a lot of other ALAC recommendations since we do have 43 in total that we're working on in a separate thread.

Okay, excellent. Ladies and gentlemen, I think that's it. Next steps, we can have some sleep – a little bit – and then meet with the Board tomorrow. So thank you very much, everyone. This meeting is now adjourned, and thanks to Evan for having given us a few additional minutes. Goodbye. And thanks to the interpreters for having coped with my speed of speaking.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**