
GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Olivier. We are starting the recording now. I'd like to welcome everyone on today's ATLAS II Debrief Single Issue ALAC call on Friday, the 22nd of August at 13:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Skuce, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Leon Sanchez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Glenn McKnight.

On Spanish, Fatima Cambronero and Carlos Aguirre.

We have apologies noted from Wolf Ludwig, Siranush Vardanya, Natalia Enciso, and Silvia Vivanco.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang; and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Our interpreter today on the Spanish channel is Sabrina.

And if I could please remind everyone to please speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation, as Sabrina is alone interpreting today. And also to state your names when speaking to allow Sabrina to identify you on the other language channel.

I hope I haven't left anyone off that are on the call. Over to you, Olivier. Thank you.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Excuse me, Gisella. It's Murray speaking.

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.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Murray, yes? Was your name not mentioned?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I don't believe so. Sorry; I joined later. Murray McKercher.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Murray. Anyone else that we haven't mentioned on the roll call? Hearing no one else, let's move on to our first agenda item, and that's of course the welcome and the purpose of the call.

We're going to be doing two things today. The first one is to have a look at the ATLAS II reports from our different working group leaders and thematic group leaders, discuss any points that those leaders would like to focus on specifically. This is all to come together for some kind of material for our next successors who will be putting together the ATLAS III in the future to have lessons learned from what we have been doing – our successes, our failures, our challenges. So that's one part of the call.

The other part of the call will be to look at the implementation of those 49 or so recommendation observations as well that we have made. We have to look through these and we have to take these to the next level, because writing, drafting that document is one thing, but actually implementing those recommendations is the important part. This is just the start of a new process.

So get ready for some heavy work today, and some heavy work in the next years. Yes, I'm saying not one, but many. Just a few things. We do need to get moving with those implementation and follow up as soon as possible. But I'll be speaking about this after we go through our initial reports. Are there any questions or comments at this stage?

Hearing no one put their hand up, let's go to the overview of ATLAS II. I must say I'm very pleased to have seen a number of reports coming in for each one of the thematic groups and each one of our working groups. I invite you to look at the Wiki page that has the ATLAS II group reports, and we start with the major, the main report for the ATLAS II working group which was filed by Eduardo. I was going to ask Eduardo to give us a few of his highlighted points in his very, very complete report that he [filed], including a wonderful picture on the front page. Eduardo, you have the floor.

Of course, I should have listened to the roll call, because I don't see Eduardo on the list at the moment. Of course I'm looking for someone who is not here. [inaudible] for Eduardo's hand.

Okay. Any question or comments on Eduardo's report? Have you read it or had some time to look at it? Is there anything that we may have missed overall? I know many of you were part of the main group, the main working group, the main ATLAS II working group. Is there anything that you would like to add that perhaps we should add to this report as lessons learned? The floor is open.

Okay. Well, it looks like there isn't any additional information we can add on this. I had a good look. There are several recommendations on

there. I wonder how we will be able to condense all of these recommendations into maybe one single document or one single set of web pages.

That said, actually, all are very good. There's a little bit of duplication with some of the sub-working group work. Eduardo has mentioned recommendations for the Survey Working Group, the Events Working Group. So all of the sub-working groups themselves. Do you have any comments on any of the sub-working group recommendations there? How do you wish to [inaudible]?

Should we collate the recommendations that Eduardo came up with and put them in each one of the working groups, just add them to each one of the working group recommendations? Should we keep them apart?

Okay. I see there's much response at the moment, so it doesn't matter. We'll just keep it as such. I don't see any specific push for this.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Olivier, it's Murray speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Murray. You have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Just on that comment, I think it would be wise to try to make it as short as possible [inaudible] any duplication. That obviously means editing by

someone, but perhaps one shorter document would be better, in my opinion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Murray. That's one thought. Let's go over to Fatima Cambronerero. We're not looking at this declaration document, so if it be please taken off the table, that would be great. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. Maybe I am jumping ahead and I am dealing with other topics on the agenda, but I'm not clear about the implementation of all the recommendations. I like the experience we had in the ICANN Strategy Group. What we did was to divide these recommendations or group these recommendations according to their similarities.

So my idea would be to have a General Recommendation Implementation Group with a subgroup focusing on the implementation of similar recommendations or recommendations that have to do with a similar topic or the same topic, just to work in a more orderly fashion.

We will need plenty of people working on implementation, so maybe we could assign certain people to certain subgroups to deal with implementation, and this would be more practical.

So once we have – I mean, we have all the recommendations, but once we have all the recommendations groups according to their similarities, we could start working on their implementation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. I think there is some confusion here. You are talking about agenda item number 4: ATLAS II implementation taskforce. I'm speaking about ATLAS III reports, or 3 in the agenda. The ATLAS III reports are on a different page. They are on this page: ATLAS II group reports. I'm very sorry about the – Heidi has put it in the chat. ATLAS II group reports, that's the one.

These ones have lessons learned from us, from our own chairing of the meeting and the chairing of the thematic groups, etc. We are dealing really just with process here. We're not dealing at all with the implementation of the thematic group recommendations. These are two entirely different things.

The aim of this call is really to see what we're going to do with the feedback that we have had so far on the process by [inaudible]. And I'd like to focus on this first before we start looking at the next phase of this call, which we'll be looking at the thematic groups, where we will be filling a table on allocating work to different subgroups, etc. Hence the reason why we have to keep those two [separate].

Furthermore, the duplication that might be had is from the different ATLAS II working groups' feedback that we are having here. The reports that each one of us have drafted and which might have some common parts to it. So the question is should we duplicate these or weave them in the table that we currently have and let people in the future deal with it and read all of the information that we have for them, or should we actually do a little bit more work on this, spend a bit more time and

duplication between our report and make one report out of all of these reports? That's the question. That's what we're going to be doing. That's why I'm asking the question.

We've got Glenn. I see you've noticed, so that's good. We've got Glenn and then Tijani. Glenn McKnight first.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, Olivier. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well. go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Olivier, I'm having a bit of a difficulty. You seem to be bouncing around on this, so if you can circle the wagons a little bit, because we started with the document, then we went to Eduardo's document. I exactly need to know what feedback exactly what you want from us this morning, so that it's productive.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Glenn. Let me state this again, then. We have on the screen at the moment the ATLAS II group reports. What I started with was ATLAS II working group and we looked at the ATLAS II planning, execution and lessons learned [PBS], which was Eduardo's feedback document.

After that, we will be looking at the ATLAS II Survey Group. At the moment, unfortunately, Wolf is unavailable, so there is no feedback on the Survey Group, although Eduardo has said a few words about the survey group in his own report.

Then we have the ATLAS II Events Group where there is a report as you can see that is on the table. Then the ATLAS II Sponsor Group has a report as well.

Then the next one is, if we scroll down, the ATLAS II Logistics Group.

Each one of these groups has a report. Some of the recommendations on those reports might be duplicate. The question I am asking you all – and I'll leave you a little bit of time to read through these or sift through these – if we have duplicate recommendations, should we actually make a consolidated document with all of our recommendations for the future ATLAS implementers, which is what Murray thought would be a good idea, or should we just leave it as such and the people in two years' time who will be implementing or be putting together ATLAS III will just look at the Wiki page and read through the whole document?

We have a choice: A or B. I hope that's clear now. The rest of it will later, but this is what we're looking at at the moment. Tijani Ben Jemma? I'm afraid, Tijani, we cannot hear you at the moment. You must be muted. I think that's Tijani. Ah, here we go. Tijani has dropped off. So maybe something went wrong with Tijani's connection.

We've got Holly Raiche. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a quick comment. I'm not sure that we're going to get through everything you want to do in under about three hours, quite honestly. I'm thinking it may make more sense for the actual people who worked on the process itself to develop one document. I think we all agree there should be one document on lessons learned, even if there are subsections.

Then those of us who weren't involved in the actual planning of it – so [inaudible] the thematic group leaders to actually have another call and put together the lessons we learned, which I think are possibly different. There may be some overlap, but I think it's a huge task for us to actually change all of the recommendations into one in today's call and then go on to 49 recommendations. I just think that's a huge task to do now.

I think that probably the people who have written the group report should be the ones who concentrate on their report, and then we do something else. I'm just thinking this is a huge task, absolutely huge, and maybe this should be done over two or three calls as well, so that we all can concentrate on the bits that we did because we are now concentrating or talking about stuff that we were not a part of, so there has to be lots of explanations and stuff.

It's just my thought that maybe this is a huge task and we can do it in bite-sized chunks over the next, say, two or three calls. Otherwise I think it's going to be a three-hour call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much for this, Holly. I was actually aiming for a six-hour call, but [inaudible] would be great.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, it wouldn't. I won't be here. I can tell you right now, I will not be here. [laughs]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've got enough munchies for six hours. I'm kidding.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I'd like to sleep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a very good point, Holly. I note in the chat that some people – in fact, most people – say it would be good to have maybe not a one-pager, but a shorter document put together that consolidates all of our reports and the lessons learned and so on, but there are also mentions in there that we should not be deleting any of the draft reports that have been – or the originated reports that we have drafted here, so as to not end up with losing the meat of the report itself.

That sounds like a good thing. Having a summary of all of our recommendations for the future themes, and then having those reports – this Wiki page is kept as is basically [inaudible] rough report.

Let's see. We've got Alan Greenberg, and then Tijani Ben Jemma. Oh, by the way. One last thing. I think your idea, Holly, of actually having a follow-up team work on this is excellent. I was never hoping we would be doing all of that today. [inaudible]. The only thing that is really time-

critical today are the recommendations [inaudible] thematic group recommendations and I will be going into these in a moment.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A couple of things. First of all, I think we want to really separate lessons learned in running ATLAS and what we need to think about for the next one. We need to separate those from recommendations of explicit other changes to make, because they really fall in two categories and they're going to be looked at by two different people.

That being said, I think there's no question in my mind that we need to have a consolidated list that is coherent and is understood and can be implemented. There may well be recommendations that made lots of sense in London, but in the light of day, we have questions about them or issues have come up. There are going to be duplicates and there's going to be lack of clarity. There inevitably is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan, I'm sorry to stop you here, but you are actually mixing the two together. Let's start again. We're dealing here with the consolidation of our process of what we have learned as an organizing committee in organizing ATLAS II. The thematic group recommendations are entirely separate and I wouldn't want to mention them in the same sentence.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Well, people have been using the terms almost interchangeably, which is why I was agreeing that they are separate. We want to make sure we do not mix the two. I think they are very different things.

And regardless of which category they're in, my other comments were applicable. There are likely to be overlap. There are things that don't quite make sense. There are things we don't understand. So I think they have to be [inaudible], certainly not on this telephone call or perhaps any telephone call, because I don't think there's much chance of actually addressing the issues whether they're organizing issues or other recommendations in other areas, unless we do that kind of preparatory work and have a document we can work from and assign tasks afterwards and check our progress. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. I think we are in [inaudible] agreement. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I do agree with what was said about a consolidated list of recommendations and keeping the report. I think the way we worked in the organizing committee was very good because we had the sub-committees or subgroups [inaudible] specific issues. This is something that would make the work easier because there is a set of [rules] and it makes people responsible for their part.

Their report, even if there is an overlap, have to be there, because next time when the group who will deal with the same issue [inaudible] will

have at least a report about what was done. So I think it is [inaudible].
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Tijani. That sounds pretty good. Next we have Carlos Aguirre. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Hello, this is Carlos. Thank you. I agree with what has been said before. I agree with condensing all the recommendations or putting together all the recommendations in a general document. This general or overall document has to include all these global or general recommendations for the next group for our successors who will be organizing the next ATLAS meeting.

And definitely I agree in that we should not be deleting the recommendations made or drafted by each subgroup, thematic group, etc. So that [inaudible] be very, very important. And sometimes when we condense things in one general document, we may not be including specific aspects of every group work. Thank you.

I agree in having a general document for the organization, the future organization, of these events and I believe that Eduardo's word is really excellent and it should be taken into account for future overall recommendations. That's it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Carlos. Just one thing. You mentioned again the thematic group recommendations. The thematic group recommendations are a totally separate process to the report that we are working on at the moment. So [inaudible] working under the moment are aimed at the next group of ATLAS organizers two years from now so that they learn from our mistakes on how we organized the ATLAS II, so they have an even better ATLAS III. In fact, we might spend less time discussing some issues which could cost some time to work out because they would just be able to read from our experience.

So seeing that we are all in agreement on this, Holly mentioned the setting up as a working group. I think several people were interested. I would like to ask for volunteers for a working group that will consolidate – or it's not even a working group, because we're all part of this follow-up. But for a small thing that would be effectively putting all of these lessons learned into one document and conduct maybe a couple of calls, probably two or three calls to put together that consolidated document.

Could I ask for volunteers on this? I'm glad to see so many people are putting a little green tick. It's great to make the suggestion, but then who's going to lead that?

Leon Sanchez, you have the floor. Leon and Holly are typing. It's not by typing that you will not get noted. In fact, quite the contrary. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's not fair. My suggestion that there be a working group of those who were involved in the actual process of the thing and then for both of us who were involved in actually running the thematic groups, that would be a separate group, probably fewer people, possibly not, to consolidate all the reports that we've done and come up with a one-pager. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're saying we should have two different themes, then? One team that looks at the process of all of our working groups and the other one – or all of our ATLAS II working group and the other one looks at the process of the thematic groups. That would be double duty, wouldn't it?

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't know. I know that my experience was what happened with the Wiki and what happened on the date. I wasn't involved in the organizing, so I don't have any experience with that. So I don't know whether my experience would be called for to combine the recommendations. That's a question, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Holly. If I understand you correctly, you're asking whether we should make sure that this small group should have people both from the thematic groups organizational part and also from the ATLAS II Working Group organizational part. Is that—

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Very good point. Murray McKercher?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: So I would agree with the comments from Holly, that we separate those two issues, the process issues, and we create one report from all the reports that have been presented on the call to this point and that the thematic group reports and implementation are a separate topic. And I would volunteer for the first part of coordinating those processes. I was involved in both the process and in the role with the thematic group, so I was involved in both areas. So I would agree with Holly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Murray. So you'd like to work on the process follow-up?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thank you So we've got – I see Leon is volunteering for something. Holly is probably going to be on that group as well. Murray McKercher we have as well. We need maybe a couple more people who were involved in the thematic groups. I see Eduardo. Eduardo, of course that would be great. Maybe that's enough. The four of you can then just look at the ps. And Carlos Aguirre. Okay, perfect.

The four of you have this Wiki page in front of you which has all of the reports. Hopefully we will be receiving more reports, because I know that a couple of the boxes are still not filled up. I've noticed that some of the reports are not actually fully updated or do not have the actual lessons learned.

For example, Glenn, you filed a report explaining the Fayre, but it would be interesting to have a report on what challenges you faced in organizing the Fayre. I can certainly think of, for example, the music – the lighting thing for the music, which gave us a real huge headache. And I can think of the band and having the equipment and catering and all of these things. There must be a lot of things that need to be learned from that organization of the Fayre, which would be usable or which the group would have to think about next time we have a Fayre like this.

So if you can focus on that maybe with a couple of other people as well, that would be helpful. But I think we've got a plan for that. Leon, Eduardo, Murray, Holly, and Carlos. And of course, staff with follow up with any of the boxes which are not filled in yet, so as for your small group to be able to have – so Gisella I guess will follow up with all those that haven't provided a record of their activities and lessons learned. That would be good. Heidi, you ask only one group or two? One group. Let me start again. We're dealing with agenda item number three, one group. Afterwards, we might be looking at another group, but not right now. Just one. Glenn McKnight, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Since you mentioned my name in particular, Olivier, yes, I'm more than happy to give a synopsis of what worked and what didn't, but I looked at the other reports that were coming in and they avoided very critical comments. So if you want that sort of observational type mundane stuff, I'm happy to do that. I'll put something together and toss it over the wall.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Glenn. It would be helpful for us to know what challenges we have faced – and you have faced – in organizing the Fayre. It was, certainly I think by everyone's account, a great achievement. It was a fantastic Fayre. But what were the really hard things there?

I think even though [inaudible] as any of the material that needed to be ready on the tables and stuff like that, maybe we could share some of our time tables to know how long before the Fayre happened that we need to have all of the material ready, all of the RALOs ready, etc.? That would be a significant side of the report.

Heidi, mailing list and all of that stuff is just mundane stuff. We can follow up afterwards. Gisella will be able to follow up with the people who are dealing with the reports.

Okay. Now this is one part of the call. Now the next part is going to be our ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce. This is going to be a topic in the even larger process than we have at the moment. That's agenda item number four. Is the agenda updated? No, the agenda is still not updated. Okay. So we'll have to look at the Implementation Taskforce

Wiki page, which is going to be on your screen in a moment hopefully. Right now I put it in the chat.

So we've got these 49 or so recommendations. These were sent as a report with the recommendations and then the appendices from each one of the thematic groups, and each one of these thematic groups – can we just change the thing on the screen please? Because it's confusing otherwise if we have the agenda item three rather than four.

So each one of these thematic groups produced its own report. These are included in the appendices of the ATLAS II declaration. The declaration was sent to the chair of the Board. It got sent to chairs of each one of these supporting organizations and advisory committees. It was sent also to each one of our sponsors with each time a little introduction note asking for feedback, etc.

We've also started a process by which the declaration has been posted up on the Wiki. It's not a public comment. It's a request for anyone who wishes to comment on our declaration, on the ATLAS II declaration, to comment on it. The e-mail address goes directly to our At-Large staff. The aim is not for us to produce a report of the feedback that we have received and to change the recommendations accordingly, but it is a little bit more like taking the temperature of the room – of the world, I guess – out there who have read our recommendations and to see if they agree with it or if they think that we might have missed anything for the future of At-Large, the future of ICANN, the future of the space that we have [inaudible].

So we've not put a deadline for this input to come in. I think we can leave it running for a couple of months, see if we've got any feedback that we received from people that we could perhaps utilize in our own working groups and in our own follow-up process. But we definitely are not going to spend any time synthesizing the inputs that we get from the outside world. We've already got 150 ALSes that brought their input and that's really enough to start this, especially when you look at the number of recommendations we have here.

Now, the feedback that I have received so far from the Board has been that the Board was pleased to see the declaration. The Board is likely to ratify a note of thanks for the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Organizing Committee and for At-Large as a whole for having produced these recommendations.

However, there has been some – I would say confusion, but certainly some questions from the Board as to saying, well, which one of these recommendations are aimed at us? What do we have to do from these?

So the first question that has been asked was, well, can you just point out which one of the recommendations are – first, are these recommendations like ALAC advice with a capital "A" or are these just recommendations where we can read those things and not do anything about it?

And my response was immediately that, because it was a declaration signed off by 150 or so At-Large Structures, this was actually even stronger than an ALAC statement, which is only signed off by the 15-

member ALAC on behalf of our community. So that was the first confusion that we cleared up.

But then the next thing was, well, the Board is really interested in having some feedback – well, actually, not some feedback, but having an expansion of those recommendations. Each one of the ones that are aimed at the Board we should clearly mark it and say, “These are the recommendations that the ALAC is sending to you. That’s what we want you to do.” So you will have noted that in the event of summarizing all of the work that was done, the declaration sometimes has just a one-liner recommendation which will then need a little bit of expansion. Sometimes three or four lines maybe focusing on specific tasks that the Board has to do, if the Board is involves or that ICANN staff has to pursue or that the ALAC has to pursue or that ICANN SOs and ACs has to pursue. That’s our next [step], effective.

The other thing is some SO and AC chairs have come back to me – and in fact some community members outside of our community. So some other supporting organizations have come back to me and said they are now in charge of the follow-up process and they are interested in working with us in implementing that recommendation, or at least in discussing that recommendation with us during the next meeting we are going to have with them.

So my suggestion was, as we now have about 45 minutes left in our call, was to go through our 49 recommendations just reading through them, open some preliminary work and allocating the recipient of each one of these recommendations. I wanted to obtain the green light from you to

say yes that's correct, or no that's not correct, and maybe tell me then where that recommendation should go.

And then also, if we have the time, to task a follow-up to expand on that recommendation. So either the follow-up would be an At-Large ATLAS II Follow-up Working Group, which by the way is one of the tasks that we have to do now – create an At-Large Follow-up Working Group. Or it gets even better – an At-Large Follow-up Implementation Taskforce is the name. That's the first thing. Or to allocate into our already existing, pre-existing working groups, and say, "You have two weeks (or three weeks) to expand that recommendation with your working groups and come back to us with a recommend that is usable, or to allocate it to a process by which we will engage an SO or an AC, or even engage the Board." This is for us to decide at this moment in time.

I hope I've been clear on that. I saw Glenn has put his hand up. So Glenn, you have the floor if you have any questions. [inaudible] for questions or comments.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

If I understand you correctly, you're looking for feedback on each of these recommendations. If that's the case, I just need to ask the first question, the first recommendation. I like to have a definition of what you mean in terms of broader audience. I'm unclear what you mean by broader. Are you looking at constituencies or stakeholders that are under-represented within our ALS communities? That was unclear on the first recommendation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much for this, Glenn. You've hit the nail exactly on the head. You're absolutely correct. This is a recommendation that would be [inaudible] to the Board, and that was exactly the question I was asked by the Board members that inquired about this.

I guess the only way we can resolve this is by expanding on this and having – and I would certainly say having the chair of that working group, and I would believe, because it's recommendation one, it's probably thematic group one, so the chair or moderator of thematic group one expand that first recommendation into a small paragraph with specific tasks that the Board should do. I'm just saying expand – I'm not saying imagination an expansion. No. I'm saying expand from the material that the relevant working group had, TG1, had.

Would that be helpful, Glenn? Yes, okay. I see that. Any other comments on this? Are we all okay with the process that I'm suggesting here? You can see in the meantime, Ariel is performing some – I believe it is Ariel who's sharing her screen – is performing some magic by having that specific note added to the document.

Glenn has lost his voice. You should not speak as loudly, and maybe it will work. All right. So [need] definition of [inaudible], i.e. underrepresented communities. So maybe add this on the [books]. Excellent.

So I think we started moving into this. We have 25 minutes, so let's go then into number two, ICANN should increase support budget and staff to programs having brought valuable members to the community. I [inaudible] as being aimed at the ICANN Board and ICANN staff. So in

the note, I would suggest saying [to] programs having brought valuable members to the community. Maybe we should say what are these programs that we want more funding of, and ask – I would define the programs that brought valuable members to the community. Any thoughts on this?

[inaudible], exactly. Leon has already got the answer for this. I'm looking specifically here – because this is going to be an iterative process, so we need to just go through this page first one time quickly, and then afterwards, we'll go through the iteration and I guess each one of these thematic group chairs to which these recommendations [inaudible] be able to fill the answers [inaudible].

Carlos Aguirre, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: This is Carlos speaking. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can. Please go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you. Regarding recommendation number two, well, I would add a note that is related to the prior recommendation number one. I would add a note regarding budget allocations and staff allocations to valuable members of the community. Well, that has or is closely linked to the increase or improvement in our outreach programs.

I have been proposing this for several years now. I believe that when we speak about necessary budget and staff allocations, it isn't that much because we have plenty of people in other regions that are interested in engaging in participating as volunteers without any budget at all.

So maybe what is needed is to coordinate their participation in this necessary outreach to improve the knowledge of ICANN and ALAC At-Large within the community.

So in this note, I would say the following or write the following. Imagine or think about possibilities to improve our participation with a lower budget. There are plenty of interested people in the region and we need to identify these people that are interested in participating in order to improve ICANN and ALAC outreach. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much, Carlos. So that would be recommendation number two, but then what you're then saying is think of ways to do more with less budget, basically. Or optimize our budget. I would imagine that would be aimed at the ALAC's Finance and Budget Sub-committee. Or should we also have our ALAC capacity – well, not capacity building because this is [inaudible] or outreach. Carlos, could you expand on this, please? Who should this be sent to? Is this also an ALAC Finance and Budget Sub-committee thing or is it also going to be an ALAC Outreach Working Group topic or an ALAC Capacity Building Working Group topic?

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you, Olivier. I think that if there is an outreach committee or working group or engagement and commitment working group within ALAC, well, I believe it is that group that should be taking on this role. If not, in order to promote ideas or reformulate or reshape our outreach activities to work with a lower budget by working with valuable members of the community, well, we should set up a very small working group with two or three members (no more) in charge of promoting these ideas that can then be shared with the community and the ALAC so that these ideas may be approved as necessary. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. I think we've captured the ALAC Finance and Budget Sub-committee. Let's put also Outreach Sub-committee on this, please. Next, Tijani Ben Jemaa, bearing in mind it's only [inaudible] to just allocate tasks to our sub-committees and [inaudible]. Tijani, sorry, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. I am sorry, the quality of the line is not good, so I don't think that I heard you. I hear you speaking about the capacity building or ALAC Capacity Building Working Group. I beg your pardon, could you please tell me what you said about that, if I have something to respond?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. There isn't any follow up yet. The recommendation number two says, "ICANN should increase support [budget and staff] to programs having brought valuable members to the community." Carlos

suggested that this, in addition to being a task for the ICANN Board and ICANN staff, this is also a task for the ALAC Outreach Sub-committee, the ALAC Capacity Building Committee and the At-Large Finance and Budget Sub-committee to think of ways to optimize the budget that we have. How to use our budget better.

No need to answer this now because that will be a task that these committees will have on their table as an action item at that point, so they can then convene a meeting of their working group and come up with answers and come back to us with it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, let's move on. Let's go to three, ICANN should continue to shape an accountability model, reaching not only Board members, but all parts of the ICANN community in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment. This I felt was aimed at the ICANN Board, ICANN staff and the ICANN community, and this could feed into the ICANN accountability process, and of course without wanting to redefine everything, that also will feed then in our work towards the ICANN accountability process. Are we okay with this or do you suggest [inaudible] to something else? If you're okay with this, put a green tick. If you're not, then put your hand up. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I think this issue should be given to the Future Challenge Working Group [inaudible] be in charge of accountability At-Large, the At-Large contributions and the accountability of ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. That's what I was suggesting, that it goes into the At-Large accountability process. I didn't say specifically that Future Challenges Working Group, because at the moment, yes, it is given to the Future Challenges Working Group, but we might have to expand on these things. But that's what I meant by At-Large Accountability Working Group.

I see a lot of green ticks on this, so that's okay. Let's move to the next one. The next one is ICANN should study the possibly of enhancing and increasing the role of liaisons between its [inaudible] advisory committees and supporting organizations to do away with a siloed culture. This was going to be aimed at the ICANN SO and AC and I was going to suggest that the ALT gets tasked with starting work on this. I'm of course open to any other suggestions.

Okay, I see some green ticks. Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just have a question about this item. I was thinking here about having liaisons from other SOs and ACs into ALAC or increasing the number of liaisons within ALAC to other SOs and ACs, for all of the At-Large.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. That's a very good question, and the answer is I don't know. It's very open. It's interesting, yeah. I mean, do we mind having other SOs and ACs write to us or do we mind having – yeah, whichever. That will really depend on what we're proposed, what is proposed to us, I guess. Because, certainly, we do have some liaisons at the moment. We've got liaison for GNSO, liaison for ccNSO, liaison for dot-mobi. These are the three bylaw-mandated liaisons that we have. We also have a non-bylaw-mandated liaison with the NCSG, which is a more informal liaison.

The only two liaisons that are currently funded to come to an ICANN meeting are our ccNSO and GNSO liaisons. The dot-mobi is not. But they have a lot of calls for us to discuss with the GAC to look at the possibility of having a GAC liaison, for example. Or we could have a possibility of having a liaison – oh yes, we have an SSAC liaison already as well. That's also bylaw-mandated and that's not currently funded. We could have a liaison with the RSSAC, for example. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to say, while you're mentioning our last one was from ALAC to all these [inaudible] sessions. I'm not sure, do we have liaisons from any of those [inaudible] into ALAC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. With regards to the ccNSO, we have Ron who is a liaison from the ccNSO into the ALAC. I don't think we have any others. I don't know. [inaudible] ccNSO. Alan, do we have anyone from the

GNSO? I don't think we have anyone in the GNSO allocated to the ALAC, do we?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Neither of us in either direction have expressed an interest.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, there you go.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Curious about this. I don't want to dwell on this. I'm just curious about how we – [inaudible] liaisons between everybody [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. Again, is this going to be for the ALT to engage in asking whether there is a take for this type of activity for a liaison or reverse liaison with the SOs and ACs that we currently don't have liaisons with. I don't think we should impose a liaison on anyone else if [inaudible] are not ready to receive the liaison. [inaudible]. Except if we absolutely hate someone enough to send them to a very [inaudible].

Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I have a brief comment. I don't know if it's relevant or more internal to ALAC. I think that strengthening the liaison position is relevant, but we have to focus on training people that, in the future, might be able to [replay] these liaisons. I know that Alan has worked very hard to have an apprentice or to mentor someone as his successor and the rest of us have not followed suit. So I believe that the liaison has to work inwardly within ALAC to train successors for the future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Fatima. Maybe we can add this as a comment on this point. Alan Greenberg, and then we'll move to the next recommend. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can second Fatima's comment, although I'm not quite sure I've had that much success in doing it. It's one thing to ask for people who want to be mentored. It's another to actually get them. And that's been a lot harder to do and something that indeed we need to focus on far more than we are right now. It's not just a matter of replacing the liaison. The liaison can't be the only person who cares about something. So we have work to do [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you for this, Alan. Staff has added "to develop training and mentoring opportunities for future successors of the liaisons." Perfect. Excellent.

Number five, ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end users remain at the heart of the accountability in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.

Wow, that's a good recommendation – aimed at the ICANN Board, ICANN staff, and ICANN communities. Could this seed into the ICANN Accountability Working Group? I did this very hastily. I think maybe this could feed also into the At-Large IANA Issues Working Group, although I'm well aware in fact that this is already being in implementation because this is what we have been asking for in the IANA Issues Working Group, and so far the response hasn't been that great.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have your hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. My comment is on the condition number four. Can we suggest that we appoint a second person to be always with the liaison so that the [inaudible] will be done automatically? I mean by that that each liaison had to have a shadow, someone who is behind him and who follows all of what you do for that [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Tijani. I'm just concerned we're now starting to dig too deep into each one of those recommendations, when really what we're doing here is to point the work at a specific committee. Here, the ALT is tasked to work on this item. It already mentioned training and mentoring opportunities for future successes of liaisons. That would also probably include a discussion on whether there could be a shadow

liaison or someone shadowing, whether it's financially or even physically possible. That really would be the ALT working on it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Olivier. I just needed to suggest that we also make clear – and I'm happy that the ALT take this task on – one of the guidance points for what needs to be done is to develop a clear understanding and coordination with whomever one is planning to liaise with.

Just on the point of what Tijani made, it's all very good for us to say, "People should have an understudy," but in some cases – SSAC, for example - the answer would be no from the receiving body. That's a body that we've got [inaudible] established and I think quite successful liaison relationship with.

Now, to change the immediate answer from something like no would take a little bit of work. I think it could be changed from an automatic no, but that groundwork has to be done, because [inaudible] tasked with this sort of relationship needs to have [common understanding] and it may not always be a uniform understanding of how things could be better facilitated. These are medium- to long-term things in some cases as well. But just wanted to make sure that the term "coordination" came into the line as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you for this, Cheryl. I don't know how to capture what you've just said into the discussion that the ALT will have. I note that

several ALT members will here. I'm hoping for their collective memory, so that when the discussion takes place, we both deal with what Tijani has mentioned just now – a suggestion from Tijani for the shadowing, and also your suggestion where there's certainly collaboration needed there. It's going to be a discussion with the other SOs and ACs and I don't expect all of them to say yes. In fact, as you very rightly said, some of them will say no, maybe because they're not ready, maybe because they don't want this sort of thing at the moment, maybe because they're not structured for something like this or maybe because it introduces problems in their community for something like that to happen.

All right. Let's move on then. Number six. I believe we've gone through five and there's no further comments on five. Number six, ICANN's multi-stakeholder model should serve as the reference and encouraging all participants, individuals or parties to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest each time vote takes place or consensus is [inaudible].

This was for ICANN Board, ICANN staff, ICANN communities. I was going to suggest this could feed into the input that the At-Large representatives on the ICANN accountability process would be proposing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I like that one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any comments? I can see a green tick on there. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think this is one that maps pretty well to what I said earlier, that it's a nice concept. I think the wording needs to be refined. What sounded good at this point in time I don't think is realistic. For people to update their [inaudible] statement of interest on a regular basis or identify conflict when they're about to come up, fine. But to update their statements of interest every time there's a consensus decision or anytime there's a vote or something I think is not practical. So the wording needs to be refined. The intent is 100% something we need to do. And in fact, [it would] have to get most parts of the organization. It doesn't [inaudible] in At-Large, but it does certainly happen within the GNSO and we know [it] happens in the Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. I'm going to disagree slightly with you. I understand it's hard for this to take place, but I would certainly say these are recommendations. We have to aim for Mars if we want to land on the moon. It's just one of these things. I would certainly be against toning down any of our recommendations and saying, "Oh, that will never happen," because if we do that, then nothing will happen at all. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think I'm toning down the intent at all. Let me look at the words. "To declare and update existing or potential conflict each time a vote

takes place,” as opposed to at the beginning of every meeting where votes take place. No. [inaudible] kind of thing I’m saying. I’m certainly not saying we want to tone down the intent at all. Just the wording there I think is less-than realistic, not because it’s hard, but because it’s not practical.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. So I understand, you don’t want to change the intent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You want to change the implementation side. But that obviously will be the – or [inaudible] into the ICANN accountability process [inaudible] At-Large Accountability Working Group that’s going to be the Future Challenges Working Group, I guess. They will be coming into [inaudible] that actually is doable.

ALAN GREENBERG: All I was saying is it’s an example where working I think needs to be refined. This should not be a [make work] activity. This should be something which [inaudible] accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Next we have number seven. There it says “[inaudible] review of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model

should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN’s constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision-making requirement in the corporation.”

That [inaudible] is aimed at the ICANN Board. Would this also be feeding into the ICANN accountability process or is that something else? How would you recommend that we tackle this recommendation? Do we engage the ICANN Board directly? Do we go into the accountability process assuming that the input that the At-Large will have in the accountability process review – [inaudible] this is a key component of what we want. [inaudible] review of the multi-stakeholder model.

Any thoughts, questions, comments? I don’t see anyone moving on this one. Is anyone against feeding this into the ICANN accountability process? Okay, I see no one against it, so in it goes.

Next one, number eight. The ALAC has the duty to keep track of action taken on all of the above recommendations. Here that’s aimed firmly at the ALAC. The question is should it be the work of the ALAC or of the ALT to keep track of these, keep track of the actions taken on all the above recommendations? Or should we ask staff to keep track of all the actions? I can see Heidi is shivering at the thought of having to track every single bit. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It’s an ALAC responsibility. How it’s implemented is a different issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. But who do we send this to? Are we going to get the ALAC to discuss it or are we going to get the ALT to discuss it? We need to transform this, give it to someone as an action item to proceed forward with. We can just have it as ALAC, but we need to get a starting point for this. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I think it is a task for ALAC an ALAC should discuss it. Of course ALAC can give it to the ALT to give [inaudible] afterwards, but first the discussion should be done in ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ALAC, thank you. Okay, so let's do it. Thank you, Tijani. Let's do it. ALAC will be in charge of this. And I can certainly think that would be then given on to a working group or some kind of tracking device or some way for us to be able to track recommendations and how they work with the Board, automated systems or something that we could be working on or it could be given to the ALT and the ALAC chair to go and discuss bilaterally with the Board, because we know that the Board is tracking recommendations – or supposed to be tracking recommendations – and yet the system was presented, but I haven't seen it being updated recently, etc. Good, up to the ALAC.

Number nine, ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy subject to cost-benefit analysis focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing and where such growth is more likely to occur.

That's aimed at the ICANN Board and ICANN staff. How do with follow-up on this? Do we give this over to the ALAC to put forward some proposals or expand on this? Who's going to be expanding on this, or is this good enough as just a standing one-liner?

One of the feedback I can certainly imagine on this is going to be from the Board will be, "Well, you are the ones with the ALSes [inaudible]. Where is access to the Internet going? Where is such growth more likely to occur? Where should we open new regional offices?" Would you be okay with answering such a question of we were asked that? Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes, I think it's a question we can help answer. ALAC can go and check on the [inaudible] regional offices and see if they are supporting [inaudible] then we can suggest the Board. Or do they open new regional offices. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Eduardo. Should we pass this on to the Outreach Working Group? Ariel [inaudible] so fast into typing this in there, but this is just a question mark. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. I'm not sure it should belong to a working group at this stage. My reason is [inaudible] this specific one is read could be interpreted to suggest that we don't understand the strategy. And one of the interpretations could be there seems to be doubt that there is a

strategy. I would suggest of course there is a strategy. We may not be privy to all the gory details of it yet.

There's a bunch of pre questions that need to be worked through on this. And to that end, I would suggest it's probably better to leave it to ALAC or ALT at this stage until the fact-finding, the analysis, the ability to find out what is already planned, etc., what the criteria are that are needed to trigger the creation of a regional office or sub-regional office, etc. So there's a whole bunch of homework that needs to be done, and I'm not too sure that that belongs at a working group yet. Once established, then it may be that the outcome is and you will now work more closely with the working group in these areas. I think it might be a bit too soon to put it out to a working group. I think it should be kept rather more at the ALAC or even ALT level. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. Maybe then we just send it to the ALAC for the time being. Is that what you're saying will be easiest?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I'll harp on the same sort of thing. I don't know what the strategy is, but I would dearly like to hope that our CEO and senior staff have a strategy already, not that we should develop one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that the Board has been brief on what this strategy is. We are opening regional offices and centers with a variety of other names in a lot of places in the world. Maybe it's a random ad hoc, they stick pins in a map, but I suspect there is some strategy involved here and some criteria to decide when and where to open these things, and I think the first step is to try to understand what it is, and of course in an open and accountable organization, it should be trivial to get a hold of that strategy document. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. It certainly then consolidates the [inaudible] followed up by the ALAC. So the ALAC can then expand on this recommendation and basically say, in there could ask the ICANN Board – [inaudible] just send it to the ALAC. I'm just mentioning here. No need to [say] everything I say here. But ALAC could extend on this recommendation. They could ask the Board is there a strategy, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think the first step is to ask staff, “Can we have a copy of the strategy document, please?”

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ha, ha. I was not laughing.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, you weren’t.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Staff could try this as a [inaudible] I had a nervous laugh was because it seems to be very hard at the moment to get any of those strategy documents in an easy way. Let’s hope we can do that. I know what the answer will be. The answer will be, “Oh, we can come and speak to you at the next ICANN meeting on Sunday morning and explain to you what we’re going to do with all of our global stakeholder engagement people.” But we’re having that anyway. We will have that anyway – a global stakeholder engagement on the Sunday in Los Angeles. Maybe that will be one of the things that will happen. Let’s move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I’m not at my desk right now. I can’t put up my hand. You’re the one who said before reach for the sky. I think we should ask for the strategy document. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Good point. I stand corrected. I should close my mouth when I have the chance to. Let's move to the next one. [inaudible] strategy document definitely, but of course following up, [inaudible]. Let's ask for the document before LA. We need that document now, please. Or ASAP

Number 10, the next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of light-scribing for all meetings and generally extend the current interpretation and translation processes and make translation available in a timely manner.

That was a very, very interesting recommendation, very strong recommendation. That I suggested was to be followed up directly with ICANN staff. Well, aimed at ICANN staff language services. Who will be following up on this? Is this something that the ALAC as a whole will follow up on or do we have a working group or a sub-committee that will follow-up directly regarding languages?

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think this is an area where we need a small standing group who thinks about language and cares about it and identifies problems. As Heidi might know, I was told yesterday that ICANN is currently in the process of translating the travel summary for London.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No one else has any reaction to that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly have a reaction, because I'm wondering how they can be translating the one from London, maybe the one for Los Angeles.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no. I didn't misspeak. I said London. It's going to help a lot of the people who didn't speak English who went to London.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's very helpful. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Timely is the word at issue here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a question. Oh, this is great. Already Fatima has put her hand up. I had a question for Fatima, because I remember that there was a group that looked specifically at language matters. Maybe we can see if that group can work on that. Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. As you know, this topic, this translation document topic, is very important for LACRALO. This topic has been raised on

countless occasions. We held our general assembly in London and our documents were not ready in English. They were originally drafted in Spanish. We were able to conduct only very general discussing because the documents were nor ready.

So I agree with *timely* translations. There is no use or no point in having it late translation. Silvia from staff is not in charge of translations because we have a translation staff, and she is helping us with this. Maybe we could increase the budget for translation. I don't know how to solve it, but definitely we need to work on this topic.

Regarding your question, Olivier, I don't know if you mean a group within LACRALO or where. I missed that bit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fatima. I was going to suggest a group within At-Large. Whether it's a formal or informal group, they need to follow up on this recommendation and they need to provide a paragraph to then present formally either to the Language Services Department or to the Board. I don't know where the process is right now and we don't have time to decide exactly who that will be sent to, but certainly to tackle that problem.

Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you, Olivier. This recommendation is very precise. It is about meetings only. I do support it heavily because it is a problem of [inaudible] first. Because the transcript is done according to the

translation, to the interpretation, and generally the interpretation is not always that precise, so we will have a transcript which is not precise.

So having a [nice] transcript is a very important thing for me, and [inaudible] had to have the translation of the transcript, perhaps easier [inaudible] because we will have something [nice], so the delay will be shorter.

If we speak about language, there's a lot of problems and Alan raised a very important point and there is lots of them. Fatima, too. There is a lot of points.

So I think that a standing working group or standing committee working on languages in ALAC and At-Large is something very good for us, and it will be the task for this standing group to follow on this recommendation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. You have a taskforce on accessibility that just has part of its mandate to look at and help ICANN improve on any areas which are impediments to engagement and participation, and I think this falls firmly under that remit. I think you have a taskforce that is looking at all manners of engagement and language accessibility be it Swahili or be it sign language. It's the same principles. It's the same issue. And as Tijani just said, is often dependent on good and timely access to transcription, be it transcribing in good time, later after a

meeting has happened from a recording or mp3 so that then other language versions, even if they are to be a screen reader for the deaf or to be changed into the [inaudible] language, whatever it is, can be done in a timely way.

So I would suggest you use existing working groups you've got that will be doing similar work in other areas. It's just an accessibility issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. I was going to go back to Tijani, but I can see there's Dev in the queue, and then Tijani afterwards. So Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. The Accessibility Working Group is one working group, but I think also the Technology Taskforce could also look at – it could be a collaborative effort to try to see if we can also work with the language services to try to help implement this recommendation. That's it. I have some ideas, actually, but this is not the time for that call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Very well, thank you for this, Dev. Next we have Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. I agree with Cheryl that it can be in the Accessibility Working Group, but if it's [inaudible] like this, I suppose that a dedicated

subgroup will be assigned the task of looking at the language problem because they are very diverse, they are very – we have them everywhere. We have the interpretation problem, we have the translation problem. I think the most important problems are translation.

Now ICANN is working very hard on the translation of the website and I am on a group who is working [inaudible]. I think that ALAC has to have a standing body that's specific – a specific and dedicated body – to the languages. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Tijani. I note Alan, you have a green tick, but your hand is also up.

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand is not up. I had the green tick when Cheryl suggested giving this to the Accessibility Group and I forgot to put it down. My hand is up now because I just clicked the button to turn off the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Cheryl, how does that sound to you? Tijani's response and also Dev's response?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Tijani is clearly watching the working pages, the Accessibility Taskforce very closely, because working to specialty areas is exactly

what that taskforce is planning to do as it moves into its work stream. But at the moment, it's running a prioritization analysis on its existing tasks. As you point out, Tijani, you can't do all things at the same time. You get into resource issues. But sub-units of expertise is one of the things we're doing.

And Dev, you must've had your ears burning also at our last call because there was a number of times when it was recognized that we will be needing to work very closely with and interact with the Technology Taskforce. So I would say collaborative work is the answer indeed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Fantastic. Thank you very much, Cheryl. This is therefore going to be sent. And I think also recommendation number 11, ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria – gender, cultural diversity, and users need [inaudible], etc. So both 10 and 11 should be sent to the Accessibility Working Group, or should be addressed by the Accessibility Working Group in coordination with the Technology Taskforce.

We've reached recommendation number 11. We are at the one-and-a-half hour mark of this call. It's not the end of the world. We still have plenty of recommendations to look at, but at least I think we're now chugging along quite well on this table, and [inaudible] managed to go through 11 of these. We should then continue during our next call next week. And because we will only be focusing on this next week, and perhaps just with a 5 or 10-minute update on the other process where

we allocated a small team to deal with the process about process, then we will be able to finish that table and start the work going.

Any comments or questions about what we're doing at the moment? Is that how you envisioned it to be? I think we've made some good progress here. I thank all of you.

Fatima Cambronero, you have your hand up.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you, Olivier. I have a general or overall question. We are thinking about holding several calls to address these recommendations, but my question is do we have a set implementation timeframe for these recommendations or are we going to set this timeframe or deadline? How are we going to go about that?

Apart from seeing or reviewing recommendations one by one, we should have work done. And my apologies if you explained this at the beginning of the call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Fatima. You've touched on a very good point. The timeframe that we have is actually somehow set by the external processes [out there]. It is my understanding that the Board would like to get moving with our recommendations as soon as possible. So I would suggest that any recommendations that would be aimed at the Board that just require not work by At-Large, but just refining by the ALAC an additional paragraph, any of these recommendations I would suggest we would have to work on pretty quickly, hoping we could

actually have a proposal – a request for the Board to look at in Los Angeles.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, and then I have to close the call because we are six minutes beyond the end of the call. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I think that the timeline has to be done by the group who will work on the recommendation. We can not decide [inaudible] working group regarding the recommendation about language, about having a live transcript for each meeting. They will study the question and they will give the [inaudible] for recommendation I think, for example.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Tijani. Ideally, I would've wanted all of the recommendations which are meant for the ICANN Board to be all sent to the Board at the same time. We do have a problem, though. As you said, some of these might take a little bit of time for a working group to expand on and to make specific requests or findings.

I'm a little concerned that if we don't send at least some of the straightforward recommendations to the Board right away, the Board will lose interest in this. The iron will definitely not be hot anymore, and when we come back to them, if we come back to them in six months' time let's say, the Board will have totally forgotten about ATLAS II and [inaudible] been ready for other things.

What I was going to suggest is also for us to go through – once we've gone through the list once, then we can prioritize and say which ones do we think can be implemented or we can expand on very quickly, and if we can do that, then we can send those recommendations – a first batch of recommendations – to the Board for them to action on as soon as possible.

Evan Leibovitch, and then we have to close the call.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry, Olivier. This is the first thing I'm saying in the call and I'm glad I sort of waited. Olivier, I'm sorry, but I really don't agree that we need to tailor our own recommendations based on a perception of a short attention span of the Board. This is At-Large. This is a bottom-up process. Things don't happen immediately. And if ICANN can't accommodate that, that should not be our problem. We have to take deliberative processes. We have to have a wide consultation in many things we do. Things are not necessarily going to work at the speed that other people would like. And I'm sorry, the fact that something's not a hot topic at the Board immediately or that we have to take some time to work on it should not at all diminish its importance to ICANN. I really want to fight against this impression that we need to compensate for a short attention span on the Board when we try and come up with quality useful, effective recommendations. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this comment, Evan. I would disagree with you. Well, one of the main problems is that the Board indeed has a short

attention span, and not conforming to this short attention span and not [inaudible] the irony [inaudible] more likely to be completely ignored.

This is one of the major feedbacks that I have received over the year, which was when you've got something to tell us, make it clear – as clear as possible – and do it now rather than waiting for a more inappropriate time.

But this is not something for us to debate right now. We will probably discuss this during our next call. I note from the chat that we need to have Adigo probably, because for some people, it will not work. So the same time will not work next week. So let's have a Doodle as another action item. That's it for today.

I thank all of you for being on this call. I especially thank Sabrina for having interpreted by herself for 90 minutes. In fact, it's 95-98 minutes of this call by herself. Sabrina is the interpreter. Well done!

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Goodnight. This call is now adjourned.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, everyone. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]