KATHY SCHNITT: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the ATLAS-II Debrief Single Issue ALAC call on Friday, the 12th of September, 2014, at 13:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Glenn McKnight, Holly Raiche, Eduardo Diaz, Murray McKercher, and Siranush Vardanyan.

On the Spanish channel, we have Fatima Cambronero.

We have interpreters Sabrina and David, and from staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Gisella Gruber will be joining us shortly, Terri Agnew; and myself, Kathy Schnitt.

I would 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. We have 90 minutes now to go through our agenda. We'll start immediately with agenda item #2, the review of the action items from our last two calls.

Now, the 27th of August call two weeks ago had no specific action items, but the call of the 22nd of August had an action item for a small group – the Reports Reporting Group. Leon, Eduardo, Murray, Holly, and Carlos Aguirre to finish putting together those reports which we had asked for. And of course, I think something that was not on the list there was for all of this work to be coordination with the reports on [inaudible], the

---

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.

ROI group, which Cheryl Langdon-Orr is leading. Is there an update on this, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Is this supposed to be [inaudible]?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just from the lack of updates – is there an update? Eduardo Diaz, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you hear me? There is no update. If I remember last time, Murray is supposed to be leading this group and I'm not sure if he's on the call. I talked to him last week about this and he was going to do something for this call but I'm not sure what he did. But I see that he is here, so maybe he can tell us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. I'll first let Holly speak, and then afterwards, I'll turn to Murray McKercher. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. Was it supposed to be the reporters? Because I didn't have one. I had just saw who was [inaudible], because I had a reporter who wasn't there and an assistant reporter who spoke Russian.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, that had nothing to with it, Holly. This is a small group of people who volunteered two calls ago to finish up on all of the reports that we were supposed to have – how things went, etc. So as for us to be able to concentrate on the next steps rather than looking back at ATLAS II. It's not high, high, highest priority, but of course it needs to be done. I don't want to spend too much time on this call on it either. If there's no update on this, then I will [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, that's fine. It's on the to-do list. It has to be on the to-do list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] until next week. It just needs to be done and that's all. Okay, so that's where it is. Murray McKercher, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you. I'm on Adobe Connect and I'm hoping everyone can hear me.

[KATHY SCHNITT]:   Yes, Murray, we can.

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

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I'm just posting in the chat a note that I made sort of to myself this morning. I'm at my computer with my glasses. I did this earlier this morning, so I'm not going to read it. Just from a reporting perspective, I looked at all of the reports that were posted on the Wiki. I also noticed that Eduardo had created a very good PDF report that summarized a lot of things with the [inaudible] recommendation. I threw that up because the links are there to all of that information.

Olivier's discussion about where we are with the website, this is I guess later in the call. So I just wanted to post that, and if you have any questions, please go ahead. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Murray. The only concern is – it's all [fine] reporting to here, but ultimately what we just need is to have the website all updated for future generations of At-Large, or shall I say ATLAS III Preparation Team to be able to resort to in an easy manner. That is fine here. Thanks for your update on this, but I think more needs to be done to make sure everything is clear and ready to be passed on to our successors.

Cheryl, you mentioned a couple of things earlier regarding the Return on Investments Group. Maybe we could touch on this right now, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure, happy to. Just reminding everyone who was involved in any of the focus areas or a particular sub-committee of ATLAS, anything that has a measurable – in other words, numbers of people involved, numbers of

people turning up to meetings, people engaged in output, etc. So, statistics, basically, that you can give the Return on Investments Group, that will help us do the baseline work that we can then do the [inaudible] stuff on top of.

We've asked for it for a few weeks now. Not next week, but the week after, I'll start to give a bit more demanding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. Shall we just have an action item for this so as to send a reminder for everyone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely. We've had an action item for the last two, if not three, meetings. So feel free to make it again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you could please dictate the action item as you wish it recorded just now, so that we know exactly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I will type it in rather than waste the time to take up the air space. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thanks very much, Cheryl. And the second action item for staff is to – and I guess that's specifically for Gisella to chase off the Reports Reporting Group and make sure that the webpages or the Wiki

pages are all setup correctly and all filled up with the reports and basically chase after those reports that are missing. Okay, thanks.

Now we can move on to the next part of our agenda, and that's going to be agenda item #3. As you are seeing on our ALAC and the At-Large mailing list, the Board's last meeting face-to-face in Istanbul has passed a resolution acknowledging the second At-Large Summit declaration thanking the summit participants for all the work, etc. I'm not going to read through the whole declaration, the whole acknowledgement.

But one of the things that it does wait for in here is to basically say, "Well, we now need to have more information. We're ready to work with the ALAC to have more information on the actual recommendations that are in there. And in fact, it also shows that three Board members have abstained from voting on the resolutions. They stated for the record that they were supportive of the work resulting from the ATLAS, but wanted to draw attention to their encouragement for the Board to take future consideration of plans to develop the ATLAS into a regularly occurring event.

So that's something which, in a way, I guess would be somehow encouraging. I'm not sure why they abstained as such, but maybe that's a way to record a comment when voting on the Board.

That said, a majority had voted in favor for the Board looking forward to following up with the ALAC on any inputs that are provided to the Board resulting from the final ATLAS II declaration. And that's the resolution [2014.09.09.11]. I can just put a little cut-and-paste onto that.

So what we then have is to really push forward as quickly as possible now through the table that we have in front of us. I'm going to repeat this. I'm really hoping that we are able to put together all of the recommendations that are aimed at the Board to be able to work on them and to have a significant number of them sent to the Board before the L.A. meeting. We're really on topic at the moment. The Board is listening and is ready to receive them, so now is our time to try and push as many as we can through. If we can push all of the ones that we are working on through, that would be great. But if we can't, then at least we need the significant subset of it.

And I therefore invite you to scroll through the table. As we know, the first thing for us to do is to look at each one of those declarations, each one of those statements in the declaration and to basically orient them in one way or another. We're not looking here at finding an answer or expanding it. This will be the work of the group that we will allocate the different resolutions to.

We've so far [had] a couple of calls and only reached number – where are we now? We reached number 22. I'm hoping that today with the amount of time we have we could reach the end. And once you've done that, the next step after it will be to actually have – actually, basically, then allocate. Once we've allocated, actually get those working groups to do the work and see really how much we can do and plan for how much we can do in the next month-and-a-half or so. Any questions or comments on this?

No? Okay, let's move through then. Let's go straight to number 22, I believe. Let's have a look. Yes, 22. Now, this one was allocated.

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 clear and non-technical language. This has been allocated to the Social Media Working Group.

So now we're on to 23: the roles and jurisdiction of the ombudsmen should be expanded. The ICANN website should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints.

[Another] recommendations from TG4. My estimate was this would be sent to the ICANN Board and ICANN staff. As far as we are concerned, what group are we going to take to work on this and expand on this recommendation? Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, I wanted to say something before this about the work that we have done already – the previous 22. These items have been sent to [these groups] who then asked them to start working on this or are we going to do this [inaudible]? Because if it is the second case, I would recommend that we already [inaudible] start working on them. That's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Eduardo. I would say we're going to have to tell those groups to work on it, and basically assign tasks to the groups with deadlines, which is a little of a concern if you work in a purely bottom-up system. But we have to remember, this is something where it's for the good of

everyone. So groups really have to be ready to act on this in a short amount of time. Waiting is going to be tough.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think if we're looking at number 23, I think there are really two action items in there. One is pretty long-term and one is simply a recommendation to the Board, because the ombudsman has a set jurisdiction. It can only be across to make the case – instead of one sentence, probably considerably more sentences and a lot of thought to it as to why that should happen.

The other is a very different set of people and the website is basically not in plain English and not readable. I suppose in the RTRPD group that I'm on, it's a completely different issue, but the same problem. Registrants [know] where they can find out about their rights on the website. That's another completely different issue and different set of priorities. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm adding to what Holly said. If we're going to send this recommendation, that the ombudsman jurisdiction should be expanded, we should give them specific [examples] as to what we mean by that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Exactly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Thanks, Holly. Next is Murray McKercher.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Just being devil's advocate on a public page on the web for people to complain might be a little overwhelming because the context of the types of complaints one might receive from the general [inaudible] I guess.

                        So just a word of caution. We need to frame that in some way. That's my comment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Murray. Back to Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Murray, I think 23 is actually two. One is simply the roles and jurisdiction should be expanded. That's a very separate thing from simply saying the whole website should be a bit clearer. I don't think

that recommendation is about making complaints. I think the first bit is – and I think Eduardo is absolutely right. There will have to be a lot of work done on looking at what the ombudsmen can do, what they can't do and make a case for why that should be expanded.

The other is just basically accessibility of the website generally. So, Eduardo, I [inaudible].

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you, Holly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, everyone. I clearly see agreement here from everyone who has spoken. This is probably going to need to be split in two. The first part, the roles and jurisdiction of the ombudsman should be expanded, is going to have to be allocated to one of our working groups to expand on that recommendation because this a really big open-ended thing. I don't think we can just tell ICANN "the role and jurisdiction of an ombudsman should be expanded." Expanded how, why, where? That would have to be allocated to one of our working groups to work on.

The second one with regards to the ICANN website that should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints, I would suggest allocating to the Social Media Working Group. They can work on that and they can make recommendations to make any complaints, website, or whatever and they can work with the ombudsman to do that work.

So the Social Media Working Group for the second part of the recommendation. The first part is going to be a tougher one. Glenn McKnight, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think it's almost impossible to expand [inaudible] the ombudsmen's functionary role. I think my experience working with him is he is absolutely invisible. Despite having an office, he's virtually alone most times. I don't think the vast majority of people know what he does. I don't think a lot of people know what an ombudsman actually does.

And I think one of the biggest things we should encourage is expanding his awareness and function within the community. I think that's probably equally more valuable than expanding his role. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Glenn. So just for the record, the ombudsman was actually in Istanbul and attended several sessions. Actually, one on of the sessions he described his office and said, "The office of the ombudsman is very active in ICANN and works 24 hours, 24/7 and you're looking at it." It certainly raised a few smiles, but you are correct. It's just one question and it's a bit difficult for him to be well-known across.

Again, what group are we going to allocate this to? If the group decides at the end that this recommendation should not be that the role of the ombudsman should be expanded and that something else should be

done, that's fine. I'm not trying to find an answer here. I'm just trying to find who we're going to allocate this job to.

Murray McKercher?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: My suggestion – I'm sorry, hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's just that you probably have a little delay or something.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: My suggestion would be the Future Challenges Working Group [inaudible] that the title fits that particular item. I just wanted also to say that I had met with ombudsmen both in Toronto and in London. There were [two], in fact, at the London meeting. To Glenn's comment, they are a little inaccessible, but I think that's just a little work that they need to do. Those are my comments. Future Working Group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Future Challenges Working Group. How does everyone feel about the Future Challenges Working Group to take on follow-up on this? I see agreement from Holly, agreement from Cheryl, from Eduardo, from Murray. Okay. So the Future Challenges Working Group will be taking up the first pass at this recommendation and do whatever it needs to do with it.

Let's go to number 24. Number 24: [inaudible] areas of the ombudsman and contractual compliance should report regularly on the complaints they receive, results, pending resolution and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints.

This is another very similar recommendation in the previous. The question is should we just allocate it to the same groups as we just had? Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Could this be part of providing a clear and simple way of the people to make complaints and reporting back, something like that? [inaudible] when somehow make it part of 23. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. How about this, then? Because we can't really shift the numbers around, since otherwise we're going to start getting a bit confused and it doesn't relate to any resolutions specifically. But [inaudible] we just used the Social Media Group for 22, because as you said, the Social Media Working Group is going to deal with that part of 23. I see agreement from everyone. Excellent.

Let's move on, 25, to enhance ICANN's community efforts on building a culture of transparency and accountability, and [inaudible] recommendations of ATRT-2, oversight of the Board's decision now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

Wow. That's all I can say. ICANN Board, ICANN supporting organizations, and advisory committees. My suggestion was to put this into the accountability thread because that looks very much like the sort of thing that the cross-community working group on ICANN accountability is going to be looking at. Certainly recommendations coming out of that will probably have a lot more weight than recommendations coming solely out of the ALAC.

But the floor is open if you don't agree or if you think we should do something else or if you support this. I see a number of green ticks. I don't know whether this is from previously or if new green ticks come up. Maybe there is agreement and we should just go into accountability.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Agreed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that will follow-up with accountability, and as we know, the Future Challenges Working Group is currently the shepherd for the accountability process. Good.

Go to number 26. This is a [inaudible] number 26: current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable policy management process available for use across the SOs and ACs in order to – and several bullet points – enhance knowledge management, improve the effectiveness of all ICANN volunteer communities, improve cross-community policy-specific activities, enhance policy development metrics, facilitate multi-lingual

engagement, create a taxonomy of policy categories, and provide policy development history as an aid for newcomers.

That's a massive with a capital "M" project. I think [inaudible] part of that. Yeah, TG5. That is a very large chunk of work that needs really sustained engagement, I would say from several groups I think. One is social media. Two, was it the capacity building? Who was meeting yesterday? I know that Dev is on this as well. Dev is on the call as well, so you would know.

It's basically putting all of our policy processes and the policy development process which ICANN is so good with, integrating it into some way that will let everyone keep track of where is what and what's goo.

One of the concerns which was made by our community was the fact that they had no idea how their input was being treated, where it was going and they were absolutely overloaded with the amount of e-mails that were coming in. And it was only through one of the systems where you basically select what topics you are interested in, and then the system would only send you details of public comments for the processes that you are interested in. At that point, will you be able to reduce the amount of e-mail that comes to your mailbox from the overload.

But this is not just something that is going to be done overnight. I would suspect this is probably a multi-year project for ICANN to move into ICANN 3.0. Or maybe ICANN 2.5.

Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So you're saying that part of sending e-mails and [inaudible] in one place, I suggest the Technology Group or the Social Media Working Group – one of those for that part I recommend. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. I note from the chat that Dev Anand Teelucksingh has also suggested Social Media Working Group and Technology Taskforce. Murray McKercher has said he agrees.

Fatima Cambronero has suggested Capacity Building. Fatima, are you able to speak? Would you be able to explain how the Capacity Building would link in with this?

KATHY SCHNITT: Olivier, one second. We're just going to un-mute her line.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: I think part of this item 26 could go to the Capacity Building, not all of it. I agree with what Dev says. It should go to Social Media and to the other group – I don't remember what it was. I suggest so that we analyze this. It doesn't necessarily need to go to that group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this, Fatima. So let's also allocate it to the Capacity Building Working Group. I don't quite know how the three

are going to work together. Are they going to have a joint call on this matter or are the task then going to be sub-divided between the three?

What I would suggest is for the chairs of each one of these working groups to talk to each other and basically decide upon each other how they are going to relate to this task.

But I note here interesting points. Glenn McKnight mentioned in the chat his initial information tracking and management systems. Absolutely. And Murray McKercher says it's a job for IBM's Watson [Artificial] Intelligence system.

Well, if IBM's Watson AI system can benefit from this, I'm sure we'll be able to share our results.

Let's move on to the next one, number 27. The Board must implement ATRT-2 recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees. That should be sent to the ICANN Board. I don't think anything else needs to be added to this. The ATRT-2 recommendation 9.1 is very clear. Just as a reminder, staff has told the community recently that the Accountability and Transparency review team recommendations are going to be implemented since the Board has voted for all of them to be implemented.

However, there has been no mention at all so far of a calendar of implementation, and we are eagerly awaiting this. So recommendation 27 is just I guess a way to prioritize this and I guess this will just be ready to be added as part of the recommendations that will go to the Board. So for the time being, it's not to be allocated to anyone.

Number 28, the ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSes to map the current expertise and interest in their membership, to identify a subject matter expert and facilitate policy communication. Another very interesting thing here. Trying to find out the knowledge and the talent that we have in our community is something that's great importance.

That of course takes us in the way to think in the future we can probably then [relate] people to specific tasks rather than having everyone flooded with absolutely everything.

I would suggest that this gets allocated to the ALAC with the RALOs. That probably is something very, very [important]. I know it's from Holly. Should it be back to the RALO chairs? I think you're quite right. The ALAC and RALO chairs. That's going to be probably one of the big jobs that we have to perform in our community in the next year.

Fatima Cambronero, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. Just a simple comment and [inaudible], but it is related. ICANN strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean, but we have implemented only five projects. And from now on, we will start to implement the rest of them. One of the projects that we will be working on is related to this and is creating contests and awards for the users in the region to determine the level of knowledge of items related to ICANN.

Perhaps somehow we can focus on this in LACRALO regionally so that we can determine the level of knowledge that we need to have at the

regional level. This is just what I wanted to say. We can go on speaking about this later on on this strategy issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Fatima. That's going to be an important part of the discussions when they take place with the ALAC, the RALO chairs, capacity building. It's all going to be part of this knowledge. At the moment I must admit I don't quite know how it will all fit together, but this really is for [Julia] to work out.

Okay. So for this one I believe that this would be sent to the – so it would be the RALOs and the ALAC. ALAC and RALO chairs.

Number 29: the ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various RALOs and acceptable by everyone.

Again, this relates to the same issue as before, and that would probably be working well with the Technology Taskforce, the Capacity Building Working Group and the Social Media Working Group. These are probably the three that we need to work together to try and design something.

I'm hoping that number 28 would really be part of number 26 or something to be implemented ICANN-wide. However, in knowing full well that it sometimes takes years before anything gets done ICANN-wide, it might well be that this community here will ned to take the lead on this. If the Technology Taskforce is able to find some software or system that would be able to let us implement an automated system for

tracking topics of interest currently being discussed, that would be a great thing to move forward with.

"A lot of social media tools may apply here" says Murray. You are absolutely correct. Yes.

Any comments on this Capacity Building, Technology Taskforce, and Social Media? Okay with that? Okay, let's move to the next one.

Number 30: For each public comment process, SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce impact statements. I felt that maybe had to go to ICANN SO and AC chairs. This might require further expansion from At-Large before we send it to ICANN SO and AC chairs. The floor is open for comments or questions.

Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This recommendation at the end when it says to produce impact statements, that's very subjective I believe. If we're going to send this to the other chairs we should be more specific, then, to have impact statements. [inaudible] subject. That's my comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Eduardo. Next is Murray McKercher. Murray, you're currently muted if you're speaking through Adobe. Oh, there we go. Go ahead.

EN

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Sorry. Just a quick comment that anything to do with resources in ICANN, we always seemed to be stretched in. The comment is we really need more outreach to get more people involved to get the amount of task work to be done. It speaks to resources, but I'd certainly agree with what we've discussed about where to put it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Murray. Yeah, expanding on [inaudible], basically asked when a public comments request is made on the Wiki page that the public comment would also basically say, "Well, this impacts end users because of XYZ," or "Why should you be answering in this?" "If you are a registry, this is how it might impact you." "If you're a registrar, this is how it might impact you," or "If you are an end user or civil society or, or, or."

It is somehow an open-ended thing, but at the same time, it's something which I've heard recurrently from people saying, "How does this impact us?" And we have had in the past in At-Large, we have had some thoughts about when we open up public comments or we create our public comment page in our policy development Wiki that we would add a few words as to how that impacts our community.

This hasn't even gone so far because of the amount of work that it requires just adding a few lines. I know it doesn't sound like much, but when you have five or six public comments that need to go up at the same time, it makes a difference [inaudible] spending an hour on it to spending the whole day on it if you have to start drafting little

EN

summaries of how this could impact our community. Any thoughts on this?

Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: So the way you are interpreting this is not to produce impact statements, which is very subjective, but reach communities X or Y [inaudible] impacts within ICANN. That way, then, that's more direct than [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I see what you mean. You're basically saying – you're saying that this recommendation 30 is saying that the SOs and ACs should be adequately resourced to produce statements that go into public comment further. I'm mentioning it the other way around. There should be some resources given to staff or to someone to be able to show what the impact is. Yeah, I think you're quite right as well. It could be interpreted both ways.

Where do we send this? Is this a Future Challenges issue? Is this an issue of the ALAC itself? Is this something we need to create a new working group on? How do we work smarter and not harder? I hear total silence on this. Let's keep this for the time being in our thinking. It's not an easy one. Let's have this for a discussion in At-Large. Holly, that's a very good point. Let's put this for a future ALAC discussion. By future, let's try and do it earlier rather than later. We might even be able to discuss this in Los Angeles if we have time as one of our hot topics. That could be a

EN

good idea. I'm just speaking at the moment thinking aloud. If I'm completely wrong, please stop me. This is more of a brainstorm than anything else.

Okay, 31. ICANN and the ALAC should investigate the use of simple tools and methods to facilitate participation in public comments and the use of crowdsourcing.

This is something which we have heard already in the past. ALAC, ICANN, and global stakeholder engagement staff were the potential targets. What we might need to do is to look at sending this to the Social Media Working Group. Is that the right one? Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: A question about crowdsourcing. I mean, I want to [inaudible] Internet, but can we give a definition for what that is? I'm not sure within the ICANN environment. I'm not sure what that means.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Eduardo. Fatima Cambronero has put her hand up. Maybe should would be able to answer this, otherwise I have a vague memory of how this was used. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I was going to make a comment that I will try to explain what it is I understand crowdsourcing. For me, this is the realization of a project collaboratively within different actors or stakeholders or sectors to obtain something that way.

What I want to ask about this is should we focus perhaps regionally? Perhaps we can have this pushed by the RALO chairs. This is just a question. I'm not really sure if I am understanding this correctly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Fatima. Big question you're asking here. Should the RALO chairs work on this? Certainly methods to facilitate participation in public comments where one of them is the clear explanation of those public comments locally.

But here we're also speaking about simple tools as well. I would say then maybe the RALOs, the Technology Taskforce obviously with the tools.

There was a question on the user crowdsourcing. My remembrance of this stems from what Sally Costerton had once put into a presentation saying ICANN was looking into crowdsourcing to do policy, which will effectively use some tools to enable anybody to log in, create an account, and then file their statement, etc. But that was something which was somehow not really compatible with our community who worked by consensus and who produced one statement out of with many people taking part into that one statement.

This statement really asks for ICANN and the ALAC to investigate this. On our side, we can start investigation. Yes, [inaudible], for example. Correct. All sorts of things.

Yes, I note the website that Glenn McKnight has also put on there which I shan't mention because it's on the chat.

Let's pass this on to the Social Media Working Group, the Technology Taskforce, and I would say the RALOs as well. They are going to have to work together and we should think of a way to get everyone more involved in public comments – how we can use the technology, but how we can also organize ourselves and the methods to make things easier for our end users to say things and speak into this.

Fatima Cambroner, you have the floor again.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. On the basis of my colleague's comment, I remembered something we do on the ALAC IGF in Latin America and the Caribbean. We have reporters or reports on the sessions and we use a tool that enables users to collaboratively report on each of the sessions.

It's not a policy development tool. It's just a tool that enables users to draft a report in a collaborative fashion, that is people attending on-site or remote participants. So this is [inaudible] maybe it might be useful to this end as well. So this is something for us to consider. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. Would you be able to please provide details of this tool to the Technology Taskforce chair, Dev Anand Teelucksingh? Just e-mail him the details and they would be able to investigate this. Yes? Okay, fantastic.

Let's move on, then. Number 32: ICANN should ensure that all acronyms, terminology and materials are clearly defined in simpler terms.

That's a very interesting one. Just for the story, just before ICANN had its [town hall] events taking place in Istanbul, we had a morning meeting with the Board and with ICANN staff and I made two recommendations. The first one was that we would not be using acronyms, and the second one was that any speaker should only speak for two minutes maximum and we should give the participants in the workshop as much time as possible to be able to express themselves.

As a result, all of the presentations made full use of only acronyms and the people who made the presentations each took 15 minutes, which meant that we only had 20 minutes left after 90 minutes to speak with people in the room and the people in the room were all [ICANNers].

So this is something which might be such an obvious thing to say, but we really need to push this. And I would say this would be with the ALAC and the ALAC might wish to – these are things that need to be sent to the Board, so that goes straight to the ALAC. No further work necessary on that. We just need to include this in one of our statements, or in our follow-up if you want.

Murray McKercher?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Just a quick comment. I always try to use the long form of acronyms. It makes it a little bit easier. It's a lot more tightening, but I think the more we do it ourselves the more other people may adopt it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Murray. That might be something we might wish to do in all of our statements, trying to use the long form at least the first time. I think we have tried that. The first time we use an acronym, we always use the long form and put the acronym in brackets, but not everyone does that, and certainly when you see some of the public comments, having an alphabet soup as the title, it's not an easy one.

So ALAC to draft statement or prepare follow-up. We're not going to draft a statement specifically on this. This will just be included in our follow-up with the Board. That will be a recommendation that can be passed on as-is and that we can probably just add a couple of words to underline as being extremely important.

Number 33: the ALAC should arrange more At-Large Capacity Building webinars.

That's to be passed on to the ALAC I think, and the Capacity Building Working Group as well. There was a call of the Capacity Building Working Group yesterday with a firm intent to increase the number of webinars that they are going to have. The next one is going to be a follow-up to the Internet Governance Forum. The one after that is likely to be a capacity building webinar about the different sessions that we are going to have in Los Angeles. And then after that, we are likely to see a lot more capacity building webinars – maybe one a month or

maybe even two a month. But it's a good way to keep our audience interested and certainly keep our participants in the loop and getting them more involved. Any comments on this?

Murray McKercher?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I know this is probably not a good thing to throw out, but the term "capacity building" has caused me some concern, just the definition of it. Is there a better explanation of capacity building? To me, it's about education. Does anyone have any other comments?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this comment, Murray. I don't have the capacity to answer you, but I'll open the floor to anyone with a better mastering of the English language to explain this. I must say, I also have a problem with capacity building. I always wonder what that means, but I guess it's one of the things that is used, one of the [inaudible].

Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: The way I understand it, in the ICANN context, when you say capacity building, people understand what we are just talking about – education, knowing more about ICANN and the things that we do and things like that.

If you take this in a context of a construction site, maybe you're talking about capacity of a water tank. But within the ICANN [inaudible], I believe capacity building is understood by everyone of what it means. That's my comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Eduardo. We can let the Capacity Building Working Group think about what capacity building is and define it, increase its own capacity. Let's move on.

Let's go to the next one, and that's number 34. In collaboration with a global Internet user community, the ALAC shall reiterate the link between the fundamental rights of Internet users and the public interest.

Now, where should this go? At the moment, the target would probably be the ALAC to start with. But where do we go with that? The floor is open. I'll let you all think for a few seconds.

I must say, I haven't got [inaudible] on how to move this one. [inaudible] public interest. It's all to do with what we do. We could send it to the Future Challenges Working Group. They already have a very, very full plate now with all the accountability process. We could look at the Internet registrant issues with Holly leading on this and Carlton. But it's not purely a technical thing. It's not purely something to do with new generic top-level domains. It's [inaudible] thing.

Or should we get the ALAC to start another thread and put together a taskforce for this? Various avenues open to us.

EN

Holly, you've been saying a few words in the background. Is it Holly or is it Cheryl? I don't know who's been going, "Um, hmmm…." Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm umming because I'm not sure exactly why this one wound up as a recommendation to the Board. I'm trying to work through what was meant here. The alcohol should – it's not really a recommendation to the Board. It's almost a recommendation to ourselves in everything we do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry for jumping in, Holly, but I don't think it's written as a recommendation to the Board. This one seems to be a recommendation to the ALAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, and I'm not sure how that translates into action, actually. I'm really puzzled by it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Should we just punt it to the ALAC and then, in a future ALAC conference call, we will be discussing this. Or maybe we could have a single-issue call of the ALAC on this. ALAC and At-Large, of course.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Glenn McKnight?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. I can see where Holly's having trouble with this, because I too – it's an affirmation. That's all it is. Restating the obvious. What do you do with this? This is reiterating our prime directive. That's all I'm getting from that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Glenn. It might be that the ALAC just drafts a paragraph or something, an affirmation of commitments by the ALAC. "We hereby commit to the following…" Something like this. Okay. We'll punt it to the ALAC and discuss it in the future. So expect this to come back on our table, ALAC members that are present in this working group.

Number 35: The ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large community in between ICANN public meetings. That was for the ALAC and the ICANN Board. What I was going to suggest was to punt this over to the ALAC, and for this question or suggestion to be made – well, first, I think the recommendation itself is very clear, so it doesn't need to be expanded on, but this could definitely be one of the recommendations that we make ahead of Los Angeles and that could be discussed face-to-face in Los Angeles. Any comments or thoughts on this?

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine? Okay. So we keep that with the ALAC. I see a lot of green ticks. Several green ticks on the Adobe Connect. Okay, let's move to the next one, number 34. Sorry, what am I saying? Here we go, number 36. Sometimes I go cross-eyed with those things.

Number 36: The At-Large community should envisage conference calls with other ACs and SOs in between ICANN public meetings to improve collaboration and engagement.

So we have at the moment two liaisons, one with the GNSO and one with the ccNSO. Sorry, three liaisons. Well, four. Start with the three with the other SOs and ACs. So one is with the SSAC, one with the GNSO, one with the ccNSO. Would it be a good way forward to task those liaisons with engaging the discussion with the other SOs, or would it be better for the ALAC chair to engage the discussion with the other ACs and SOs, bearing in mind that for some ACs there are no liaisons at the moment.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thought, but what about, for particularly when there's a publication by the SSAC or a new working group or whatever to invite, say, the chair of the SO or AC to brief or to give a webinar or something like that, so that there's an occasion where they can talk?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. You would say just invite the actual chair or the leadership team of that SO or AC to speak to us?

HOLLY RAICHE: That's what I was thinking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a fair suggestion. Yes. Interesting discussion, indeed. Let's see with Murray and with Eduardo. Murray McKercher?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you. I assumed that the liaisons have reports that are up so people can read those reports, and also there's nothing stopping people from observing any of these other ongoing meetings. So I think it's a great idea. I'm just wondering, based on any particular person's area of interest they certainly have the ability to participate and then bring that back to their own community. So I think it's a great idea. [inaudible] why it's an issue, per se, I think that's happening. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Murray. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Expanding on what Holly said, maybe we can have X number of minutes in our ALAC monthly calls to invite a chair from one of these ACs or SOs

EN

to talk to us about specific items that we may want to hear about? Even though we know we have a liaison, this will be more dynamic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. I'm not sure whether you want to subject a chair from another SO or AC to our excruciatingly long monthly call.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just for a small period of time. [inaudible] come and go. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just an idea.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a good suggestion. Let's punt it over to the ALAC and also to our liaisons, because I do have concerns of one thing which is the continuous engagement of our liaison. Having our liaisons say the same thing as the chair of those organizations coming to speak to us somehow does double duty. We also have to make sure that doesn't fluster anyone or certainly doesn't waste more of our time by having this.

EN

I think it says here "engage in conference calls in between public meetings." It could well be a single-issue call with an SO or AC chair that is outside the monthly call where we could just ask questions to the chair or to the leadership team of that SO or AC on whatever issue that we might have or whatever issue they might have.

Eduardo, your hand is still up.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, it's an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. So that's punted to the ALAC and liaisons. We'd have to give more discussion on it. I'm taking your point here and they're good points.

Next, 37 is for additional logistical support from ICANN being needed to improve the At-Large Wiki. That's pointed towards ICANN staff, and in fact, number 38 is very similar. ICANN should ensure that its beginner guides are easily accessible. That's part of the web redesign.

So 37 and 38, how shall we play or work this one? I'm going to ask Heidi if she's able to speak. Oh, she's not. She's away. Okay, that doesn't help.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, I'm here.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you are here. Okay. Excellent, Heidi. So the question on 37, additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large Wiki. How do you wish to play this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well, for the Wiki, that probably would be with the updating of the At-Large website, something that might be connected to that. On the second part about the beginner's guide, that's something that we could bring up to perhaps [Nora] who had the public interest and learning aspects. You'll see that on the main ICANN.org website now, the first tab on the left is about for newcomers. I believe that might be a good place for beginner's guides right there. It's an easy area to add that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Heidi. So what I would suggest is for 37 to be punted to the web design team, and that web design team including the current feedback team that we have, which is basically composed of Dev, Anthony Niigannii and myself. It's a very small team.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And Dev.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think I said Dev.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, sorry.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just used the Trinidad accent. I said Dev. Sorry. I'm kidding. So At-Large website design team. We'll follow-up on this as well. there certainly needs to be some work on the At-Large Wiki as well. [inaudible] one call which took place yesterday. Ariel is actually shepherding this as far as staff is concerned, so she's also included the At-Large website design team and we'll follow-up on that.

On 38, as you mentioned, that works with the web redesign. That also involves [Nora]. I would suggest that we have a follow-up here with [Nora] plus – is it our Capacity Building Working Group or who deals with it in our community? This really is capacity building, isn't it? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: For that, yes. It's Capacity Building. That would also be a good area.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dev mentions also outreach, yeah. And Siranush as well mentioned outreach, and Fatima too. So let's also put it in the Outreach Working Group.

We're going to need a lot more coordination between our working groups as well, and I really resort on working group chairs to talk to each other and not just involved in their silos, because a lot of these issues are cross bridging from one topic to another.

Yes, Outreach Sub-committee, Capacity Building Working Group. Heidi, back to you.

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just noticed. I went on to that "Get Started" tab, and actually the beginner's guides are already there. I'm not sure what more can be done for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Heidi. Maybe that's a recommendation that's already been completed. That would be the first one. Who knows? Let's leave it at that for the time being. And the Outreach Sub-committee and Capacity Building Working Groups could come back to us and let us know. That's fine. We can then tick it. We will need a box at some point in there that we'll be able to tick. Great.

39: ICANN should encourage open data best practices that foster reuse of information by any third-party.

Again, targeted at ICANN staff. As I saw it, I was going to suggest that for this one, the new chief information officer would probably be the target of that. However, we need to get one of our working teams to work on this, and probably the Technology Taskforce might be the best one.

Any comments? [inaudible].

The role of the Chief Information Officer, Murray, is one which has been recently added and he is going to be looking absolutely everything that takes place at ICANN and will coordinate things, etc. It's quite a long-winded thing that he's going to be working on.

I just wonder whether we would want to maybe invite the Chief Information Officer for one of our next meetings. Heidi, on the Sunday face-to-face session in Los Angeles, are we planning to see him?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, who?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't hear you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I didn't hear. Who were we planning on meeting? What was the question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ashwin Rangan is the [inaudible]. He is the new Chief Innovation and Information Officer. Some of the work that we couldn't [bear] is actually really aimed at him. Certainly the putting together of this big, big information system to track all of the policy and all that is something that he's probably going to have to look at.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So we are not currently planning on meeting him, but two options. One would be to invite him with Chris Gift on Sunday morning. All of you would have an opportunity to speak with him. Or we repeat [how] he was introduced to the At-Large and that was with the ALT on Friday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, [inaudible]. Check [if he's] available [inaudible] and then we can decide on that a little bit later.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Murray McKercher, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Olivier. I'm just going to zap into the chat. It seems to me that a lot of what we're discussing falls under the idea of a knowledge management function. I don't know whether that exists or exists in various places within ICANN. I recall having that title once upon a time of knowledge manager, but it is quite a specific science. I just wanted to throw that out in case it's helpful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Murray. The answer is, no, there is none. [inaudible] the fact that it's good to have Ashwin Rangan join ICANN, because I believe that probably is going to be one of the first things he's going to have to look at. I've just put a link to the announcement of his appointment on the chat.

Let's move on. Open data practices, Technology Taskforce, yeah. We'll leave it at that for the time being.

Next, ICANN should operate process similar to the community of regional outreach pilot program, but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel.

So that's another [inaudible]. Any comments or questions on this one? My thought was this was aimed at the ICANN Board and ICANN staff. This was obviously a privacy or overall financing thing. Leon quite rightly says all three should actually – or actually 40, 41 and 42 are all related to finance. Should we send this to the Finance and Budget Sub-committee to work on? Okay, I see agreement from Glenn, Murray, Wolf.

So just for the record, the first one is, as I've just said it, 40, ICANN should offer a process similar to the community in regional outreach pilot program but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel. This was actually a program which originally was discussed with the Finance and Budget Sub-committee [inaudible] CROPP. So this one would be allocated to the At-Large Finance and Budget Sub-committee.

Number 41, the ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. That should also be with the Finance and Budget Sub-committee.

And 42, ICANN should create annual face-to-face RALO assemblies either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events. That will probably also have to go to the Finance and Budget Sub-committee.

I open the floor for comments or questions on these three. If you're happy with Finance and Budget Sub-committee, which I note several people are, then we can move on.

Murray McKercher, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Sorry, I hit the wrong button. I meant to agree. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Okay, excellent. So 42 also has Finance and Budget Sub-committee, please. We'll follow-up on that.

And then, finally, RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements.

Oh yes. That goes straight into the Metrics and also with the RALOs themselves. For those of you that might have not been on a recent call, there has been a regional secretariats call a few days ago and one of the action items was that the ALAC, the RALO chairs – so the ALAC, the RALO, the whole lineage if you want, from ALAC, RALOs, ALSes are going to be engaging into Metrics. Should the Metrics Working Group be working on this as well? We can just leave it with ALAC and the RALO chairs.

Just as a summary, several RALOs are now really working very hard into putting together some measurement of inactive ALSes, and of course

the ALAC has a minimum participant requirements, too. So that would be then allocated to ALAC and RALO chairs.

Number 43. Now, with regards to the observations, I'm not really sure whether we need to allocate those to anyone for the time being or whether we can just go through them very quickly and see what group would like to take this on if they are to be taken on.

Before we engage in this, I open the floor for comments on that. What do we do with the observations? I'm just reminding you all, the recommendations were to be acted on by various parts of ICANN. The observations mostly relate to processes outside of ICANN [or] more general statements that we make.

Murray McKercher, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I would just suggest that those observations be put into one document and posted in the appropriate place. I'm not sure if they have to be assigned specifically to anyone. That's my comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this, Murray. Any other comments? You're quite right. They actually read more like best practices and things that could be just put somewhere again on a visible set of ideals which the ALAC subscribes to or which At-Large subscribes to.

Eduardo Diaz, you have the floor.

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm confused here. These observations will [inaudible] as such or we did it ourselves or how it was? If I look at observation number 5 where it says "fellowship [inaudible] should be [inaudible] to expand [inaudible]" that sounds like the ombudsmen that we talked about before, as a recommendation of expanding the jurisdiction [inaudible] expanding eligibility.

So I'm confused as to what – you say recommendations requiring action and observation. There's [inaudible]. But to me, that's a recommendation. If you can help me or the group understand what that means, I would really appreciate it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Very good point that you're making. It might well indeed be that some of these might turn into recommendations. I see agreement from Glenn McKnight and from Murray.

We have 15 minutes until the end of this call. We could discuss this now or I could let you all ponder about this until our next call. We could now go into the next steps.

Let's think about this until our next call. Have a look at the observations and we'll discuss the observations during our next call. We've done very well to go through our 43 recommendations and I'm very, very happy that we've reached this point. The next steps are maybe what we should speak about now since we have ten minutes until the end of the call.

So, effectively, what we now need to do – and I'm hoping that staff will be able to do that – is to actually divide that table. So we keep that table and we create a new table where, instead of having things in a chronological basis where recommendation 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc., we then divide that table or the task into various working groups, so various allocations.

So anything that's allocated to working group on capacity building, let's say, will all be in the same table, and then anything to do with future challenges is going to be in the same table, etc.

I'd also like to make sure we can easily realize the recommendations that are going to be meant for the Board, ultimately sent to the Board because this is where we need to assign absolute priority to recommendations for the Board since that's the only really time-sensitive thing that we have.

So that was a suggestion for moving forward, and the floor is open now for discussion. Glenn McKnight, you have the floor.

Glenn, you might be muted.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hello. One step further on the table. I would suggest – not to create more work, but I think it could create a framework for the working group is using smart or results-based (RSB) tables which have clear timelines, follow the SMART format, which will make it easy for the working groups to slot information in. That's my recommendation.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Glenn. Good point. I'd be looking at others to comment on this please. Next is Edurado.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to suggest also that when this table was put together somehow has an indication for those areas where there are like three groups working on the same recommendation. It should have some indication that the groups are [inaudible] and working together. Even though we are [inaudible] by groups. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Eduardo. Could you explain this, please? I'm a little confident as to…?

EDUARDO DIAZ: The way I understand it, you are proposing to put these tables together. [inaudible] you have capacity building is working the recommendations A, B, C and D, and the Technology group is working on A, B, C, D, F whatever recommendations.

Now, we mentioned in our discussion today that some of these recommendations are going to be working on by three groups at the same time. So just saying all those groups should talk about how to work on that.

So if you have these tables [inaudible] recommendation, there should be an indication of which recommendations, which groups, are working together. I'm not sure if I'm explaining myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I understand that. You're absolutely right. We need a table that has enough complexity to it that will actually show all of this information so everyone is clear on what we're working on. But we also need to know that we'll have something that is not too complex to certainly look like a really difficult thing to follow. Achieving the two is something a little bit hard.

Could I ask Heidi, who is going to follow up on this, on the staff side? What I was going to suggest is various options be tested out to see what would be the best format for a table. I was going to also ask Cheryl Langon-Orr having been through the At-Large recommendations, the previous At-Large improvements. I know that several tables had been also created back two years ago and whether they have any advantages to them or whether they were just simple expanded tables. This is all about organization of our work, basically. I do remember also Glenn's point on the SMART results-based tables. I don't know whether staff is aware of those or whether we can actually have those run on the Wiki [inaudible] questions?

Heidi? No one? Somebody? Anyone?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello, Olivier. Currently, Heidi is unable to speak at the moment, but we will [inaudible] staff with Ariel and myself. I think that would be a good solution.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Silvia. Thanks very much. That's good. So let's have this as an AI then as a follow-up, please. So Silvia and Ariel to follow-up on those tables. We'll build up the follow-up tables on this. Let's keep Glenn in the loop on that as well. Glenn, if you could please contribute and just point us to the SMART tables and finding out if they can work with the Wiki.

So the first thing really I would say, the priority is to isolate all of the recommendations that are meant for the Board and work on these as a matter of priority, because we do have – in answer to Fatima's question, do we have a deadline to work on these recommendations? The first deadline is the L.A. meeting and that's for any recommendation relating to the Board having to – so that we can actually move on this.

Now, do we need another call for this group? I would say that we could now expand to a larger group than the group we currently have. Currently the chairs of working groups in ATLAS II Working Groups and also the chairs of the thematic groups. The suggestion is to expand this now into an ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce where you would have the chance to of course continue the work if you are interested to spend 90 minutes every week on these issues or maybe not every week, but at more intervals.

It really is important for us to open this to others, including our ALS reps that worked on this. So I was going to suggest that we make the ATLAS II it. The ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce, any comments on this?

If there are no comments and no objections to the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce, I would suggest then e-mailing the ALAC,

because ultimately, it is for the ALAC to create this. E-mailing the ALAC explaining the idea behind creating the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce. And within the next seven days launching a consensus call.

I think we already have a mailing list for this, but we don't actually have an official ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce, and we would therefore need the ALAC to agree to it.

Rather than having a vote, I don't think this is going to be controversial. I would just send out a consensus call on the ALAC mailing list and if we have no objections within the week, then next week the ATLAS II Information Implementation Taskforce may be a day before we meet, the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce would have a call for members.

Fatima Cambronero?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I agree with what you're commenting. My question is what e-mail list do you refer to? If it is the ATLAS II participants, many of the ALSes or the representatives of the ALSes who did not attend the London meeting, well, they're not included in that list. I don't know if you refer specifically to that list or to another list, just to make this clear because I do agree that all ALSes need to be involved in this implementation state. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Fatima. That's a very good point you've made here. Let's ask Ariel if we can find out the wider subset of participants. So that would include sending to the ATLAS II participants

mailing list but also [sending] to our At-Large mailing list. I guess the largest mailing list is the ALAC Announce mailing list, which theoretically has all of our ALS representatives on it.

Okay, start again. So Ariel, the ATLAS II IT, which is what we are now going to create is going to be the mailing list for all of the people on this call plus whoever else wants to volunteer to be in this follow-up taskforce.

ARIEL LIANG: Let me just double check the subscribers for this mailing list. Give me one moment and I will get back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ariel. We are reaching the end of our call, so I'll just give you a few more minutes on this. What I would say is we've got this new mailing list. We'll put the people who are on this call and chairs of ATLAS II working groups and thematic groups on this, and then we'll issue a call for members to the ATLAS II participants mailing list and also the ICANN At-Large Announce mailing list. I'm going to get through this one. That's it.

Alberto Soto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. In each RALO we can work with people that did not go to London and are not included on this list. We can quickly recharter

these people and the ones that are interested in participating can very easily join. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto. Very good point. So let's also include the RALO list in there, and then the RALOs themselves, the RALO chairs and leaders, can follow up and engage people in this process.

As you know, this call is interpreted in Spanish at the moment. If we have a significant number of French-speaking volunteers, then we will have to also add French interpretation on this.

With this, I thank you all. Any other business, any other comments before we close?

Seeing no one put their hand up, I thank you all for having gone through all of this work today. We've really made good strides forward and we're now ready to move on to the next phase of the ATLAS II implementation.

With this, I also thank the interpreters and thank staff for having been so great on this call and moving swiftly through the table. Goodbye. This call is now adjourned.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Adios, gracias.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

EN

KATHY SCHNITT: This call is now concluded. Please disconnect all remaining lines.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]