
KATHY SCHMEDT: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the ATLAS II Debrief Single Issue Area call on Wednesday, the 27th of August, 2014 at 13:30 UTC.

On the call today, we have Glenn McKnight, Murray McKercher, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Sebastien Bachollet, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

We have also on Spanish, Alberto Soto. We have apologies from Wolf Ludwig, Fatima Cambroner, Natalia Encisco, Holly Rache, Maureen Hilyard, [Julio] Sanchez, Siranush Vardanyan, Humberto [?], Raf Fatani, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Lange, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Kathy Schmedt. We also have interpretation services from Veronica.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and Olivier back over to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Kathy. And it's Olivier speaking. As you said, we have interpretation, so I will ask everyone to say their name before they speak. I have noticed in the chat that there is no sound on the channel in Spanish. Can I just check before we start that the interpretation is working and that there is sound on the channel in Spanish?

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.

KATHY SCHMEDT: At this time it shows that Spanish is fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Spanish is fine. Okay. Thanks very much. So it's Olivier speaking. Today we're going to go through just the action items of the last week, and we're going to continue going through our long table of post-ATLAS II thematic working group, well not really the activities, but the implementations of the post-ATLAS 2 recommendations.

So I invite you all to start immediately where the action items from last week. There is only one and that was for the creation of the reports reporting group. The RRG, Leon, Eduardo, Murray, Holly, and Carlos Aguirre, I just wanted to check if this has been created and if there was any progress on this.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: This is Murray speaking. If I can have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead Murray, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: It's Murray McKercher for the record. From my perspective, we have not had a communication since last week, unless the others have been communicating without me. But at this point, we have not progressed from the call last week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Murray. Let me just check then with Gisella, in the invites and the actual work for creating this sort of [inaudible] facilitating this has been done.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, Gisella here. We're in the process, I'm setting up the mailing list, and we'll take it from there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's perfect. Thank you Gisella. It's Olivier speaking. So that's fine. Let's go then immediately to number three, the implementation taskforce. And we have a long table of recommendations that were contained within the ATLAS 2 declaration. Last week, we went through each recommendation one by one, and reached all the way down to recommendation number 12.

And I therefore invite you to look at that table. I think that, is it Ariel who is going to be updating the table on the fly? Or how would that work? I believe this is Ariel's computer.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, this is Ariel for the transcript. I'm going to share my screen, just let me know if you see my screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can see your screen very well. It's Olivier speaking.

ARIEL LIANG: Okay, great. One additional note for the report reporting group. The wiki space has been setup and the mailing list has been established as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Ariel. Well if the first message then can be sent to that report reporting group, then they can start the report reporting, and they can then report back to us on the report reporting. Let's get going. [Inaudible] as to activities workspace, we have that on the screen. For those of you that weren't here last week, effectively each one of these recommendations is now just an one-liner.

We have had some feedback from the Board that an one-liner isn't really helpfully if it doesn't actually specify what the recommendation wants the Board to do specifically. So we have two things to do. First to allocate direction through the recommendation. In other words, a recipient. Is the recommendation directed at the Board? Is it for ICANN staff to act on? Is it for the ALAC to act on or ICANN, supporting organization, and advisory committees, or specific working groups? That's type of thing. And that's in the common [inaudible]...

I've taken a stab at that last week. And then we have the notes column, which is really what our next steps is for this. In some case, we might have to expand recommendation if it's something that is aimed at the Board, we might have to focus on what we would, what steps we would like the Board to specifically take. In some cases, we might wish to have this work undertaken by one of our committees, or working groups that we already have.

So [inaudible] working groups that we have, some cases the topic can be somehow taking care of by our working groups that are supporting cross-community working groups that are currently in place like accountability, process, like the IANA stewardship transition process. And in some other cases, we might actually have to create a taskforce, a specific taskforce that will be following up with the implementation of the recommendation that is on the screen.

And that's one of the things we're going to do today. We are going to create a taskforce, and discuss what kind of forum this taskforce is going to have to follow up on all of this. At the moment, what we're doing is to just have the chairs of the different ATLAS 2 working groups, and ATLAS 2 thematic groups, come together and you are those people who came together last week and this week, but obviously if we want this to be more inclusive, we might wish to expand this invitation to others and therefore, creating a follow up ATLAS 2 taskforce.

It sounds like a good idea forward. So, at this point, any questions, or comments on anything I haven't explained correctly so far? Murray McKercher, you have your hand up, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you Olivier, it's Murray for the record. I was just wondering, of the comment, whether we should have a very tight, small team that looks at this, that we're involved with the leaders, the organizational leaders, and the leaders that executed the thematic, these groups? Would that make sense, rather than a much larger group?

I think a smaller group would be better, in my opinion. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Murray. There are advantages, it's Olivier speaking. There are advantages to having a larger group and to having a smaller group, you're absolutely correct. I felt that perhaps as a smaller group, we can first go through this first pass of the whole table, and then afterwards, see if we need a larger group or maybe have subgroup that will work each on specific, so that we can work in parallel.

I'm just throwing ideas at the moment. Don't take my word as being the end result, these are just suggestions. Glenn McKnight, you're next.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi everyone. Glenn for the record. What you have suggested Olivier, is similar to results based management charts are, RSBs, which use smart grid, which we... This is way more than what this chart is able to do. So we need to include specific, objectionable, sorry, objectives. We need to put in results.

We need to put impacts. So it's a much more bigger job than what we can achieve today. I think you're right, we can go through this based on this chart, but this taskforce will need to flesh out the balance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Glenn. It's Olivier speaking. I absolutely agree. You know, in putting together this table, this is just the first step for a larger set of tables, or more complex table that we will work on afterwards. And I guess that's it's very good that you struck on this just

now, because if you know how to build those tables, then your experience will be valued very much.

But then, you know, perhaps there are some of the tasks in there that need to be done faster rather than others, and the prioritization is also important. The one thing I've just forgotten to mention is that the Board has their own time tables as well. They are eager, now that they are reaching the AGM, they are eager to plan on their next year's assignments and work.

And one of the suggestions that was made is that we need to get the recommendations that are aimed at the ICANN Board, to the Board as soon as possible. Initially, one suggestion was that we would have these ready for the Board, sort of the Board weekend I think that takes place in Istanbul after the IGF. That's totally, well, impossible for us. It's just too short notice, and I don't think we'll have any time to spend any significant amount of thinking on those recommendations by then.

Our next target would be the Board meeting, or meetings in Los Angeles. And that gives us a little bit more time, which I think we give it about a month to deal specifically with the recommendations that are aimed at the ICANN Board. I don't know whether it's achievable or not, and maybe it's, by the end of this call, you have a point of view on this, I'd be very happy to hear it.

I'm hoping we can do it, because if we don't do that, then the next chance to have something looked at by the Board will be at least two to three months later. Remember, the break between the AGM and the next ICANN meeting is usually quite long, with all of the holiday period,

etc. And so that will significantly delay our ATLAS 2 follow up and implementation.

Are there any other questions or comments? Oh yes, Sebastien has put in the chat, the Board retreat is on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of September. Yeah, totally impossible for us to get anything to them by them, especially since I think that the material needs to be sent to the Board well in advance, and we probably have missed the deadline as well. And I also not from Murray McKercher, let's not get caught up in paralysis by analysis. We should have realistic deadlines. So all right.

I see no other comments on this. Let's have this first task, I don't know if we can finish it today, but let's see how far we can go with it. So I invite you all to go onto that page, and if you don't have it in front of you, if you're in the Adobe Connect room, you can maximize your screen size and you'll be able to see the recommendations.

Ariel has [inaudible], at the keyboard, we have reached recommendation number 12 now. And number 12 is, is as follows: so in collaboration with At Large structures, ICANN should put in place campaign to raise awareness and extend education programs across under-represented regions. I felt that this could be the end of the ICANN global stakeholder engagement staff. I open the floor.

Any thoughts on this? Should it also go to other parts of ICANN? Maybe the ICANN Board, although I know that there used to be a global stakeholder engagement program on the Board, subgroup on the Board, but there doesn't appear to be now. So I'm not sure how worth it is it to go directly to the Board on this as well. And of course, as far as

raising awareness, this is something that we keep on doing ourselves, all of the time within At Large.

So we've got Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Tijani Ben Jemaa. Let's start with Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier, this is Jean-Jacques. A remark is that formulated like this, it seems a bit vague. I would like to know from the Board member on this call, how he feels about it, something to which the Board could direct staff and say, implement this or is it much too vague? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. We happen to have Sebastien Bachollet on the call. I don't know whether Sebastien is ready to comment on this, or give us some feedback.

I can't hear Sebastien Bachollet at the moment. I think he might have dropped off, yeah it looks like he has dropped off. Nope, he's still here. Sebastien? Okay we can't hear him for the time being, so let's bank this question for the time being Jean-Jacques. Just to mention, it may well be that we have to allocate it to one of our working groups as well, and expand this, and make this a little bit more explicit, and that's certainly probably from what you've mentioned here, it looks like the way forward as far as we're concerned.

Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. As far as the implementation of these recommendations, it could be done by the capacity building working group. But, there is a problem of funding. So the Board is involved. We need the Board to allocate budget for that and the capacity building working group can implement this kind of program of the ALSs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. So what you're saying is, capacity building working group on the one hand, ICANN global stakeholder engagement, and of course the Board, since this would require funding, campaigns to raise awareness and so on. So, that's one thing. Then Alberto Soto.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can I try to see if this is working? This is Sebastien...

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. I was able to participate in three countries, where the Internet penetration is very low: Bolivia, Haiti, which is the lowest in the region, in the Latin American, the Caribbean region, and Dominican Republic. And you cannot imagine the way in which the end user thinks that ICANN has responsibility in terms of its functionality.

So I think that this aspect was not taking into account, and I insist on this. I was able to participate and to get the feedback from the end user in those countries, and they have no idea at all of what the IANA

transition is. And ICANN is then responsible for their failure of having Internet. So in LACRALO, we used a core program to deliver the training. The communication department of ICANN was in touch with me, Alec was the contact, and we still have a meeting pending.

And it seems to be that there will be something that would be implemented, not only through the core program, but through ICANN, something similar that was implemented in Bolivia, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alberto. That's very valuable to hear from the ground, which is always something, often something that we are lacking, having the actual direct end user voice in this. So that's helpful. Let's see if Sebastien now is able to speak.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can try.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. We can hear you Sebastien. Welcome.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Good, great. To answer the Jean-Jacques question, I think it's clear. I have the impression that the Board, and specifically the chair of the Board, need to have more insight to know what to do. But the question is more what you want to achieve with that. And I really think

that the first discussion must be taking place between GSE staff and At Large staff.

And then you can be involved with the Board at one moment. But really, as much work would be done at the level of staff and then at your level will be proceeded by the Board, I am sure. Hope it's helpful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Sebastien. It's Olivier speaking. And so I think we've heard that the answer to the question from Jean-Jacques, has this been helpful for you, Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, it does answer, in part, my questions, but not my concern. My concern is that before sending anything like this to the Board, it has to be much, much more developed. As I said in the chat, it has to be, you have to give precise orientations to say what is insufficient, make suggestions on expanding that kind of outreach to what regions, to what tools, and rough idea of the possible cost.

And that cost can only be ascertained in conjunction with members of the staff, Sally Costerton's team or herself. So, it's just a word of caution. I'm not against it. I'm just saying that at this stage and as it is formulated, it is too vague. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques for this. Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry Olivier, this is Alberto Soto speaking. I forgot to put my hand down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay, thank you for this Alberto, sorry. Okay, so what I hear then is that we need to do some more work on this. Tijani has suggested that the capacity building working group should work on this. I felt this also needs the outreach working group to work on. Clearly this recommendation needs to be expanded, and this could probably be a task that the ALAC sends to that working group to either the capacity building, or the outreach working group, or both.

And to come up with a proposal, as Jean-Jacques mentioned, what is sufficient, what kind of outreach is needed, and then work out, as a first step, what the costs would be with the ICANN global stakeholder engagement staff, and once a proposal is then ready with all of the costs, etc. then that can be sent over to the Board.

Would that a plan forward? Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I tend to agree that either you make a recommendation that is very vague and tell the Board to direct staff to do it, or you give a lot more specificity. For instance, in the wording that's there, it says, "Educational programs." Doesn't say on what. Are we talking about making sure that the rest of the world knows that ICANN exists?

Is this an attempt to ultimately get more ALSs for At Large? Which are two very, very different things. So you've got to develop the idea sufficiently so that we even know who to present it to, and when we present it, they have an idea what we're asking for. Right now, it is subject to too much, too many different interpretations, and that's just not going to end up with a result and a product that we can, you know, that can be effective.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So, indeed the feedback, the initial feedback for the Board on many of these recommendations was that the fact that they are very broad doesn't help at the moment, and they need to be focused on. So definitely our road forward is to expand on them. Secondly, you have to remember that the recommendation is there but the appendix of our ATLAS 2 declaration would have, would probably have a bit more background about the recommendation itself.

And so we can probably look at that and whatever working group is going to take that task on is going to have to look at the appendix of the declaration, perhaps even make use of some of the members of the thematic group that worked on this recommendation, and will then be able to take it forward and expand on it.

Does this, would this fly Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I think so. I wasn't saying that the people who wrote it originally didn't know what they were asking for. I'm just saying that if we're

going to present it to someone, it's got to have enough clarity that they understand what it is we're talking about and can accept the concept and investigate more, or tell you out to lunch, that's not something that ICANN should be doing at all. And explain why they believe that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. It sounds like we're in violent agreement on this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. So next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you Olivier. I can make several contributions in this regard. When we speak about costs, we had three trips with everything that is involved in a trade. We have certain inconvenience, but when it comes to the topic, as regards whether we would incorporate ALSs or not, I think that the objective is to cover those countries where there are no ALSs in LACRALO.

But, in Haiti and the Dominican Republic, all the stakeholders from the ICANN ecosystem attended the event. Therefore, the idea that was to add ALSs, turned into an overall outreach and debate among, for example, an Internet Service Provider, or Internet Service Providers and Civil Society representatives. So what I mean with this is that when we try to incorporate an ALS, as we did in the past, we had to speak about, at that time, about the IANA transition, and we have to explain the ICANN function.

So, I don't think it would be feasible to separate the topics. Two hours is not enough time for that. So, we need to take this into account. I don't think we can separate the topics. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Alberto. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, do you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. One of the, all of the, let's say, possible replies on the Board would be to the CROPP. Why the CROP is there? It is there for outreach, so you have the funding, you have to do it. We don't have anything to do now because we already give you the tools and you have to do it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much for this Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. Indeed, there is the CROPP. There are a number of other programs in place, maybe those programs won't go far enough. But of course, we're not going to be finding the solution today. We just have to allocate it to some working groups, so the answer, I guess, is capacity building working

group and outreach subcommittee to develop a proposal for GSE staff and then send a proposal for Board review.

And in fact, I think, develop a proposal, maybe in coordination with GSE staff. I have a feeling there is going to be a lot more working in collaboration rather than just chucking something over a wall and hoping that someone comes back with an answer within a few months. We definitely need to have some collaborative work here. And then the second thing, the proposal can be expanded on the relevant items listed in the appendix of the ATLAS 2 declaration. Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Hi. Glenn for the record. Yeah, I can see this discussion going on forever. The reality is, whatever we come up with in this analysis, it's got to be based on some kind of squat analysis as well. If it's, there is going to be gaps in here that you... Definitely there is no money, there is no staffing, there is no desire. It's not part of the strategic plan, so that may reveal in the charts, but you know, it's got to start somewhere.

It's incomplete as it stands. I can understand why the Board is looking at this saying, "Well, what are we doing now?" So we've got to do something. So it's going to take some work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this comment Glenn. I think you've just come up with a first job that those working groups are going to have to work on, and that's a [inaudible]... [CROSSTALK]... There have been some [inaudible] in the past, and maybe some of the work from the past

[inaudible] could be taken up as well. I heard Sebastien wanted to be [inaudible].

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Actually Murray speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, was it Murray? Sorry, I thought it was Sebastien. Murray Mckercher and then we have Alan Greenberg afterwards. Murray, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you Olivier. It's Murray for the record. So I have been, this is a topic close to my heart since Toronto, ICANN 45 I think it was. And Sally Costerton came onboard at that point, and I think the global stakeholder group of which I've been communicating with more recently, obviously has a plan and we just need to align our plans with that.

So I'm quite sure there is a large group involved, and it's just a matter of aligning it to our interests. So I would be happy to be involved with that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Murray. Next is Alan Greenberg, and then we'll have to move forward otherwise if we do just one recommendation per call,

that's going to be quite a few calls for us to go through the whole table.
Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you for channeling my comment. We've done a half an hour on one recommendation, I believe. I think we need to stop solving the problem, and as Evan said in the chat, decide who to assign it to, preferably an existing work group and move on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this reminder Alan. And so we can move to 13, because we have done the allocation on this. So 13, ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate coordination is given to all views proportionally to their scope and relevance. That I felt, was to be sent to the ICANN Board. I beg to be corrected or confirmed.

And so the floor is open. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier, Tijani speaking. This is a good example, the best example of a very vague recommendation. It is very vague. I understand exactly what it means, but give it to the Board in this form, it is very, you will receive cautions. This is not, this is something very, very large, very broad. So we have to be very precise and say where we want a better organization, where is anything representation, or what kind of, why we speak about the views and the scopes and the perspective.

So I think that this kind of recommendation will not be useful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. But in its current form, it's Olivier speaking, in its current form it might not be useful. If we were to make that recommendation useful, who should we allocate it to, to make it useful? In other words, what group within At Large should work on that and come up with a proposal? Do you have an idea, a suggestion?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Accountability.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Accountability.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Accountability, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Accountability. Okay. Evan Leibovitch, you're next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. First a quick mention on that particular issue, since there isn't an accountability working group right now, future challenges has been working on the accountability stuff so anything to do with that should be pointed their way. Just as a matter of trying to make this meeting go along a little faster and deal with what it is supposed to do,

can we not use that status call in the wiki, to say which of the working groups, or who is being assigned on either making each of these line items more specific, more detailed.

The best we can do right now, is identify what needs to be done to the line items and needs to work on it more. We've got a status column there where we can say, "Okay, here is where it has been moved to." At the end of this meeting, staff can literally collect it and say, "Okay, here is the list of things to go to outreach. Here is the list of things to go to future challenges."

It can be collected that way, and then assembled, and then essentially handed off. Anything more than that, we're not really going to be able to get done in this meeting. So I suggest, since staff has the ability to edit that column right now, that we fill this in saying who each of these line items is being assigned to, and if possible, with a very short explanation of what they're being asked to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. It's Olivier. I'm surprised this isn't what we're doing, I thought this was what we're doing at the moment.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm not seeing anything going to that status call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Really? That's very strange. Can you not see on the post ATLAS 2 activities the... Basically Ariel is typing on that sheet as we speak. So she's adding who that work goes to.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. As long like, we've got a good, we've got a lot of line items. So we should just literally...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, I agree. We have to speed up. I totally agree, we have to speed up. It looks like the future challenges working group is going to be tasked with this. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll echo and [inaudible] words what Tijani said. It can't just be tossed into a working group unless there are people involved in that process who understand what it was it was addressing. It's not clear what thin, what ill it is trying to fix and where there was a perception of an equal, unbalanced, not relevant, or out of scope, you know, representation.

So, should we say do it right according to a standard that we don't understand. We can certainly find places where the people on the group think that ICANN is not balancing input properly, but we need to really make sure that there are people who created this, can enlarge on what the statement is. Now there may be something buried in the other document which gives some more detail, but we can't just toss these things over a wall and expect a group that may not have been

involved at all in the creation of the recommendation to address the problem if there is not more specificity. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this...

ALAN GREENBERG: There is an odious in making a recommendation to work on the solution.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks. I totally agree. And I was thinking that maybe we should have another column on that table that would show what thematic group the recommendation comes from, and at that point, when we pop it to the future challenges working group, we would say, “Well, this comes from thematic group number one, two, or three.” And that will be a task of that group to then work with the chair of that thematic working group, and identify the source of the recommendation.

That probably is... I mean, again, I’m just concern here that we’re starting to micromanage of how our follow up working groups will work with the thematic groups. And I totally agree with, obviously this all needs to be done with high coordination in mind. I was going to add future challenges working group, slash accountability process, since this is all going to be a part of the accountability process. Evan, your hand is still up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Apologies, taking it down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Next 14, ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws. I felt that this could be going to the ICANN Board and ICANN staff. The floor is open.

Not many, ah, Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I think this has to go to the Board, because no other [inaudible]... I wasn't in the thematic group when this position was done. And it was because there was a lot of complaining from registers and from the contracted party about the problem of [inaudible] and the contracts.

And I think no one can sort this issues other than ICANN Board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Tijani. I think that your computer must have been on so I could hear... I think someone is both on the phone call and on the Adobe Connect, so there is an echo.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that has stopped. Okay, thanks. Absolutely understood Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. The question comes as to whether this recommendation as it is, is cooked enough to be sent to the Board as is, and would be understood by the Board and they would probably have to work with legal staff to look at their contractual framework, or whether it is for our community to develop a fuller proposal for minimizing conflicts between requirements and a lot of international laws.

Sebastien, you have the floor. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I have trouble sending that to the Board because you will get a very tiny answer. You need to build that up more to have a real discussion with the Board. I'm not sure that the Board decides what to, it's a good idea on that. Must be more [community?], SO/AC discussion before going to the Board.

If the Board is a recipient of every proposal, it must be a proposal to share with others. It's not, it will not get anywhere, because I don't know if you see really the situation of the Board, but the Board is not really balanced, and they answer will be on one side and not the other. And don't end too much things on the Board other. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this feedback Sebastien, very helpful. I note also from Jean-Jacques Subrenat, it's Olivier speaking. I note from Jean-Jacques that there is a huge, a big chunk of work requiring legal

research, etc. Well Jean-Jacques, you've put your hand up, so you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I think that the point Sebastien just made is very important. So picking up on what he said, I would suggest that if the chair of ALAC could informally get in touch with his colleagues on other SOs and ACs, to find out as a starter, on this list, what could be shared, and what not interest other, our partners, and you will have to do alone, it would already be an interesting start, because there is no sense now in starting a huge chunk of work on our own, if we know in advance that our preoccupations are shared by others in other silos.

And it's much more effective and encouraging to team up right at the beginning of a process like this, rather than writing up our stuff and we're now cornered, and submitting it to others to have it bashed up, or approved, or amended. I'd like some reactions on that part, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques for this suggestion. I'm going to call on Alan Greenberg in his capacity as GNSO liaison, on whether there has already been some work in GNSO working groups regarding this alignment of, or adjustment of contractual framework and minimized conflict between requirement and relevant national laws.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's Alan speaking. There certainly has been a lot of discussion, I don't believe there is an active working group on it. The issue has been raised. ICANN has essentially agreed that, and it has for a long time although they haven't implemented it very well, that no contracted party should be obliged to violate their own laws.

I mean, any other option is clearly ludicrous. The question is, what do you put in the base contract? Because national law varies very heavily and you cannot guarantee that nothing in any contract violates a national law somewhere that maybe created at some point. And remember, this is a fluid situation where laws change.

So the general principles are understood. The process by which they are implemented has not been particularly elegant. So, I'm not quite sure what the recommendation is saying. You can't adjust the contractual framework to eliminate, minimize obviously. ICANN had thought that they had minimized it, or they would not have, you know, no one is masochistic enough to put in a requirement which you know 90% of your contractors are going to have to get changed.

So, I'm not quite sure where we go from now. There has been discussion in the GNSO, I don't believe there is currently any ongoing discussions that, you know, that addresses it further. I may have missed something, but I think where it stands right now is, we clearly have identified one major issue in data retention, and ICANN seems to be getting up to speed on being able to address the way we're structured for that.

If not 100% clear that there are any other issues that need to be addressed immediately. The thick WHOIS implementation is going into elaborate pains to make sure that what we're doing is not going to be against international laws.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. In the interest of time, we have to move a bit faster. It's Olivier speaking. Let's have Jean-Jacques again. And then we'll make a decision on the action item. Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. There are two things to keep in mind. The first is that whatever we do, there will be an understandable and automatic reflex on the part of ICANN as a corporation, to consider that the contractual part is and must remain under exclusively California law for all sorts of reasons.

So second observation on my part is that if we want to get this moving in another more globalized direction, we cannot do it without some link with the CEOs project of expanding, as he has already started to do, expanding the presence of ICANN in other parts of the world. Now the big question with the Geneva office of ICANN is whether he will go as far as to implement the recommendations we had put out in the improving institutional confidence document of recommendations of 2000, and I think it was nine.

And clearly, Fadi is acting on upon that, although he has not made explicit reference to that document of the president's strategies group,

a committee, but it is very clearly that. So the question is, is he prepared, is senior staff prepared to contemplate giving some offices, maybe in Singapore and especially in Geneva, a possibility of being one of the operators, and slowly becoming one of the chief operators, as far as contractual relations are concerned?

If we don't know more about this, then maybe we are wasting our time, because we can make all decisions we want. If legal counsel of ICANN, of the ICANN Board is not up to that speed and says to the CEO and to the Board, "Look, we can't get away at all from California law for contractual relations."

The forget it, it's useless. If, however, we feel that there is some opening, let's go ahead. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Jean-Jacques. I'm just concerned, we're driving a little bit too far, too deeply into the rabbit hole at the moment, in trying to go so far. I think the first suggestion for the ALAC chair to get in touch with colleagues on other SOs and ACs about this issue, is probably a very good first step. I've certainly have heard some concerns from specific stakeholder groups in the GNSO group about this.

And I think I've also heard some concerns from some GAC members about this. As you know, European GAC members have, are going to be pushing on this since the European Commission has been particularly tough on this issue. So first step, ask the other SO and AC chairs. Next step, I would allocate this task to the registrant issues working group

that we have, who will need to do a follow up after this, but that might be further down the line.

And it looks to me as though this is something which is going to, as Jean-Jacques mentioned, be a huge chunk of work, and it probably is worth being in a cross-community working group, perhaps it will be the suggestion to other SO and AC chairs would be that the cross-community working group should be working on this. Aside from that, the question of moving ICANN out of US/California law, or making amendments to this, is something which I think comes back to the beginning of the world, at least the beginning of the ICANN world.

And I don't think we're going to get an answer at any speed on this, any time soon, except if there is a real huge push from the community to get an answer, or at least get moving on this. But our first steps are as I've just described them, and I'm concern we're going too far down the road when we still have another 20, 25 recommendations to go through today.

Are we okay with that? Yeah, okay, so next 15. ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure brief, [inaudible] a truly global organization and examine legal and organizational solutions. Well there you go Jean-Jacques, just recommendation that you've just touched on. Probably the same track as number 14 and expand on that. What's your thought on that? 15 to follow the same track as 14?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you Olivier. This is Jean-Jacques. I did not formulate this one during the ATLAS 2 but I recognize it's something that many of us have

been calling for for some time. The difficult thing is being careful not to mix up daydreaming or ideal situations with [inaudible]. I think we cannot call for a sort of complete internationalization of ICANN. The link with California law, the headquarters, etc. will remain in the United States, etc., we know that.

The real question is to what... Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jean-Jacques, I'm sorry to be interrupting you, but again we're trying to discuss the issue, I'm trying to just allocate it at the moment to some follow up.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry, I thought you were asking for a comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I understand the concern. I'm just asking for a comment as to who should we allocate this. You know, we can spend the rest of the call on this issue because it is...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, sorry. I misunderstood.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you have a suggestion as to whom to allocate it to then? Should I send this to [CROSSTALK]... Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No, I don't have a quick suggestion as to who it should be allocated to. I think if you take only that question, then it could be [inaudible] that group. If you want to link it to something else, such as the proceeding theme which was number 14, the contractual framework, then it would go in more than one legal direction.

If you take 15 separately, 15 and some other topics on the list, then it's more a conceptual, an overall conceptual thing, which may end up, let's say, in future challenges, I don't know. So I don't have a quick answer to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Next is Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Just to say, I don't think it's a good idea to put it with the previous one. I would say this one can go to the future working group, because it's more linked with accountability and how we organize ICANN, link with the ICANN 's ability in the future, and with legal framework for agreement between, with ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Sebastien. Good thoughts. And I think that resonates with the feeling I have. I haven't seen anybody else speaking against this. Certainly Jean-Jacques Subrenat has also [inaudible] keeping the two separate would be better. So future challenges

working group looks like the working group that will end up with on its table to expand on, and possibly a much larger...

And of course, ultimately the recommendation is aimed at the ICANN Board, but this issue is going to require some considerable work as well. Next, 16, ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones. That was to be directed at the ICANN Board and ICANN staff, follow up with the, what group?

I don't hear anyone with a suggestion at the moment. My suggestion for this was to send it to our own communications working group. I don't remember the exact name for it. Tijani Ben Jemaa will also look at the list of standing working groups we have. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I think that this doesn't concern only the At Large groups or At Large work. It concerns the whole ICANN, I think. Second point, this, we cannot assign it to any group. I think our staff should work on this, and also we need to expand, we need to make clear recommendations that we send to the Board later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. So are you saying then that we should keep this recommendation within our own follow up working group, or follow up taskforce, and expand on this recommendation ourselves, rather than passing it on to one of our standing working groups? Did I understand you correctly?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I think so. I think it is more, it more something that we have to do before sending it to the Board because, as I said, it is not, it is [inaudible]... What I mean by that, where are the problems? We have to explain that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Tijani, why not ask one of our own working groups like, for example, our social media working group, or do we have...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Communication working group, communication.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Communications working group. We don't have a communications working group, do we?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know we have a social media working group, but we don't actually have a communications working group as such. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll, I guess, second what Tijani said. I don't know exactly what this is talking about. Is this saying that we have technological problems? We're not likely to change the fact that the world has time zones, and that we have people all around it. So, you know, we're not likely to invent a time machine.

So I'm not quite sure what the problem is that it's getting at. There are certainly all sorts of problems caused by the fact that we have time zones and people have to attend meetings in the middle of the night. But I'm not quite sure how, what this is addressing. Now again, maybe it's buried in some document at one point and we don't recall.

But it's not clear what the problem is, so I have trouble identifying who to assign it to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. It's Olivier speaking. Actually, I'm [inaudible] to the point that you're not planning on designing a time machine. But let's hear from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say it wasn't on my list, I said we're not likely to get it done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But ICANN has already got some troubles, the whole time lord thing anyway. So it's not an issue. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record here. I put a whole bunch of things into the chat that have given you some existing working group, notice the plural there, that had a stake in this

particular area. And they include outreach, capacity building, also the GSE, the regional hubs, etc., etc., etc.

And whenever you start listing four or five possible spaces that it could be housed in, I'm strongly suggesting that it belongs in the ALAC and the leadership team, because it is a bit of an overarching issue. Let me help you and others who may not be quite sure what it is that is being solved, or trying to be solved. We still have, as you rightly identified, the situation where, you know, ungodly hours, and inhumane treatment, is expected to be the norm of some parts of the community, that should be contributing to policy development and discussions.

And so if you've got a southern hemisphere, a northern hemisphere, versus west versus east, it doesn't matter. The thing is round, we know there is time zones. What I think this is calling for, is a fairly meaningful cross-community discussion, and so that's why I think it should probably be housed at the ALAC all leadership level, because it does necessarily need to engage particularly SOs, but also the ACs.

But the SOs, it's vital because that's where the policy development stuff seems to get generated from. That we need to find ways of not having this round thing with time zones, as a barrier to engagement and a barrier to contribution. And so to that end, we've got examples already happening, at least in the Asia Pacific area where the regional hub running out of Singapore is already running duplicates, purely, unadulterated duplicates of whether those run at inconvenient if not ungodly hours, in a time zone that is suitable for the people it helps to serve.

And then run its own Q&A associated with that. And so, I think that's where it was coming from and so it's a big picture sort of thing. And I'll stop now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Cheryl. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Mr. Chair, this is Eduardo for the record. I suggest that, you know, we talk to the leaders that were in each thematic group to see if they [get] concerned a little bit about that because that's very vague. And we might be interpreting things that are not really the basis for something like this. That's my suggestion to this group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Eduardo. It's Olivier speaking. And having Cheryl's explanation, and having also heard you, it certainly would seem like the post-ATLAS 2, the taskforce I think we can call it, post ATLAS 2 taskforce, whatever name we're going to decide for it, is going to have to be in charge of this, because it is an overarching issue. And I would say in charge of this with the ALAC leadership team, with the ALT.

And if we can add in the column which shows who the targets will be, we would have ICANN Board, ICANN staff, and in particular, ICANN global stakeholder engagement staff, since I have just heard that the Asia Pacific hub, which I believe is run by the global stakeholder engagement, it is running duplicate, as an example, is running duplicate

webinars at a more normal time for the Asia Pacific and Pacific Islands region.

We often miss the Pacific Islands there. Let's move on. 17. Asia, Australia, Asia, and Pacific Islands. Apologies Cheryl. The AAP. ICANN is to be sensitive to the fact that social media are blocked in certain countries, and in conjunction with technical bodies, promote credible alternatives. This looks like something targeted towards GSE staff. I would certainly say the technical, let me just think really. Technology taskforce would be one group that would be able to identify the type of technologies that are blocked in specific countries, maybe, as a first step.

And we might need more than this. Let's see, Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, may I suggest that you send that to the CIIO. The new guy has joined the staff because it's in, [inaudible] type of work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very good point Sebastien, thank you. It's Olivier speaking. The ICANN GSE staff and CIIO as well. Let's get the tech taskforce on that. Any other suggestions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Social media, it needs, there needs to [inaudible] is what social media.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And social media, perfect, excellent. Thank you Cheryl for this. Good point. Next, 18, support end users to take part in policy development. That's ICANN policy staff. That is a much broader issue, and the question is, who do we allocate this to? Does this go over to the capacity building working group?

Does this remain within the ALAC? Or does this remain within the ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce? Very broad statement here. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead. You have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Tijani speaking. This is, in fact, very broad. And I don't know if this kind of recommendation is going to educate, so we have to expand on it, to explain it, and to say where is the problem and what we have to do. So, to make people participate more, it's something that can alleviate the problem that is a lot of [inaudible]. There is the linguistic problem. There is the outreach problem that we talk about before.

There is a lot of other problems. So we need something very clear. So this will be, how to say, explained by the thematic group who issued it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. Unfortunately the thematic group is now closed. So we have to fold this into our working groups, or keep it under the ATLAS 2 taskforce, implementation taskforce. So when you said we, who do you mean by we? That's the question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. My question was, we need this recommendation to be explained. And these people who can explain it, are people who can issue it....

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, but who is we?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We, At Large, you, me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. What we're doing here, Tijani, is to allocate this follow up work to someone or to a group. Now are you saying that the ALAC should then follow up this, or do we allocate it to a working group? I was going to suggest the capacity building working group would be taking this on, bearing in mind that I think mentoring is within

the capacity building working group as well, or is going to be a part of the capacity building working group.

Alan Greenberg you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. As I'm listening to this, and I just put a note in the chat, I think an important lesson is coming out of this a bit late, unfortunately. To bring people around the world together, give them one week, in many cases some of them who are not even aware of all of the details of what's going on in ICANN, make recommendations, and then go home and expect somebody to implement them, is probably a recipe for failure. And that same recipe is being replicated here by tossing them into working groups, where the members may have relatively little interest in a particular subject or knowledge what it is talking about, and then the failure becomes theirs if they can't address it.

So it's too late to fix the overall problem, but I think we need to think about it for the future, but indeed we have to give the various working groups we are tossing these things to, some tools or we're just pushing the failure down in the organization. And I'm really worried that we're taking a bunch of people who already, many of whom have their hands full, and giving them a huge list of, a huge to do list, with no real way of addressing them.

So I guess we need to continue this process, but I think we need to think about what we're doing and the follow up to it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan. Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I want to sort of follow up on what Alan is saying. And it makes all the sense in the world what he just said. Some of this, I'd imagine, would be addressed by the success of trying to get some of the thematic group people brought into the various working groups, so that offers an opportunity for the people that made these recommendations to actually act out upon them.

But you're absolutely right. You've got people that are going to be in existing working groups that are going to have the things tossed, tossed into their laps. I think the result is going to end up being, if it's going to be at all effective, is that we're going to send these recommendations to the working groups. And what they do with it, may be something unexpected, which is what happens when, you know, the people are making the high level stuff have absolutely no connection to the people that are asked to implement it.

But ICANN is full of this kind of problem, where the people making the policy, take a look at the staff, at the implementation of it, and say, "Does that actually reflect anything at all that we did?" That kind of activity, that kind of problem, is certainly not uncommon within ICANN. And for us to try and deal with it, like I say, one of the best ways is to make sure that we get the people in the thematic groups into the working groups that are charged with the implementation, but also to give the working groups a little bit of leeway and flexibility.

So that the work they choose to prioritize, and the way that they choose to turn the various things that we're going to give them, will reflect the people that are involved in the working groups, and you know, may not come out exactly that the way the recommendations come in, but that's what happens when you've got this two-step process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Evan. And whilst you were mentioning this, and whilst Alan was speaking as well, would you say that... We're already taking the step with which Ariel will do afterwards, to link those thematic working group sources to that table, so we know what recommendation comes from what thematic working group.

It could be a good follow up once we've gone through the whole table, once we have rationalized the difference, different recommendations, and put them together when we have similar recommendations, etc. and allocated to groups, to then contact the people in the thematic working group to join the working groups that will be dealing with the follow up of their activities. Would that be maybe a good step forward?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I think it's a necessary step forward, but it's obviously not the whole answer, but it certainly an important first step, I agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Evan. So this is recorded, I don't think we have to re-repeat it as an action item, but Ariel I'll work with you on that afterwards as a necessary step forward. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. I am happy to task it as a capacity building working group, to try to find the real meaning of this recommendation from the thematic group, that issued it. But I have a question. If the meaning, they don't mean there is a problem of capacity building, it is a problem, for example, of language, of very long documents distributed [inaudible], etc.

What I will do with this, because...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: ...capacity building working group need to work on both the questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Tijani. It's Olivier speaking. So at that point, we can come back to the ATLAS 2 follow up calls, and say, "Well, this actually needs to be assigned to another At Large working group." And then we can work it out and coordinate and get that specific part of the overall task to be sub-tasked, or subcontracted elsewhere. That's the way I see it at the moment.

So really, if you're okay with allocating this to the capacity building working group, then we can do that, and of course, what we will do as a

follow up afterwards, is to get the members of the thematic group that came up with that recommendation and say, “Your recommendation is now going into implementation stage, in the capacity building or implementation building stage, in the capacity building working group. Join the discussion, join the working group, continue your work there.”

That’s probably the step forward. Evan Leibovitch, you have your hand up. Hand down, okay. So 18, that goes to the capacity building working group as a follow up. 19, just for the record, I have my own thoughts on the support end users who take part in policy development. Of course, we’re not discussing the issue yet, we’re just allocating.

So we’ll defer this until later. So the next one, we’ll put a question mark next to it. Eliminate barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices. And I thought that was probably, again, ICANN policy staff, but I wasn’t quite sure because as was correctly just mentioned now, it could be languages, it could be all sorts of things.

I would suggest then that we also send this to the capacity building working group, as 16 and 17 appear to be, sorry 18 and 19, appear to be coming together. We still have 10 minutes until the end of this call, let’s see how far we can go.

20, input the user perspective whenever necessary to advance accountability, transparency, and police development within ICANN. Is this going to our future challenges working group that currently is dealing with accountability?

Let’s see outreach and global engagement, Eduardo would you care to expand on this please?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry. This is Eduardo. I was referring to the previous one, not this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh previous one, sorry about that. So this one, what should we allocate it to number 19, no sorry 20.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think it's accountability, Olivier. So future challenges perhaps.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So future challenges? Okay. Evan and Jean-Jacques, you've got a lot of work on your hands. But that's what we're here for. Number 21, encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment. That looks again like global stakeholder engagement. And probably, I would say, social media perhaps? Or what group should be working on this?

Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is this about ICANN? Or we should simply be raising consciousness about the Internet?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I'm not the person to ask. So I'm not sure you're going to get an answer here. The floor is open. Any thought on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe it's relevant because, you know, they're following two completely things. One should be doing social good, and these days... A few years ago, ICANN said, "No, we don't do that." Nowadays there is acknowledgement, but it's really a different aspect of what we do rather than outreach to get people involved in ICANN and explain what ICANN is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I agree with you. I don't have an answer for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: If this one essentially code language for saying, "We need to figure out how to make sure everyone in the world has broadband and has access to the Internet," it's a different issue than outreach and education about ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. You're absolutely right. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. So this is again, something to ask the thematic group, because we don't know the real meaning of this recommendation. Who should ask the thematic group? I think perhaps

the social media working group, or technical, no, yes, technical [inaudible] to have the thematic group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Tijani. Well technology taskforce only deals with technology. This is not public campaign, I would say the outreach working group is probably the one to work on this, in conjunction with maybe our social media, really more the outreach subcommittee, and but we'll have to certainly obtain some clarification on this, because there are concerns that I've heard and seen also on the chat, that this could be out of scope as well.

Out of ICANN scope as a whole, one deal with campaigns to use the Internet for education, information, etc. Next, 22, members of the general public should be able to participate in ICANN on an issue by issue basis. Information on the ICANN website should, where practical, be in clear and non-technical language. I thought that this was aimed towards ICANN global stakeholder engagement staff, but in fact [inaudible] GSE probably communications staff, ICANN communications staff.

But then who should be picking up the ball on this one? As far as At Large is concerned. Well, perhaps, again, this one, it seems to be related to the website, I would certainly say maybe our social media working group is the one to pick up on this. Gisella, would you know which group is which? We've got social media working group and we've got [inaudible]... Who is dealing with the website? The ALAC website under...

GISELLA GRUBER: Hi Olivier. I think Ariel can respond to that one. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Ariel, go ahead. Ariel Liang.

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, this is Ariel for the transcript. We don't really have a working group dealing with the website, because the website needs focus to dedicated members to work on, and right now we have to talk to Dev and needs to bring, to be on board, and also Olivier too. And we're reaching out to the third person in the community, likely to be Anthony, will have some web development experience.

So right now just individuals from the community dealing with the website, not a whole working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Ariel. And what about the curation working group that was part of the ATLAS 2? Which standing working group has this folded into? Has that folded into the social media working group?

ARIEL LIANG: The curation working group changed its name into social media working group, so it's the social media working group. And on the ATLAS 2 communications working group has nothing to do with the social media working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. So that's fine then. So this is going to be the social media working group that will pick this one up as a follow up obviously with, in conjunction with the thematic group that came up with recommendation. We still have a couple of minutes until the end of this call, what I suggest is that we take a break here, we've still got about 20 recommendations.

I realize we've spent three hours on this so far. But at least that is now sending, really dividing the work everywhere. I would say since we're now rolling quite well, we can probably go through the next 20 in our next 90 minute call, and then we will be able to get these recommendations put together, rationalized, and sorted, and then sent as batches to our different working groups with an explanation and a follow up.

Now, the last bit of our agenda today is to create our own working group, the creation of the ATLAS 2 follow up and implementation taskforce. I think it was, I can't remember who it was that said, maybe was it Murray earlier that mentioned that we shouldn't have, Murray or Glenn mentioned that we shouldn't have too many people, I think maybe it was Murray, shouldn't have too many people in the working group. Let's just have a small group that works hard and push the thing forward.

The concern I have with just having our small group push forward, and do the heavy lifting, is that it's not really included as such, which we all know that even when we do get large working groups, it is only a small

core of people that will do the heavy lifting. So I was going to suggest that we open up an ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce that would pick up the ball, and invite members of the At Large community, including the people that came to ATLAS 2 to join.

And that taskforce would then pick up the ball after we have finished our first, going through the whole list of recommendations that we currently have on the list. So perhaps the taskforce would start in three weeks' time, or a couple of weeks' time. Any comments or thoughts on this?

And effectively the job of the taskforce would be able to see and coordinate all of the implementation activities to the end, so that would include making, interfacing with the ALAC, interfacing with all of the working groups that are in charge of different bits, and making sure that nothing falls between the, you know, between the gaps and that we don't drop any of the issues.

And making sure, of course, that there is a follow up on each one of these recommendations. Comments or thoughts. Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is Eduardo for the record. I was under the impression at one time, or maybe I was doing the, we were doing the coordination for the ATLAS 2, that the ROI group was going to be mostly, other than that come up with the return on investment, will be making, you know, making this, you know, being this implementation group of getting through this, whatever was coming out of the ATLAS 2.

I mean, that was my impression when, or my idea when I was doing this architecture of the whole process. Because we need to get feedback from people that went to the meeting. And you know, this recommendation has to be like what we're doing now, we need to follow up on them, and the ones that are not implementable, or they don't make sense, you know, define why they are not implantable, or why are they implementable.

So, you know, I'm assured that the ROI group would like to take that on their umbrella, or change their name and expand their scope, or how that's where I would put it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Eduardo. As we have the chair of the ROI working group with us, I'll call on Cheryl Langdon-Orr for her feedback on this. You might be muted Cheryl. Have we lost Cheryl at the moment or...? We don't appear to have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Have I been dropped? No.

Okay. Adobe is checking for Cheryl. Any other thoughts in the meantime regarding this? So the suggestion is to get the ROI, the return on investment, ROI working group to follow up. Still on the audio line but not with us. Eduardo, we're going to have to bank this. I would be concerned about the ROI following up with this because I never thought that it would be the ROI working group that would follow up on all of these things.

I would certainly hope that an ATLAS 2 implementation taskforce would group all of the chairs of the different working groups of ATLAS 2, and would also incorporate some members of the community that are

interested in the implementation side of things. The ROI, in my view, was going to just look at the impact of ATLAS 2.

And I've seen Jean-Jacque's note in the chat. Yes, if we create a working group, would it make sense for the co-chairs of this working group to be considered as guiding the work for ATLAS 2? I certainly agree with this, Jean-Jacques.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is Eduardo. It's, it was just a suggestion, but you know, having implementation group for ATLAS 2 sounds, I mean, we have to do it. We have to follow through all this declaration and before we get to ATLAS 3.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you. No, Eduardo, we certainly have to get the information. It's Olivier speaking. We have to get the input from the ROI, but this is a separate process. The implementation though is a long-term thing that will last quite a while. Okay. I don't see any other counterpoints. I don't know where Cheryl Langdon-Orr is. She might have gone to her next call.

Staff is not letting me know, well she is still on the audio line, so looks like we've lost her. So ladies and gentlemen, let's not then make our choice today on this. Think over it, think about it over the week, and let's continue next week by going through, hopefully, the last 20 recommendations and then we'll really be on our way to start moving forward with implementation.

And that's pretty much it. Ariel and I will work on the thematic group and on the follow up. I will certainly immediately perform the action item of look at the recommendation. I think it was number 14 or one of the recommendations there and contacting SO and AC chairs.

And with this, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for attending. Thanks to the interpreter. We started at five minutes past, so it's seven minutes past, two minutes behind schedule. I thank you all for this. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and good night.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]