

---

TERRI AGNEW:

Certainly. We'll go ahead and begin at this time. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce taking place on Wednesday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of September, 2015, at 13:00 UTC.

On the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Leon Sanchez, Judith Hellerstein, Glen McKnight, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Gunela Astbrink, and Siranush Vardanyan.

On the Spanish channel, we have Alberto Soto.

On the French channel, we have Aziz Hilali.

We have apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Baudouin Schombe, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemma, and Heidi Ullrich.

From staff we have Ariel Liang, Joe Catapano; and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

Our French interpreters today are Claire and Camila.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes, but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Olivier.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Terri. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? I don't hear anyone shouting their names out, so the roll call is complete. Today's agenda is going to be very busy. We have to look at all the recommendations that we have drafted as a large group, as the large At-Large Summit, the summit that took place over a year ago now. I think that this call is going to be not only just a one-off call, we're going to need a series of calls, depending on how far we go down the list of recommendations and review them at the moment.

In the more recent ALAC call, there were some questions as to the validity of some of these recommendations whether they had been superseded, whether they were still up to date. I guess we're going to make use of the call that we have now and the calls we'll have in the future weeks to be able to actually decide on this. I gather that some recommendations will probably fall in the category of not being relevant anymore. Some recommendations will come in the category of having been completed, which is excellent news. In that case, we will need to see and decide as to how we want to report about this.

We want to of course not only report to the board or to other parts of ICANN, but we want to report to our At-Large Structures about the recommendations that have been completed. At the end of the day, they are the ones that drafted these recommendations and we certainly should seize the opportunity to actually score good points with this, say, "Well, look, this is what you wanted, this is what has been done now, this is where we've improved the system." We definitely have to engage in further dialogue with our At-Large Structures once we present this.

---

Thirdly, we also want to find out those recommendations that still need some work to be done and plan for this work and perhaps find out whether we need to engage other parts of At-Large or other parts of the community or staff or other resources in order to complete those recommendations.

So what we're really doing today I guess is a stock take of where we are. Although so much time has passed, it seems that some recommendations have really moved forward quite well and quite far, others have stalled a little bit sometimes due to the fact that we have had some serious amount of work to produce elsewhere, such as the IANA stewardship transition and the ICANN accountability processes that have pretty much sucked some of the life out of the room and superseded the work that we needed to do here.

Now we're in front of these. The first thing I was thinking of doing in this agenda was to have first a follow up on the recommendations already sent to the board. In fact, there is only one set of recommendations that has been sent to the board. A second set, which we were going to present to the board, we couldn't. So I wanted to review those and see if there is any follow up required and then also review all of the other recommendations that we have.

Ariel Liang and Dev Anand Teelucksingh have worked an enormous amount to reformat these and help put some shape to this. We did spend some time face-to-face after the meeting, our last meeting that took place in Buenos Aires. We spent much time face-to-face trying to clean things up.

---

At this stage, all I want in agenda item #1 is to approve the agenda, if you're okay with it. Is there any other business that you would like to add to the agenda? I don't see anyone, so that's fine. Then the agenda is approved and we'll proceed as per the agenda.

I note from Glenn already some discussion going on about how we should work out the alignment of the recommendations with the ICANN strategic plan and the necessary budget and then work from a budget backwards and proposals. You're absolutely right. You're spot on. This is what we need to work on right now. We need to find out if they're aligned with the strategic plan and where we go from here. We have the ability as this working group is the follow-up working group to ATLAS II, we have the ability to say let's continue with this or let's not continue with each one of those recommendations.

I note also for the record that although we do have only a subset of all of the people that were invited to this call, there is at least one person from every region which is very important. And I remind you all that the call is interpreted in Spanish and in French, so please state your name before you speak. Of course those recordings will be very useful because I think we can then appoint people to those recordings when we will let them know this is what needs to be done and we discuss this. If you have any further questions, you can check the recording or the transcript of course, and we can help you see how we move forward with this.

Let's move to agenda item #2 and start first with recommendations to the board. We actually made a presentation to the board during the Los Angeles meeting, and in there – and let's see, Ariel, I think you're in

---

charge. Yeah. Ariel is now sharing her screen, so we'll be able to go a lot faster than just sharing applications. If you cannot see this, you can put full screen for this window and it will make things a little larger for you.

Ariel, if we can look at this, now the agenda that we had there was to tell the board what the community had done after ATLAS II and had recommendation highlight for board attention. There were only a handful of recommendations, in fact three of them that were highlighted for board attention. In other words, we wanted the board to respond to these.

If we go to slide number – it doesn't have a number. This one, there we go. That's the first recommendation that we told the board. Now, for the record, we have not received any follow up from the board, although we were asked, "Do we need a follow up?" The answer was, yes, we do need a follow up but perhaps if the board has further queries or questions about the recommendation and the slides that we have made, we're absolutely happy to provide them with further information.

The first one was ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria: gender, cultural diversity, and user needs. Here we've [inaudible] the captioning technology, the prioritization from the primary objectives for the taskforce and also explaining that the discussion was [inaudible] with key ICANN staff during the Accessibility Working Group meeting during ICANN 51.

The question I ask you all here now on this recommendation is should I follow up as the chair of this working group? Should I follow up with the

---

board chair and ask for the board's feedback or for a board statement on this? The floor is open. I see a green light from Glenn McKnight. Judith Hellerstein also a green tick. Green from Gunela.

Okay, what I will do then is to do a follow-up e-mail to the chair of the board asking him whether they require, on the one hand, any further information from us, and on the other hand how is ICANN acting on this recommendation. I guess the chair of the board can then get his staff to respond back to us and let us know what is ICANN doing in the spirit of this recommendation. Is that okay with everyone? I see Aziz and Dev are okay with that. You may speak as well. And Siranush has a green tick.

Let's move forward. Recommendation 11, we know how to move forward. Ariel, I hope you're... Yes, okay. I see in the notes that this is taken care of. Is it Silvia who's taking the notes today or who is taking the notes?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, Terri is taking the notes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, Ariel. Thanks, Terri, for taking the notes. Great. The floor is open. Glenn McKnight, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. I think Gunela was first, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, sorry. Okay. Thanks. Gunela Astbrink.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Olivier. I'm not sure if it's Glenn or me. Maybe we were simultaneous. This might be discussed a bit further on in the agenda. If it's going to be, then I'll hold my question. It was noted before in the announcement of a call that the recommendation 11 has been completed. I was just wondering what that meant in terms of how we move forward with a range of recommendations or actions under this recommendation. It would be great to get clarification [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Gunela. So when we say the recommendation has been completed, I think it effectively means that as far as the ALAC's work is concerned, we have produced some – we have taken some action in order to follow this recommendation. That's how... I think I interpret it this way. With regards to saying, well, now this recommendation is sent to the board, obviously that hasn't been completed, so they might well be that we need to follow up on that. That's my interpretation. I don't know if anybody else wishes to speak to this. Glenn, did you wish to respond to this?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, I have another comment, what you were asking a minute ago.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So back to Gunela then.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Olivier. What I'm not clear on when it talks about a recommendation being completed that there are three particular points that have been taken to the board about actions. When it comes to the primary objectives of a taskforce, there are a number of suggested actions to be done. I'm just concerned that the board may think that everything in recommendation 11 has been completed whereas I think in the taskforce, there's still a lot of work underway and to be done. Yes, I'm just wondering how that works. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Gunela. I think that the way forward which I suggested, and it's actually in the action item, to send the chair of the board to ask whether the board requires any further information on recommendation 11 and how ICANN has been acting on this recommendation is probably our next step. In that respect, yes it is not completed. We have a recommendation with the work that we have done underneath on that page with the links to the various pieces of work and with things that we [are recommended] ICANN should do.

Obviously, you're absolutely right. The recommendation would not be closed or complete until we receive a response from ICANN, and I gather that at that point we will have to make a decision ourselves on whether this is a satisfactory response in our view or not a satisfactory response. If ICANN says, "That's great news. Thanks very much, goodbye," do we accept this as closing the recommendation or do we



---

actually want to see action from ICANN on this? That's the follow up if you want.

It is, I guess, not totally complete, obviously since these are recommendations for the board. Does this explain? Is that a suitable way forward for you?

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

We look forward very much to the board's response. When it comes to the captioning that Judith has raised, it's a pilot project so it's to be decided if that's going to be ongoing. There's a lot of work being done on web accessibility, which is fantastic, but based on the staff review of accessibility, there are a number of actions which I feel are under consideration.

My main concern is that the board thinks, okay, there's some work done and thanks very much. That's it. As long as they understand that this is a very good starting point and the work will proceed. The recommendation of our work that is underway, that the idea of it might be complete but it's not closed, if that makes sense. If that would be workable from getting response from the board. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Gunela. That absolutely makes sense. Perhaps it is one of the tasks of this group is to make sure it continues to monitor the work, not only in At-Large but also on the board and that's what this e-mail to the chair of the board is going to be asking and monitor whether

---

our recommendations are moving forward or whether ICANN is doing or asking upon them.

Let's continue through the queue. Glenn McKnight, you're next.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I had a question earlier. You requested some feedback on approaching the board, but I wanted to respond first to Gunela's comment. In the discussion thread here, we're seeing examples of actions such as the three event captioning pilot that Judith created or the e-book that we're looking at one example. Or even what Laura Bengford has done in terms of the contract with the W3C, [inaudible] 2.0 on the website for accessibility.

So there is something happening, but on the other hand, I have to agree with Gunela. We have extensive work we did on the great work that Gunela did on stock take to survey the culture within ICANN on accessibility. It was dreadful. The results were don't know, don't know, don't know, don't know. It's not something that one could use.

If anything came out of that result is that they perhaps didn't take it serious or they didn't put the time in to actually measure the culture of accessibility.

The second point on this is that this was because it's such a broad recommendation 11, way beyond just the people with disabilities. It deals with so much other accessibility issues, we need to be clear that most of our recommendations, particularly Gunela, myself, and Judith has really just focused on people with disabilities. There's other real

---

serious disparities as well, but in [inaudible], we chose our poison selectively. I just want to make that point.

Let me go back to what you asked earlier, Olivier. You were talking about approaching the board. Can you clarify for me? I'm assuming you mean a subcommittee within the board or an individual or a small group of people responsible for this. I would assume those who have a special committee. Do you have clarification for us who actually you'll speak to and how empathetic they are to this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Glenn. I will just contact the chair of the board. It's a follow up of the ATLAS II statement that was sent to the board. On each occasion, I guess then it's down for the chair of the board to see who on the board deals with this. I have no idea on how the board is organized on these matters. Is that okay, Glenn? You might be muted.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thanks, Olivier. I think that's a good start.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. All right, then, let's move on. Let's go to the next recommendation, number 27. The board must implement ATRT 2 recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees. That is of course to amend the ICANN bylaws so that the ICANN board will respond in a timely manner to formal advice from all

---

advisory committees explaining what action it took and the rationale for doing so.

Now, these are ATRT 2 recommendations. This is a process that is pretty much outside our hands. It's led by staff with the board, and I have no idea where we are today, I'm afraid, although I was part of ATRT 2.

It seems that the board, if you recall, has actually said, "Yes, we will proceed forward all of these recommendations and we've given the green light for their implementation." We did have a status report from the Strategic Initiatives department to let us know... I think it is the Strategic Initiatives department that deals with the reviews that basically told us, yes, we are proceeding forward with work. There hasn't been anything since.

So what I would suggest here as well is to ask in the same e-mail to the board, "Where are we on this?" It's reminding them. It's now been two years since the ATRT 2 recommendations or it's closing up to two years since the ATRT 2 recommendation. What's going on with this recommendation 27 that looks at recommendation 9.1 from ATRT 2? Glenn McKnight, you have the floor. Okay, it was an old hand.

I note in the chat that we can wait until the transition happens to push for bylaw changes. Of course the IANA stewardship transition, the ICANN bylaws. Some of these bylaw changes might go down the way another year maybe. Who knows? Leon will probably know better what the time table could be for this, but I'm a little concerned about the time this is all taking to moving forward.

---

If nobody else has to say anything about recommendation 27 and we're okay with my suggested course of action, then we can go to the next one which is on the next page, recommendation 35. The ICANN board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large community in between ICANN public meetings. That was to enhance communications between the board at the At-Large community.

Here I shall ask for a response from the board chair because that's a simple, straightforward recommendation and I'm not quite sure why it's not being followed up.

The feedback we did have, the semi-formal feedback we did have from the chair of the board during one of the ALT sessions, that's the Friday morning session, was that it might be better to have perhaps board sub-committee or the board chair and vice chairs to hold a conference call with the At-Large community in between ICANN public meetings, so that they don't have the full board there but just a smaller number of board members including the board member that was selected by the At-Large community and that would enhance the communication between the board and the At-Large community. Is there any feedback on this? Would we prefer the full board or a subset of the board would be fine?

I note a subset from Glenn McKnight. Okay, so that's the third recommendation to follow up with the board. Let's go on to the next ones.

The next ones were just progress updates and these were not recommendations that the board should act on. If you want to read

---

through them, I recommend that you have a look through them in your own time. Really, the follow up was on the three first recommendations that we had for the board. Let's go to the next presentation.

The next presentation was the one that was prepared for the Singapore meeting, which unfortunately we didn't have any time to present due to other factors that we had to discuss. Here, I think it starts on page number five or six maybe further down. There we go.

ARIEL LIANG: [inaudible] seven.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Seven, yeah. Thank you, Ariel. I note one the lower right-hand side. Yes. Now, these were status updates as well, so they did not require the board to actually act on these, at least not at the moment. What we have shown is just the status of what we're doing showing that there's an absolute increase on the rotation of calls. The At-Large calls are about to rotate around time zones. Making decision within 24 hour period is still a challenge. That was for recommendation 16.

On 26 it's to do with a project that overhauls ICANN's information management system is underway, etc. So I don't think that we actually missed any opportunity to ask the board for things in our... That was the Singapore meeting. I just included this just to show you that we didn't have any feedback required from the board on this. At the moment, just three pieces of feedback needed from the board to our first three recommendations.

---

Let's move then to agenda item #3, and that's now the bulk of the work that we need to do today looking at our ATLAS II recommendations. Recommendations for the ICANN board and then recommendations per working group. I invite you to have a look at the table of recommendations to the ICANN board.

What Ariel has now done is to take each one of these recommendations, slice that bit of the table up. So have the recommendation number, then the recommendation next to it, the recipient of the recommendation, the thematic group [source] just in case we don't understand the recommendation anymore and we want to go back to the thematic group chair and ask them if they remember what they said over a year ago.

Finally, the people or groups that were assigned a task to proceed forward with carrying out the implementation or the follow up of this presentation.

On the right-hand side, there is a status box which we can use to either say the status is something is pending, we're waiting for a response, or the recommendation is being completed or any other status that we wish to put there.

Underneath that box – that slice, should we say – are the notes that are now being developed as a follow up to what's going on, what that recommendation [enticed].

If you look at the page, each one of these recommendations has more or less follow ups as such. The other interesting thing to note is that the recommendation number itself is clickable. If you click on the

---

recommendation number, it will actually send you to a separate page for this recommendation.

Now, Ariel, help me out here. I know that you're using embedded pages. Where does one perform the amendments? Then it shows on the other page. Is it on the subpage that one is able to do the edits and then it will show automatically on the previous page? Ariel Liang?

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Olivier. You are correct. The page [1] need to make amendments on is the subpages for each recommendation and the quickest way to get to the subpage is to click on the hyperlink number, which you can see I'm pointing to. On this page, is editable by anybody. The other pages – for example, the one for ICANN board and then also these recommendations for working groups, you can see the lock here on the top-left corner. That means it's not editable and you have to click on the number to go to the individual page and add it there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Fantastic. Thanks very much, Ariel. That's really helpful and that certainly helps us in being able to make sense of each one of these recommendations.

A while ago, we had decided that our priority was to have the recommendations designed to go to the ICANN board or ICANN staff to be all prioritized as the first ones that we want to move forward on, and therefore what I suggest on this call is we start looking at all of the recommendations for the ICANN board and make decisions on these,



---

remembering the questions that we had earlier. Is this recommendation still up to date? Is it obsolete perhaps? Do we still have to follow up or have things already been done and we don't need to follow up on it?

Perhaps we can even also add as to whether there is anything that needs to be done in addition to what's there at the moment.

We have people on the call who can provide updates on what's going on, so let's start with recommendation #1. That's for ICANN. ICANN should continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.

Underneath that, the three bullets that we have – bullet points – are the chair of Thematic Group 1 to develop a paragraph and expand the notion of broader-based on the materials of the TG1. Broader audience equals underrepresented community members? ICANN's efforts to bring in new people should not be limited to people in developing countries, but also underrepresented community members that live in developed countries. Therefore, ICANN should expand its programs in place to all underserved communities. [Assignees] were Leon Sanchez, Rafid Fatani, Adam Peake, and Evan Leibovitch. I note that Leon is on the call.

Leon, I know you have to leave in 45 minutes, at past 45 minutes. Do you still have a few minutes before you run away? Leon Sanchez?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I thought I had sent the message right in time to avoid speaking, but no. Yes, we were tasked with this. I think

---

there hasn't been much progress in this task. To be truth, I haven't personally followed very much the discussion on this because I have been absorbed as you may be aware by the CCWG and other responsibilities that I have been undertaking. So I have really not much to report on this side and I apologize for that.

I think I will touch base with Rafid, Adam, and Evan so we can provide a more detailed update on this issue.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thanks very much, Leon. Of course you've now had priority on CCWG Accountability and thanks for doing all this extensive amount of work. Raf Fatani I think has also taken on a job. Adam Peake is now working for ICANN, and Evan Leibovitch is working for the UNDP. People have moved on. It's a little problem. Should we maybe have other assignees that we add to this? Judith Hellerstein?

**JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:** I know Glenn and I have been looking on trying to outreach in the NARALO region. One thing I brought up, which is also I brought up to Leon and others' attention is that there is other ICANN outreach programs that are going on that we have no connection to. That also would be great to tie those in, so [inaudible] for the next generation.

They bring in university students in the different regions to ICANN, but they're not at all connected to At-Large or anyplace else. That's another way in our outreach. And they are supporting it, but there's no connection. So they're supporting it, but then they're not connecting it

---

to either At-Large or to the other constituencies, so I think there's a missing link there and we'd love to get that... That's one way to help on the outreach issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Judith. You're very right. I looked at the announcement of the Next Gen people, the Next Gen Fellows, for the Dublin meeting and have noticed people from developed countries as well being listed. And of course at the time, the Next Gen program did not exist, so maybe we need indeed to link up with this. Let's have in the notes link up with the Next Gen program. Perhaps if we can ask staff that are running the Next Gen program to bring their inputs, so we can point to it and say, well, that's another thing that's going on at the moment. Good point.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Well, [inaudible] recommendation 1. Given the key focus of this is outreach, I'm kind of wondering whether perhaps the Chinese could also put on the Outreach & Engagement Subcommittee as an assignment. What we can do... Well, Judith has mentioned the Next Gen program, we have the fellowship, we have the CROPP program, and I note some of the discussions that were happening in some of the RALOs. How do we do... How should I put it? Perhaps look at ways of getting funding for events, for having an event in a country without At-Large Structures, for example, in order to bring people from that country or territory with the goal of encouraging them to set up an

---

organization [inaudible] Internet governance issues and then apply to become an At-Large Structure afterwards.

So, a suggestion. [inaudible] realize that, well, as you mentioned with the assignees, a few of them moved on. Leon of course is very, very busy on the Accountability track. This is a suggestion. Perhaps this recommendation needs to be handled by the Outreach & Engagement Subcommittee.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev. Let's hear from Glenn McKnight. Then we can make a decision on this. Glenn McKnight, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I have to reiterate what Judith was saying just a second ago. As you noticed, the recent announcement for [year] 16 young university students will be at the ICANN. In my experience, deeply involved with volunteering with the fellows because North America does not have any fellows at all, neither does Europe. But it's a great opportunity to meet fantastic volunteers. For example, Siranush is an example. She came [inaudible]. Tijani, for example. It's such a wealth of... A great way to enter into the ALAC space.

But the Next Gen, speaking from a NARALO point of view, is a great opportunity. I ran across one individual in LA. He was at the [inaudible] center. Zero knowledge of ALAC. I mean, absolutely nothing. I clearly want to stress this: that we need to make sure that we get in front of those individuals or individually invite them to our showcase. We've got

---

to something because this is a huge mistake. I just want to reiterate with what Judith is saying. We're definitely going to follow up on this, because when ICANN goes to Puerto Rico, which is in our region, next fall, we definitely want to reach out with Eduardo and the ISOC Puerto Rico people to make sure this happens.

The second point on outreach, a lot of this discussion seems to have shifted the term from outreach to engagement. We did some analysis of our own numbers in NARALO and it was astounding how many new ALSes that we recruited over the last couple of years didn't attend one of our phone calls. We have engagement issues that may not be addressed with this. We need to find out why people aren't coming, why people aren't volunteering. Perhaps we need to redefine this recommendation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Glenn. Would you speak for or against having the assignee, the assignment of this recommendation, go to the Outreach & Engagement Subcommittee?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Yeah, I would say so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For or against it?

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT: For it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For it, okay, excellent. Does anyone object to it going to Outreach & Engagement Subcommittee? I don't see any objections. So what I would suggest then is that we still keep the original assignees in the loop because I think that unless they wish to be taken out of the loop explicitly, then of course we're not going to judge them on that. It's fine. But maybe we can ask them whether they are able to contribute. If they're not, and circumstances have changed, then we will be able to take them out of the loop and we definitely then put the Outreach & Engagement Subcommittee in the loop for this.

Glenn, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand? Glenn McKnight, you might be muted. Okay, Glenn has put his hand down. Then let's move on to the next recommendation, and that's the recommendation #3, ICANN should continue to shape an accountability model reaching not only board members but all parts of the ICANN community in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.

Now, that has been assigned to the Future Challenges Working Group. As you know, the chairs of the Future Challenges Working Group have moved on somehow, so we're in a bit of a dilemma at the moment in that this recommendation seems to be assigned to a working group that is not active, so we have to think about where we go from this. Do we assign this to another working group?

I do note that this is all to do with accountability as well, and of course the question here is whether this feeds straight into the ICANN

---

accountability process. That's what we have in the note at the moment. It could feed into the ICANN accountability process and all of the At-Large work in this process. Are there any comments on this?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up on this specific issue. Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I think perhaps in the short term, we can make these recommendations [inaudible] into the current accountability process and ensure that these recommendations are a direct [inaudible] any of our comments that we send on the accountability proposals, that these recommendations are taken into account.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to quickly finish, [inaudible] assignees rather than being Future Challenges, which seems to be a dormant group for now, perhaps would therefore be the At-Large Advisory Committee or the IANA Working Group that is dealing with IANA stewardship transition and accountability, that working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Dev. I was thinking right in line of what you mentioned here. Perhaps assigning this to the IANA and ICANN

---

Accountability Issues. I think that's the official name of the group. If that can then be followed up immediately, since as you know, we have public commenting period that's open at the moment. Immediately after this call, perhaps any recommendation that is assigned to the IANA and Accountability Working Group – or Ad Hoc I think it is [inaudible] can be sent to them. My personal feeling on this is that this is indeed being taken care of by the ICANN Accountability process.

Let's move to the next one, number 5, ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end users remain at the heart of the accountability process and all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.

That obviously speaks straight into the Accountability Working Group process. I would therefore suggest that we assign this over to the Accountability Working Group. Yeah? I see a green tick from Dev. Let's move on then.

I guess these are all in process. It might well be I think that once the accountability process has ended that we will be able to take stock and see which one of these has actually been successful.

Number 6, ICANN's multi-stakeholder model should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants, individual or parties, to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest. Each time a vote takes place or a consensus is [inaudible].

That was assigned to Future Challenges, and here again, the notes were this could feed into the accountability process. Are there any objections for this? No objections, let's move on then.



---

The next one is number 7, a periodic review of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN's constituent parts adequately addresses the relevant decision-making requirements in the corporation.

Very large question. It was assigned to the Future Challenges since if you recall, the Future Challenges Working Group had prepared a green paper or a white paper – green or white colored paper of some sort – to suggest the different way to reorganize ICANN. This was somehow unfortunately fallen by the wayside and the accountability process isn't really discussing much of this.

Here we are suggesting that this could feed into the At-Large, again IANA names, IANA issues and ICANN accountability issues. Are there any objections to that? Then we can get that group to work on it and decide what to do with it.

Okay, I don't see any objections to reassigning 7 to ICANN Accountability Working Group.

Then number 8, ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy subject to a cost-benefit analysis focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing and where such growth is more likely to occur.

The assignees for this were staff and the ALAC. Staff were to provide the strategy document before Los Angeles and the ALAC was to expand on this recommendation. We haven't had much of a follow up on this so far. Can I ask whether the strategy document was provided before Los Angeles? I frankly can't remember.

---

ARIEL LIANG: I don't believe we have that strategy document, but I'll follow up with Heidi and see what's the status for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Ariel. Now, it said here ALAC to expand on this recommendation. I mean, is it the view of this working group that we should just send this over to the ALAC and get a discussion going on this? How do you feel we should proceed forward with that? Clearly this is part of the globalization of ICANN and it also has to do with the different geographical regions and the global stakeholder engagement.

I guess this could be the GSE team, Global Stakeholder Engagement team, that could perhaps produce some feedback on this recommendation as to what's been done so far.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Olivier. You quite answered it. I think the Global Stakeholder Engagement team can help/assist in documenting this recommendation as to what is their strategy. I was just thinking perhaps I misunderstood, but I thought that there was some sort of discussion or question before the GSE team in Singapore and they may have already answered this question, but maybe I'm wrong. I think it was Leon that was going to raise these questions with GSE. Maybe I'm mistaken.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. I'm not even sure... I'm not sure about this. I can't remember from memory. Ariel, could we follow up after this call or maybe just couple of days and try and see what we had done? Did you say Singapore, Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, I think there was something done at the Singapore meeting. I could be... Like I said. I do recall that we raised certain questions to the Global Stakeholder Engagement team. I have [inaudible] slew of information around. I can't remember which one. But maybe we could follow up afterwards.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Let's move on. The next one is number 11, ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria. That was the one which we had sent to the board, recommendation 11, and that has got all of our information underneath. That's the one which we're following up with the board and finding out what the board is doing on it.

As you will notice, it's very, very well documented. I really thank the people who have worked on this. It really is fantastic. That, to me, is the kind of... If we get output for most of our recommendations like this, that's the stuff that we can now present to our community and say, "Well, look, you've asked for it. That's the sort of work we've been doing on that." Maybe we will need to make webinar presentation to our community or some way. Maybe even a short presentation on each

---

one of the RALO calls to show the progress once we've got a few more successes like this one.

Moving on to 13, recommendation 13, ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views proportionally to their scope and relevance.

Here that was again sent to the Future Challenges. That is on hold at the moment. I would say again this would go to the At-Large IANA Issues and Accountability Working Group. My feeling, having followed the accountability process closely, is that this is very much at the moment what's being discussed in the Accountability Working Group, with some concern in fact that some are trying to reduce the ALAC's footprint, if you want, and ability to act. Some are trying to emphasize supporting organizations as having more of a say than advisory committees in general. Not feeding into this. So this goes straight into the ICANN Accountability. Any points or comments on this? No.

Let's go then to the next one and that's number 14, ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws.

Here I have gotten in touch with colleagues on other SOs and ACs about this, and indeed the response that I have received so far... Where did I write this? Because I think I had written something about it.

ARIEL LIANG:

I'm pasting in the chat.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Ariel. It's actually indeed my comment is underneath the recommendation itself. That's the feedback on it. The question I had for you was whether you believed this is we need to do more about this or whether we considered this to be complete. Any comments or thoughts on this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I guess everyone is reading this at the moment. The work is currently taking place at the moment regarding this recommendation.

On the one hand, there is the discussion on the special amendments to contracts on a case-by-case basis, especially regarding data retention waivers and I've shown some examples and pointers to what's going on at the moment. Secondly, there's also the Accountability Working Group. The Cross Community on ICANN Accountability is working on this issue.

What we can do is to just recommend that the work of this working group should be examined once it is complete. So we can say that this is partially complete perhaps, but on [inaudible] the outcome of the Accountability Working Group. Are we okay with that?

Go ahead, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Should we then also then assign it to the IANA and Accountability Working Group? The IANA Issues and Accountability Working Group, sorry. Because now then it will be tracked more formally by the IANA

---

Issues and Accountability Working Group which will be looking at everything.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Dev. Absolutely correct. Let's reassign it to the At-Large IANA Issues and Accountability Working Group. Okay, thanks for this. Are there any other comments on this recommendation?

I note it is the top of the hour. We have started five minutes late. I suggest that we take another couple of minutes to try and finish the recommendations for the board. I don't think there are that many more listed at the moment. Actually, there are a handful.

Next one, number 15, ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure befitting a truly global organization and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions. I was going to suggest that we send this to the ICANN Accountability Working Group, same as the others.

I see a green tick from Dev. I hope everyone else has not dropped off completely. I know it's a bit tedious, but we do have to go through these since all of the recommendations that were pointing to the Future Challenges haven't moved much, so we do need to get them to move.

Number 16, ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones. That was a bit of a questionable one. We did have some movement. Still in progress at the moment, but we have increased the rotation of the calls. That's undeniable and we are providing, or trying to provide, more time for decisions. Is there

---

anything else that we need to add on this or could we actually even mark this as being complete?

Glenn McKnight?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I find it sometimes really difficult to slip these calls in during the day, [inaudible] contractor. I have some flexibility, but a lot of times this is really difficult. I'm just suggesting from my Eastern time zone that some of the calls can be done during the evening after work. I'm not sure if other people are crazy over that. I don't mind anytime from, say, 6:00 to 2:00 in the morning. That's fine. But I never get a call. It's always 10:00 in the morning or 3:00 in the afternoon. I don't mind doing some stuff that's in the evening and that's when I have a little bit more free time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Glenn. That's a good point. There seems to be rotation, but the rotation always seems to be ending up in your morning for some reason.

Let's keep this one still alive in progress, but really the assignees are the ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce (ourselves), but also the ALT. What I'd like to perhaps ask is for the ALT to come back with a firm commitment that there will be rotation of calls irrespective of whether they're morning, afternoon, evening, night time, this sort of stuff.

What I do guess perhaps from what you said, Glenn, is that if repeatedly you had calls every morning, then it's difficult for you as a contractor because that will interfere in your life having repeated calls at the same

---

time, but if there was a rotation, you could take the odd call at an odd hour. Did I translate this correctly?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

For example, I had double duty last week. I was on the Capacity Building, but I couldn't participate. I tried to monitor it. But I had another call I had to be on for one of my customers. I'm sorry, my customer takes priority over ICANN. It was impossible for me to do both. If that call was before work hours or after, I would be able to do it. Other people probably have the same problem.

I know there's a culture within ALAC that you have to be tough. I'm not trying to [inaudible] about this, but I am concerned that some people have a disadvantage in terms of timing. I'm just saying let's try to be more flexible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, excellent. Thanks for this, Glenn. Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks, Olivier. I also note that [inaudible] document [inaudible] recommendation going to the ICANN board. I think [inaudible] sessions or the briefing webinars that are being rotated as well. For example, the pre-ICANN webinar on what's coming up in the next upcoming face-to-face meeting, for example. I note that they now have two sessions to try to keep for persons in different time zones. I suppose [inaudible] things need to be updated. That's a suggestion.



---

We're talking about what's happening on our end, but it's what ICANN as a whole, what we want ICANN to do. We [inaudible] progress in some areas and perhaps point out any possible shortcomings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. This is where the question goes into whether this recommendation is still relevant to be sent to the board and to ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement staff if ICANN is already doing this. Are you saying that ICANN is already doing this then?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I do note that whenever there's a [inaudible] on a large issue, like for the IANA stewardship transition, the accountability, there's been multiple webinars within the same day for different time zones, so to speak. I would say there's been great progress. I'm trying to think if there's any shortcomings. I can't think of any immediate shortcomings right now where it's not coming and it's glaringly obvious. I don't have anything to recall. I will say there's been great progress by ICANN in this regard.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. What I would suggest then is in our reporting on this recommendation, we ask the ICANN board and ICANN staff, Global Stakeholder Engagement staff, to confirm that this policy of having webinars or information calls at a rotation in time is something that is going to continue [inaudible] commitment to continuing with this system of rotations.

---

I think Ariel has made a bit of... It's not the ALT to ask the ICANN board. We have to ask the ALT for this and we have to ask the ICANN board and GSE staff for this as well. Then we can commitment from both the ALT and commitment from staff that rotation will move and that, yes, there will be the occasional time that will be terrible for someone, but it won't needs to be the ones always affected by this terrible timing.

Speaking of timing, we are running out of time. Oh, I've just heard someone.

ARIEL LIANG:

Sorry, can you clarify who is "we"?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We is the working group. Okay. On this, it will be the ALAC to ask the ICANN board. That will be in our next... The next time that we present this to the board – so this recommendation to the board in whatever way that we use to present it to the board, we will have to ask this question. But it is this working group that needs to ask the ALT for its commitment.

ATLAS II Follow Up Working Group to ask ALT to confirm that there's been a firm commitment and it's the ALAC to ask the ICANN board and GSE staff. Okay, there you go.

Fantastic. Speaking of time, we are running out of time already. It's gone really, really fast. The last one that I just wanted to touch on then was number 20. Inputs to user perspective were never necessary to advance accountability, transparency, and policy development within

---

ICANN suggesting that we reassign this to the At-Large Working Group on IANA stewardship and ICANN accountability.

We have pretty much run out of time now to look through the rest of those recommendations on the page. What I suggest then is we continue in next week's call. We have several weeks to go through all of this. I think we're making some progress.

As you can see, there is some work going on. What I would ask is if you do have a little bit of time, just scope through these. You know how to make amendments to the notes and add things to the notes. If you are aware of things that are moving forward and are not reflected on these pages, please add them and we can certainly progress a bit more.

Next week's call, what sort of time would be best for everyone? Should we just send a Doodle out? Probably send a Doodle out for next week's call. If we can do it gain on the Wednesday next week, that will probably be best. So Wednesday the 9<sup>th</sup>, have a Doodle for various times. Let's play with the rotation of times. I'm ready to wake up at 6:00 in the morning or have a call at 2:00 AM if needed on this. Let's show a bit of ability to work this out so that Glenn doesn't have to take his morning off from work every single Wednesday morning.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Olivier, I'm [inaudible] this call on my cell phone on route to a client. I try to adapt, but it's not always possible. I'd just like to say with Doodles, they work really well, but there's always somebody that doesn't benefit from them. I'm assuming it's going to go right back to the same time zones as usual.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Glenn. I can't contradict you. You're right. We'll see. Let's hope. Let's cross fingers. We'll see how it goes.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Some of the people that should've been on this call that were penholders for some of this stuff, is there a process of trying to make sure they actually attend the next call? It's kind of pointless that the people who wrote these suggestions were not on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for mentioning this, Glenn. Very good point. As you can see, we've had a number of apologies that we received on this occasion. Let's see how it goes for next week. What we might do is perhaps look at the list of people that were invited to participate – the penholders and so on. If I can ask staff to make a list of those that did not send apologies and did not attend a call, I'll send them a little stimulation e-mail to remind them that, really, if they are serious about these recommendations, it would be best for them to listen to the call today, so as to be able to catch up, but also attend the next call next week. Hopefully we can get them to take interest in the work that's been done so far and that they've done so far.

Thanks, everyone, for this call. Apologies that it's taken a little more time to proceed forward. We haven't gone as far as I hoped we would have gone, but at least the ones that we've looked at, we've really dug into. If we continue like this, in a couple of calls, we will have actually

---

gone through the whole list of recommendations. I suspect that we are going to have several recommendations that we can either present to the board or consider as being closed or actually ask for responses from staff – follow up basically at the Dublin meeting and get some great progress on this.

Also, we might even see that some of these recommendations are now done, both because of the work that we've done but also because ICANN has moved on and is a very different animal from what it was a few years ago.

With this, I'd like to thank you and adjourn this call. Just before that, to thank our interpreters, Veronica and David on the Spanish channel, and Claire and Camila on the French channel.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thanks again.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thanks, everyone. Take care all.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**