TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. This is the ICANN Accessibility Taskforce call on Monday, the 5th of January, 2015 at 19:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Joly McFie, Yasuichi Kitamura, Judith Hellerstein, Glenn McKnight, and Gunela Astbrink.
	We have apologies from Maureen Hilyard.
	From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Joe Catapano; and myself, Terri Agnew.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you, Terri. Welcome one and all to the beginning of what I hope will be a both rewarding and not overly taxing, but nevertheless busy, new year for us all as we assist bringing ICANN up to an industry best practice level for accessibility.
	I would like to just take a moment and ask if there's anyone who wants to make any additions or changes to the agenda, but I would like to note that one of the things we will be picking up under our item 3, which I suspect may be the primary activity for today. For a very selfish point of view, I would be very happy to give us all back sometime today. I have some clashing commitments.

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.

But one of the things that we will be discussing under item 3 is how we will be updating the ALAC and the advice from the ALAC, the ICANN board and other staff in ICANN on where we are with Recommendation 11 from ATLAS-II.

And within that, I was hoping to pick up on some particular feedback and reporting from the recent work with our subcommittee that Laura has talked about with us back – where were we? I think we were in London. That's right. A bit of a blur. And the recent RFP that's gone out on Web accessibility.

So with the exception of that, which most, if not all, of you will have seen recently in news coming out of ICANN, I was hoping that everyone would now have an opportunity to bring forward any additional items because it's been a little while since we've gathered.

I'll just leave the floor open for a moment for any new items of business to be brought forward at this stage. We will do any other business again of course at the end of the call, but anything to be [walked] through now?

I'm not hearing anybody and not seeing anybody in the Adobe Connect room. I've neglected to do one very important thing, and that is, of course, ask is there anyone who is only on the audio bridge and not in the Adobe Connect room for this call? If so, please make yourself known now, and Terri, you can just double check if anything is obvious to you.

TERRI AGNEW: Cheryl, at this time, everyone is at least on the Adobe Connect site.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. So we can assure ourselves that people will wave or put up the red "X"es or green ticks or things as is appropriate. Terrific. Okay, I'm not looking to add anything to the agenda at this stage. Let's pause briefly to welcome those people who have just joined. I saw Chris Mondini join us, and I think Joe came in as well.

Welcome, and thank you for getting your beginning of your working world back in ICANN right started with us. And Laura, perfect timing, my dear. Thank you very much. We appreciate the fact that your desks and lives will be very busy after daring to have a few days away from the ICANN office. I hope you did have a few days away. We appreciate you spending some of your time with us today.

Let's now move on to the – I don't believe we got any apologies, but Terri will note those if they come in, and someone can always send one in a little bit retrospectively. Let's get a review of our action items. We have one that is on us all, which will stay open, which is the continuing on the SWOT and SMART analysis. We've got a few ticked off. I'm just going to go through the ones that are not ticked off.

I will go down on bended knee with humblest apologies and say I have not formally reached out to the Technology Taskforce about making sure that they're all organized for our next call at the end of January. However, I am very aware that we have both Judith and Glenn, who are active and integral parts of the Technology Taskforce. I would be very surprised if the Technology Taskforce wasn't aware of our plots and plans.

But I have, for a whole bunch of reasons, been very naughty and not actually sent that e-mail. I will get to Dev and "discuss it" formally. That does exercise an open action item on me.

Another thing is, of course, my follow-up with Laura on the progress made with regards to captioning. Laura and I have still to have a formal conversation and interaction on that, but we will certainly be doing that between now and the next meeting. Or, if not, we'll manage somehow to bring everyone up to speed at the next meeting – which, to remind you all, is dedicated to the topic of captioning, and in particular, within the Adobe Connect tool. But I suspect we might look at captioning in general because, of course, it's a very useful tool with face-to-face meetings as well. Yes, Judith, over to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I guess the item I have is for later. I know the timing of the January 26th call, as well as the timing of these calls, it seems like the way the Doodle is often working, it's not the times are not created by people who say yes, but they add in the maybes and the yes to get a final answer. I think that is not necessarily a correct way of doing it.

I think you should just do the yes, pause, and then if you can't find enough people on yes, then you can go look at maybes. That's why I – 2:00 Eastern is usually not as good for me as 3:00 P.M. I think that other people [were] at 3:00 P.M., so I'm hoping we could get that moved for the January 26th call for 3:00 P.M., which seemed to be a very popular time according to the Doodle.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Judith. Thanks for that. I'll pass that. I'll put a pin in that for now. We will come back to that as a particular piece of business and discussion in terms of how the Doodling is done. You are correct. It is a normal standard to add the maybes with the yeses. But we will certainly not only discuss that, but look at and undoubtedly, probably, do move the next call for an hour later. But we'll come back to that toward the end of the agenda.

Thank you for raising that piece of additional business, Judith. We'll get on to that. I can assure you the Antipodeans will have no problem with you proposing moving an hour later in our lives. We'd probably get a bit crestfallen for an hour earlier. But we'd be perfectly happy to be up one hour later than one hour earlier in the very, very beginning of our day. It's either 06:00 or 05:00 here in our part of the world.

Coming back to that, we'll just continue to move down now of our unticked action items. There is a request for stock take on accessibility activities in all admin and management areas of ICANN. I think what we'll do is I'll work, again, with Laura and Chris, and probably Joe and anyone else that they think should be in our e-mail chain.

We will pin up a slightly more formal call, because I think this particular action item wasn't very clear on which staff to send to where. So let's pin a generic call up while Laura and I are having our indirection on captioning. We might as well pick up on that as well just so there's a certain degree of consistency and there's clarity on that. So let's leave that one open as well.

The call for small work team has gone out. Thank you, again, thank you very much for that. [It's so weird.] We saw that go out in the last couple of days, but we will have to leave the unticked box, which is documents that we're hoping will be born out of this small group for, obviously not our January meeting now because the one following this month will be devoted to captioning, but the February or face-to-face meeting will stay there until we've sorted that out.

Another one – and again, it's one of those unspecific and unallocated open action items. It's staff – I'm not quite sure who – to follow up with [inaudible] with Adobe as a supplier of services to ICANN about any effects on accessibility since various updates on Adobe Connect.

This is one that is probably important that we have some information on before our next meeting. I'm not concerned that it's not ticked now. It just comes out of the point Greg was making, I think two calls back, and it's certainly something that one of us needs to own.

Again, whether Laura or Chris want to decide whom amongst them will do that, or whether it's just someone working the expert in IT, our IT, ICANN IT, who can follow that. That's a question we've asked and it still needs answering. But undoubtedly it will be answered, if not before, at the following call this month.

Finally, to ask if we can have our own ICANN staff expert guru of Adobe Connect to join us at our meeting in January 26th date regarding captioning, because we suspect that it will be some use to have that [inaudible] as a liaison then.

Slightly longer list of unchecked boxes than we care to see, but there's no particular issue with any of them not being done for the first meeting back for 2015.

Now we move, unless there's any discussion on any of those points, and recognizing that with the foibles of Adobe Connect, and I haven't updated my Windows-based system – I don't have a chat pod that's operational in that room today. Over to you, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Good morning. Thank you very much, Cheryl. I'm sounding a bit drafty, trying to wake up. I just wanted to ask about the checkbox for the staff [inaudible] for a second small work team inaudible] hold the pen on [inaudible]. That's one that's grayed out.

I just want to be clear on what that small work team is supposed to be doing, because I recognize we have a prioritization discussion based on the early objectives and activities that I drafted back in Singapore, and the workshop materials from the L.A. meeting. I'm wondering, do we need to have a small work team to do that? It seems that we should be able to, as a larger working group, agree to move forward on some of those prioritization materials that we already have done. I'm just trying to streamline the work here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that, Gunela. I am now officially somewhat confused, because this is actually suggesting directly from you two if not three meetings back where you suggested to in fact focus down on the

priorities that came out of the initial Singapore meeting in your drafting, that there would be some use in having a small group, and we assumed you amongst that group, to particularly focus on working to identify what ICANN currently does in terms of accessibility across the organization. This clearly goes beyond just the web accessibility work.

At that stage, the discussions went along the line that that would be a small work team that could work intersessionally and further that particular part of our priorities. If you feel the committee as a whole is better now at doing that, fine, and we don't have a problem with that. We will utilize the call for work team members to be new fodder if anyone puts their hand up to be beyond our group to be perhaps members of their group. But if you want to revert to the committee as a whole, I'm quite sure we'll be happy to do that. We'll just have to adjust our agendas accordingly. Back to you, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: There are two calls for work teams, and there might be some confusion between the two. Yes, I did suggest a small work team to work with staff to identify current ICANN accessibility activities across the organization. And, yes, I can put my hand up for that as well. I'm looking at the second work team, two points down, which has a tick box [in it]. And then indented [inaudible] it says these documents shall be available to the task force to review at the January/February face-to-face meeting. That was the one I had in mind. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So that's the crystalizing from our face-to-face work in London.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: And in L.A., I think, yes. We didn't have a formal [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] whatever country it was we last met face-to-face and ran our paper exercise [inaudible].

GUNELA ASTBRINK: That is correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. So you would like to see us continue, then, as an exercise as a whole, which, can I just say, is not, in my view, being progressed by the whole group. There has been very little, if any, continuing input into the Wiki space on that. We've had one or two little bursts of activity after the initial drafting went up on prioritization, and again after each of our meetings, and particularly the face-to-face one.

So you're proposing – let me see if I've got this clear – that a work team is not required to serve this, that somehow it's going to change from [topper] to activity. If so, I'd like to hear how.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: I'm wondering, with what is already on there on the Wiki space, if that is sufficient. I'll address these questions to the working group. Is that sufficient when it comes to the prioritization and [inaudible] to guide

the working group, and particularly staff, to be able to advance some of these suggestions for activities? I think it's [the question at this stage].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that question, Gunela. That's going to be something else I'm going to suggest we put a pin in then, because the aim of having some drafting done beyond the complete listing that's been done in the original prioritization paper and then the additional work from the SMART and SWOT analysis was to have some form of integrated commentary and outcome document that could show in what particular order this community, our sub-team here, our taskforce here, thought was most important issue. And then of course the business case analysis and various things coming out of all of that. An example there is the importance of captioning, etc., etc.

I, personally, am of the view that what we have with our overall prioritization document and on the Wiki is probably not enough, but that obviously my bias – I think something pithy, concise, and probably under 500 words with a checklist, a checklist that meetings can use and a checklist that web workers can use and a checklist that text and informational video and outreach material developers can use within ICANN would be useful and somewhat more detailed than "It's a good idea for them to be accessible."

However, that was going to be the primary focus of our face-to-face meeting in the Singapore gathering. Rather than totally take up today going back and discussing that, I think it's a question that perhaps we all

need to ponder, contemplate, and come back to the list between now and our next meeting with our personal responses to Gunela's question.

I think there should be additional drafting, but others may disagree. I'm not going to poll it now because I don't think people will have necessarily had time to think too fully on that. But I certainly think we probably should poll it. If we take an action item on that and send to the list your question, Gunela, and of course that either will or will not affect somewhat radically what we do or don't do, indeed if we need to or not, gather face-to-face to review where we are in all of this prioritization work in Singapore. But I see your hand is still raised, go ahead.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Yes. I hear what you're saying, and maybe what would be helpful then would be if [inaudible] now you were visualizing I think you said an integrated commentary [inaudible] lot more important issues from what was [inaudible] Wiki space in regards to the objectives and activities that came out of the SMART and SWOT analysis.

That's very helpful for me to understand, because I think maybe it wasn't clear to me what you were looking at in terms of the document, and maybe everyone in the working group here will find that helpful if maybe you could maybe just draft a couple of sentences or someone could draft a couple of sentences to explain that that is what the document is supposed to be. It's a short document with a checklist, so that when everyone has time to consider that on the list, we all know what we're talking about. That would be really helpful.

If people consider that we should have a second small work team, then hopefully something could be put together quickly, and so there would be a document in time for the Singapore meeting so that we can move forward. Because I think, for those people who are going to Singapore, to be able to work through this and get to the next stage of the prioritization is really important. I'm happy to help, of course. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Gunela. I'm not sure I need to modify my previously stated action item terribly much then, other than perhaps to take the polling aspect of it, to perhaps list the poll as more of a survey or an inquiry.

So we'll wait for the transcript of this call to come out, and I'll use the language used in the transcript of this call, compare it with the language used in the transcript of the call where this action item was generated – because I think that we probably did have a relatively clear understanding, at least at that stage, of what our intentions were – make sure that that matches and that we're not somehow drifting the intention of this action item, and put something out to the list.

I'm not going to give you a deadline on when that will happen, and I'm not going to make any statement on what that may or may not do in terms of planning and organization pre-meeting in Singapore, because I'm also very, very aware that a lot of us are stretched extraordinarily thin from other demands – in fact, beyond heroic demands – on our time with our work in other parts of ICANN at the moment. We'll see how that goes.

But let's make that action item. Terri, the action item is that a new action item is going out for a clear guiding principle and outline of what a second small work team will be doing, if indeed we all agree it needs to exist, on an outcomes document from the priorities discussion and work, looking at the workshop material from whatever meeting it was – L.A. is as good as any other – and to develop a checklist or brief document, or not, to assist ICANN with regards to gaining greater accessibility.

That is a terribly formed sentence. If that helps, having a terribly formed sentence as an action item, you'll send that to me and then I'll edit, then you've got it repeated. I probably wouldn't like it record it that way. I was, as I said, very happy to simply resort to listening to the MP3 and looking at the transcript. Does that help, Terri?

TERRI AGNEW: It certainly does. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's more of a tome than it is an action item, but anyway, we'll see how that one works out.

Recognizing that we have spent an extraordinary amount of time on some of our action items, we will, I would suggest, already [flagged] not get through our full agenda today, but we do need to, and this is time-critical, and it does have to be done at today's meeting or at least begun at today's meeting, we need to prepare – this is item three, now – an update to the At-Large Advisory Committee on the progress, on our

progress, on this taskforce's progress, from Recommendation 11 out of the ATLAS II meeting. We are going to have to spend a fair bite of time on this now.

Just to remind you all, the ATLAS II recommendations sum I think 43 or 44 in total number. Number 11 states that ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria (gender, culture, diversity) and user needs (disabilities, etc.). Again, they are examples.

This is one of the ones that we were able to report back to ALAC and the ALAC was in turn able to report back to the ICANN Board at their last face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, that we were already working proactively and very well with key staff, and we named Chris Mondini and Laura at the time, to ensure that we were acting as a resource for them.

One of the examples we gave was Laura and Chris had discussed with us in the L.A. face-to-face meeting, which was of course the formation of the small group to assist them formally, and of course we've already seen an outcome of that. It was the recent RFP for web accessibility review going out to the public. What is not obvious from that RFP going out, we are aware of course that Laura has made, I hope, good use of any advice our people could give based on that. We'd like to think we're having influence.

These are the sorts of specific example that I am hoping we will be able to build on and give a piece of text to the ALAC. The piece of text will need to be in the ALAC's possession no later than the meeting this

month, which is, I believe – Terri correct me if I'm wrong – on the 26th, the same as our – or is it 27th, not sure of the exact timing [kicking over] from one day to the other, then. Either the 26th or 27th of January. So hopefully is after our next meeting. But we had promised that our next meeting would be dedicated purely to captioning.

We will need to have final text reporting on this in the ALAC's hands no later than that date. That gives us roughly 14 to 18 days, barely enough to put some text together on this. The Recommendation 11 request came in after our last meeting, and this is a request for a specific update that has gone out to every one of the subcommittees or work teams that have had a recommendation from ATLAS allocated to it.

I'm sorry, Judith, what do you mean? You thought we already sent our recommendation for Rec 11 for the last [meeting]?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I was told by – I think Heidi mentioned that I thought that the issue of Recommendation 11 was finished because it was discussed at the Board already, and that that one did not necessarily need to be updated, but maybe staff can figure in on that and tell us what they want. Because the only updates we have are for video and the captioning, and we wrote it all up for that last time. We could say we're having a second one and we can reiterate again about the need for captioning, but I'm sort of unclear about what they really want.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Judith. Thanks for that. I'm going to open the floor and ask other people to respond to your suggestion that this is a point that no update needs to be given. For example, what I suggested in my preamble, the example of our contribution via Laura's group to the recent RFP would have been well and surely worthwhile updating.

Remember, this is not a "we have a prioritization list and ICANN has to do it" exercise. It's a "how is the implementation of that aspiration going?" It's a tracking exercise, not just a statement one. Over to you, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Cheryl. I think the more we can report on the activities of this working group, the better, even if there might be some [inaudible] and I'm not sure if there is. If we can talk about this and the [inaudible] accessibility RFP, that's really important. That's really important.

But also the work with the Technology Taskforce on captioning and other activities there. That [inaudible]. I think both the words are in a small report on progress would be very helpful to highlight what we've done and hopefully give some indication of what we intend to do in the near future. Thanks.

CHERYL LLANGDON-ORR: I certainly am of similar mind to you. Judith, I want to come back to you. You indicated that staff had – in fact, Heidi – had said that everything was settled with Rec 11, or that reporting for Rec 11 was, in your view, you were hearing, finalized. Can you help us through that a little bit

more? Because I'm clearly going to have to get back to Heidi, unless some other staff can help me now, to understand that better. Can you give us some context, in what way was this [inaudible]?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think I was asking about Recommendation 11 a couple of meetings ago, and Heidi mentioned that since it went to the Board, it was – I thought she said finished, but maybe staff has a better idea on that, and maybe I misunderstood something, or something like that. But that's what was my recollection a while ago.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so – just one moment, Siliva. Let me be clear, Judith, this was one of our meetings, not some other meeting, that Heidi—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, no. I don't remember. I don't remember.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, that's all right. Because if it was one of our meetings, I could just go back through the transcript. Back to you, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: I can check on Heidi regarding this recommendation. I don't recall that this has been in any way reported or briefed, the Board has been reported or briefed, on these recommendations. That's my belief. But I will take this as an action item and clarify where we are with regards to

the recommendation or the reporting of this recommendation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me make sure we're really clear on a couple of things. It has, in fact, been used as a specific example of the outcome recommendations from ATLAS II. Recommendation 11 was selected as one of the two or three examples that the At-Large Advisory Committee reported specifically to the Board about progress. When they were reporting more generally on the outcomes of ATLAS II and for the implementation of the outcomes of the recommendations in the Los Angeles meeting.

So it's not true to say it has not been reported or discussed or anything with the Board. Recommendation 11 was specifically targeted as something that was showcased at the last face-to-face meeting between the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Board in Los Angeles. It occurred almost immediately after, and I do mean within less than a couple of hours, of our workshop in Los Angeles.

So the Board has certainly been updated on Rec 11 to the extent of where we were and what we were doing up until and including Los Angeles. What the ATLAS II leadership group has done since then is write to every single work group, including the Technology Taskforce and all other work groups, and ask for a progress update on everything that has happened between when we last reported on any of the recommendations.

In our case, we were one that was actually reported on. In other cases, some of them would be a little bit more immature than our reporting.

So, to that end, what we need to do in what's left of most of today's call is agree on what we will be saying to the ALAC they can put forward as reporting on Recommendation 11 implementation.

If Judith has been told, however, that because it's "been discussed with the board" that we don't need to go any further, then that's something that we now need to take back to what may have been very generic requests for updates for all of the taskforces and work groups that were given work out of the ATLAS processes. Back to you, to see whether or not what I just said then makes things any clearer or has muddied the waters. Silvia?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. What I understand is that this group will come up with the wording and the report on how they recommend ICANN to implement this range of services, according to the various criteria. So we come up with a number of suggestions, recommendations, and report that will show the progress of this working group, the achievements and the goals of this working group, on how this will then be used by ICANN and be implemented by ICANN. Correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Close. Again, this is not a report on the activities of the Accessibility Taskforce. It is a report back specifically on Recommendation 11 from ATLAS 11. Because, as you know, a number of the recommendations were allocated to a number of parties. Some of them were owned by the whole of ALAC. Some of them were owned by particular work groups or taskforces.

We were given Recommendation 11, and what we've been asked for, and I'm just desperately looking for the specific e-mail, is a update to the ALAC in advance of the Singapore meeting this year to be included in ALAC's overall reporting. Okay? So it's not so much everything we've been doing, but specifically, what has happened in terms of any implementation or progress regarding Recommendation 11.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Glenn, for copying it into the chat. It is on the agenda, but it is worthwhile looking at the fact that it is [quite clear] a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria. That's good.

"The link Judith provided specifically addresses only users' needs of persons with disabilities." Yes, thanks for that, Glenn. Obviously we were specific to one thing. Judith seems to have dropped out of the room. Sorry to hear that, Judith. Hopefully you've not lost audio.

I understand not gender or cultural diversity. Thanks, Glenn. The whole accessibility and diversity question hasn't been teased out at the moment. We own Rec 11, so need to update – we've been asked to update regarding Recommendation 11.

Thanks, Laura, for copying in the RFP. Sorry, Judith. Glad to have you back in. I'm of the view that the RFP is an extremely important thing to include in some short text for responding to this request for an update. Are there other things? Please do use the audio facility if possible so it's

caught to the transcript for today's call. Are there other things that you believe we should be updating the ALAC on? Go ahead, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Cheryl. Certainly the RFP for web accessibility is a big one. The other reporting could be, as we've discussed, the work done with the Technology Taskforce on testing various captioning options, looking at the accessibility of the various web conferencing systems. It's work in progress, but it's pretty important when it comes to engaging the wider ICANN community in the work of ICANN. So if that can be reported on too, that's great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Gunela. I certainly agree with you there. Any other suggestions from people? I'm being very selfish suggesting that if you can put some of this to the audio record, it would be useful. Just to remind everybody that I literally do not have the chat pod operating on my Windows operating screen. Today, for this call, there is nothing showing in the chat pod in the Adobe Connect room on my Windows operating machine. Everything that can go through audio allows at least me to keep up with what you're saying, but also would mean that we can capture it for the transcript.

I'm looking at a mobile phone to read the chat now. Glenn is pointing out Technical Taskforce spent the last year evaluating conference tools, and one of the [inaudible] was accessibility. Yes, thank you, Glenn. In fact, there is going to be some overlap with the Technology Taskforce and ourselves, obviously, with Recommendation 11 in particular. That is

something that we obviously need to work for together. But we, our taskforce, has been asked to respond, and we need to put some text together.

Joly is saying there is a link in the note. Let me read this on your behalf, Joly, for the record. Joly is suggesting that that page, the page Judith put into the chat – staff, this is something you'll need to do – is captured in the note section on Recommendation 11 on http forward slash, and it goes on, recommendations to the ICANN board.

It looks to me that we are not in the couple of minutes left going to get any drafting of such a short report done at all, much to my disappointment. So let's look at how we're going to draft intersessionally then, remembering that we do have to have a draft response from us to the ALAC in their hands certainly no later than the end of the month, 26th, 27th, but preferably I would have thought by the date of the leadership team meeting for the ALAC in January. Terri or Silvia, do we know what date the leadership meetings for the ALAC are going to be in January?

TERRI AGNEW: Generally, it's been being held on the fourth Tuesday of the month.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's the ALAC meeting. The leadership team meeting, isn't there a mid-month one usually?

TERRI AGNEW:	Yes, there is. And I believe that's being determined. I apologize about that. It's still in the works.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Fine, okay. That's not a date we can try and hang our hats on, then. Never mind. Hopefully, when that's out, we may even be able to answer that. So what we're going to have to do is, and because it's an ATLAS II recommendation I don't just want this work linked to today's meeting. I don't want it as a child page from today's meeting. I think it would be better to be linked from the main landing page.

Action item now, so we can draft, will be for a Wiki page that is a child page of the main Taskforce page, or whatever it is we already have up on ATLAS II Recommendation 11. It needs to be linked to this agenda item, but the new space will need to be the one that we do our drafting on for our reporting. We will take what text was projected through the meeting in Los Angeles.

The staff could dig out the PowerPoint page that has more than just Recommendation 11. I think it had a couple of recommendations on it. They could link the PowerPoint presentation on the ATLAS II implementation of recommendations that was given to the ICANN Board in the Los Angeles meeting. That will be a foundation or a base point for us to work upon.

Let's pick a date by which we'd like to have initial drafting agreed. Can we commit to put something together between now and the 13th or 14th of January? Is that reasonable, everybody? I'm hearing deathly silence. A tick from Glenn, thank you Glenn. I appreciate some feedback.

Looking at the chat, if I could also ask staff, if there's any of these additional links – for example, I think again this is so small reading it off my mobile phone, Glenn was saying that the link Judith provided was Technology Taskforce based and we need an Accessibility response, too. Exactly, Glenn.

So I think we probably need to capture some of that, perhaps even in the comments section of this new page that I'd like to put up for drafting. Gunela is agreeing. Okay. So what we're going to do is now take this work to Wiki work, and obviously, anyone who wants to just put something to the list, we'll also capture in the Wiki. I will be able to assure the At-Large Advisory Committee leadership team that they will be getting something from us in terms of updates.

However, I do want to follow up with Heidi on what she has said to Judith, because it's obvious that there's that area of some mismatch or miscommunication here. So I might ask Heidi to think back, and then Judith, you and I and Heidi will make sure that we have a clear and unambiguous understanding, because it's not good to be coming at these things from two entirely different directions and expectations.

You have two updates for item 5, then. You have the shortest period possible to give them. We'll skip those totally and go straight to that. Over to you, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi, everybody. Quite quickly, also in the chat there is a session that I think Laura is going to as well. I'm getting permission from [NTEN] to film this session. It's going to be done by Nancy O'Donnell from the

Helen Keller National Center. Her topic at [NTEN] in March will be "Accessibility and IT."

So I'll keep you all informed. I'll be doing a blog post for the ICANN newsletter as well. I'll be sending it on to Chris for editing with [Jill]. That's one item.

Second item is we're talking with ISOC on these issues of accessibility as well. So we'll keep this committee informed on how that's proceeding as well. That's it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, that is terrific. That is excellent. Please keep us up to date, as you said, Glenn. Also, just to remind us, anyone else, that these are the sorts of things that feeding into our group is always very, very valuable. Of course, it's not impossible, but we could also add some of the resources that might be coming out of this in perhaps some published materials. It might be something we could link to our own resources as well.

We do need to come back to the question that Judith raised early on, and that's the matter of the next meeting – in particular about Doodles in general. Let's deal with the next meeting, first of all. Judith has proposed that on the Monday, 26th of January, 2015, that it is instead of a 19:00 UTC start, it is a 20:00 UTC start.

I don't have Gisella on the call. Obviously the normal mechanism for Doodle decisions is a mix of both the yeses and the maybes. But Judith has specifically requested that we have [inaudible] at least at the 20:00

UTC. Can I ask, is there anyone who objects to us moving the Monday, 26th of January, from 19:00 to 20:00 UTC? If you object, let us know.

I'm not seeing any objections. I'm not hearing anyone making a negative noise. So, staff can I ask you to make whatever magic happens when you shift everything forward one hour? So all the calendars and etc. need to be updated, and if you'd be so kind as to put up a blank page, a meeting page, recognizing that the draft agenda doesn't particularly need to be filled in. Just a space for it at this stage because it is going to be a dedicated captioning meeting.

But make sure that the meeting page is listing it 20:00 UTC. If that link can come across to me as soon as practical, I will bludgeon together some form of very light agenda that we can operate with. I see Gunela is delighted at the 20:00 UTC meeting start.

The second question Judith raised, which was the arcane art of scheduling and how we have added together the maybes and the yeses, is probably a conversation now we'll have to have at another time. But you are right, Judith. It is normal practice, in fact, that the maybes and the yeses are added together, and the most popular date is usually selected unless a critical person, such as the leader or chair or presenter is in the maybe or unavailable [part].

Ladies and gentlemen, at two minutes to the top of the hour, I'm going to stop the agenda now, but ask one little piece of feedback from staff. Do we, as yet, have a time or a day where we will be meeting in face-to-face in ICANN 52? Silvia? Terri?

TERRI AGNEW:	I believe that's also being determined still at this time.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	So the lack of knowledge that I have is a lack of knowledge generally. Okay. Well, we still do want one. We do hope we get to know about ti soon, because even those of us who are not attending Singapore meeting might want to schedule their calendars to try and not be double-booked so that they can come in remotely.
	Laura, I see your microphone. Did you wish to say something?
LAURA [BREWER]:	Yes. Hi, Cheryl. Just a quick summary and update on the response for proposal deadline. It is January 20th and we have proactively reached out to several vendors, some of which were recommended by this working group. So a big shout-out and thank you to Gunela and Glenn and Antony and others that helped out with that. So I will be providing a further update on that probably via e-mail as that date approaches before our January 26th meeting. So I just wanted to give a quick update on that. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Terrific, Laura. Thanks for that. I'm hoping we can quote out officially all of the good parts you just shared with us, that our group was of use to you in that process in our Recommendation 11 reporting. If you want to be quoted accurately, perhaps you should write the text that you want me to quote.

LAURA [BREWER]:   Yes, absolutely. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You pen the exact text that you want to be quoted as saying and I will plug it in. Saves being misquoted, that way. Laura, you and I have a little bit to catch up on a couple of action items as well. This coming week is not going to be good for me, and in fact, probably until we get back from Frankfurt, it's going to be challenging, but we can see what we can do. Perhaps early or middle next week. But if I don't get back to you, if you could get to me, that would be appreciated.

One minute past the hour. I apologize for keeping you a little bit longer. I think the conversations we've had today have been important. Some of them need clarification work to follow. If staff would be so kind as to let me know what their interpretation of the action items are out of the pod, I will do my best today to go over them and see if there's any omissions or additional clarification on those action items, because we really don't have time now to go through and discuss them.

Thank you, one and all. Our next meeting, as I have said previously, will now be 20:00 UTC on the 26th of January, and we will be focusing on the matter of captioning. Thank you. Happy new year to you, and bye for now.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, everyone.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]