

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And start the call.

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 call on Wednesday the 9<sup>th</sup> of September, 2015, at 18:30 UTC.

On the English channel we have Vernatius Ezeama, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Sarah Kiden, Sébastien Bachollet, and Judith Hellerstein.

On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto.

Currently at this time we have no participants on the French channel.

We have apologies from Gunela Astbrink, Hong Xue, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, and Maureen Hilyard.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang; and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and Sabrina.

Our French interpreters today are Claire and Isabelle.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and also for our interpreters. I'll now turn the call back over to Olivier. Please begin.

---

*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. Today we're going to continue the work that we started last week, going through our recommendations for the ICANN Board. And then once we have finished going through these and updating these, then we will go into the recommendations per working group, looking at each one of the working groups that are here. Hopefully we have the chairs of those working groups, all those different parts of At-Large, the At-Large community, that have had the allocation of this, of these recommendations. It's going to be a little bit fuzzy.

We have a full 90 minutes for this call. It might well be that we go faster than 90 minutes. I remind you all that what we're doing here is to now try and take the recommendations which were drafted by our community during the At-Large Summit and effectively transform these into something that is implementable with some results. It may well be that since the recommendation was drafted, a number of events have taken place, circumstances have changed, and so the recommendation might actually be obsolete and we might dispense of it and say, "Well, that's already done."

Or we might be modifying it slightly so as to be able to target it specifically at something and so focus it a little bit more because the recommendation might be a little bit broad in the way it was drafted.

Or thirdly what we might do is to then, after having focused it, say, "Well, this is now ready for implementation," whether it's implementation by staff, by the Board, by the ALAC. It really is a case of taking what our community has drafted and making it happen. That's why we are going through this long-winded way – or what might seem

---

to be a long-winded way. But the important thing here is not only the actual implementation but the process by which we reached the level of implementation or the outcome that we are going to reach.

So thanks for joining this call. Ariel is in charge of the screen. She has shared her PC screen. In fact, it's not a PC. It's one of these fruit-based machines, the name of which you'll find on the upper left-hand corner. If you want to be able to see this better, you can maximize that screen by pressing the little ICANN that's to the right of this little window.

Now, last week we've gone all the way to recommendation number 21. Now let me see. Recommendation 21 is "Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment." Before we start on this, by the way, yes – let me just open the floor. If anybody has any comments prior to starting on our wading down these recommendations. Do you actually have any suggestions as to how we could do things faster or easier, or is this the right way to move forward? The floor is open. Sébastien Bachollet?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Olivier. It's my first observation to this type of call. As you know I was not too much able to participate to the ATLAS II. I am here because you requested participation of people from the CCWG on Accountability to look to the specific issue you wanted this group to take into account. I have no problem to stay 90 minutes, but I know that the other member from At-Large participating to the CCWG are not able to participate today, but I think if you want to use my time usefully, at one moment it would be good to go to those specific issues and to see

---

what we can do, and if you want me to say something on each of those recommendations. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sébastien. Which recommendations were you pointing out specifically? Do you have the number of them, or...?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, we received a mail last week or a few days ago now, three days ago, about recommendation numbers 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, and 20.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Sorry, then. So these are the ones for the CWG IANA, I believe.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: IANA transition... yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. On accountability. Okay. And yes, you are quite correct. I apologize. The agenda does not have a link to those recommendations. Ariel, since you're in charge of those web pages, do we have a correct web page that looks at this? Under recommendations per working group, do we have one that looks at groups, all the ones that are for Accountability Cross-Community Working Group? We appear to have, and it's on the screen. Fine.

---

So Sébastien, what we'll do is we'll go through the ones recommended for the Board, and then we'll start with the IANA transition and ICANN accountability recommendations, to look through those. As I've said on the last call of this working group, I did say that we will be touching on this in our next call next week, so it would certainly be a good point to have a first look now during this call. So thanks for bringing them up. Is that okay?

Okay, in the absence of a response from Sébastien, I believe it is okay. Right. Then let's go back to our recommendation for the Board, please. And so we are in 21.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Olivier. You have the answer in your screen. Yes, it is okay with me. I put a green tick. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've got a full screen. Okay, sorry. No, but I have a full screen, unfortunately, so I couldn't see that. But that's fine. Thank you. Thank you, Sébastien.

Now let's go to 21, then. The first one here is, "Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment." That was sent to ICANN Board – well, the recipient for these would be the ICANN Board and the Global Stakeholder Engagement staff. The assignees were the Outreach and Engagement Working Group and also the Social Media Working Group. There has been a lot that has – a number of things have come underneath there.

---

With some input, with some actions, with the Social Media Working Group to clarify the recommendation with the [GG3] leaders, with Leon and [Murray] to contact GSE staff, and with Leon to attend the GSE meeting in Singapore.

I haven't seen any follow-up on this and I know that Leon has been otherwise engaged in another process that has somehow removed him from the current process. What do we do with this? Is this still working well? Is this something that we want to continue working on, carry over? The floor is open. You've got all of the input at the moment on the screen for this. Sébastien Bachollet?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Olivier. Just to say one word. I think the organization of the B meetings, the meeting in the middle of the year for ICANN in a smaller country with an outreach day the Monday at the beginning of the meeting, will be a good enhancement and may be linked with this request. On the other hand, I think that the ICANN staff is doing a great job with the Fellowship Program, with the [NextGen] Program, and that we can just try to support that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Sébastien. That's a good point. Thanks for bringing in the organization of the B meeting. I note from the screen that most of the feedback from the Social Media Working Group and the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee has been a concern that the public campaigns using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment is too broad and it might be outside ICANN's core

---

mission and value. Do you see, coming into a B meeting, these topics coming within the scope of ICANN? That's a question to Sébastien as a follow-up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. The B meeting, for the moment we are in the process within At-Large and [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Continue.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Is there some echo? Okay, it's better now. Thank you. We have a sub-group for the – the first B meeting will be in Latin America and Caribbean. We have a small group with people from that region and I am also participating. We will start to discuss all these goals, and we have exchanged with the meeting staff, the staff organizing the meeting, how they want to organize it. I don't know if it will answer your question, but my point is that we need to link this issue with the B meeting knowing that it's the only meeting where we will have a specific day to do outreach. If we have specific requests, it's a good time to push for them during the preparation of the first B meeting in Latin America and the Caribbean next year. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. We have a queue in operation with first Dev and then Heidi, and then I see Sébastien has put his hand up again. So Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Just, I think the discussion regarding the meeting B really falls in line with recommendation 1, which talks about “ICANN shall continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders.” I think the meeting B discussion could probably happen a little bit more under that recommendation rather than this one, which was talking about public campaigns to use the Internet for education, information... what was it? Empowerment and creativity.

I think the concern, the Outreach and Engagement Group – the new group that’s been reconstituted – hasn’t had a chance to really fully look at this recommendations yet. We didn’t have time on our call yesterday because we were spending most of our time looking at the outreach strategies. But my thinking is it’s still along the lines of what was on the notes that... It’s just way too broad. Maybe we could work with other [ISTAR] organizations, like the RIRs, the Internet Society, etc., and make sure that we share the information that they produce, perhaps. But for ICANN itself to do it may be – I think it’s potentially out of scope. But I’ll be bringing this to the Outreach and Engagement Working Group to get their feedback and so forth. Thank you.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Dev. Ariel, since you are in control of the screen, I haven't seen anyone speak to the meeting B suggestion as being good for recommendation 1, I think. I have looked at this. It looks like this could be a place where meeting B could be looked at, and we can also put a question mark for this one, recommendation 21 meeting B as well. But I do take note of what Dev has told us here, what he has relayed from the outreach and engagement subcommittee. What's already in the note there is already pretty complete. I did note also a green tick from Wolf Ludwig regarding this comment. Heidi Ullrich?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. Just a few comments. One, with relation to meeting B, I do believe that the ALAC working party on the new meeting strategy is looking towards more structured interaction with the NextGen and the Fellows, and that's what Sébastien has mentioned. So I think that's key to note for this, when ICANN goes into these regions, that there needs to be promotion of the meeting B, of what the outreach and engagement activities will be, etc. So that's one point.

The other point that is perhaps more broad, but At-Large is based on the bottom-up structure of having ALSes at the bottom, and they're the ones that are the most engaged in their local and national, even regional activities. It seems to me that it's these ALSes that would have, really, a large role to play in having public campaigns in their region on education, information, creativity, and empowerment related to Internet governance and ICT issues. I think that we should really be looking at them to engage in this activity.

---

And then finally, thirdly, there is now growing work between At-Large and NCSG and NCUC and NPOC on working together on some type of civil society work, aspects of civil society, etc. So perhaps there is room for collaboration there on doing campaigns on end users, civil society groups, etc. So perhaps we can include that point. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Heidi. I know that Ariel has been trying to keep track of things and update the notes as we speak. I can only see my screen flickering at an amazing speed at the moment. Ariel, did you catch Heidi's points there?

ARIEL LIANG: I captured her point and I will note that after the call, in order not to make you too busy when looking at my screen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, that's fine. I enjoy the show. That's great. Thank you. Okay. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have raised your hand again.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you. What Heidi suggested regarding that the ALSes themselves are probably involved in education, information, creativity, and empowerment, actually [I thought that was a] good idea. I think [inaudible] is that the Social Media Working Group could perhaps [inaudible] those efforts rather than asking ICANN to do this, so they

---

encourage public campaigns on using the Internet. We just re-share the information as... yeah. Let's do it like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Dev. That's a very good point. A good suggestion here. So whenever our ALSes or an ALS is doing a public campaign of some sort, they could share that. So what we in At-Large would do, I guess, is to provide the platform for being able to share that. So if they want to share this on this Wiki page, or – I guess sharing it on the mailing list is probably just going to create more traffic. We could have a Wiki page with the links to the different public campaigns of our different ALSes and maybe even give our ALSes some time during either our RALO calls or even during the ALAC calls to spend some time telling us about their public campaigns. Is that the sort of thing that you were suggesting?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Olivier, it's Glenn on Adigo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Glenn, I put you in the queue. Thank you.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So thanks for this, Dev. Next we have Alberto Soto and then Glenn afterwards. So Alberto Soto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Olivier. We have been working with our RIR, LACNIC. We have not [signed] the MOU yet, but we are working on that. So in the meetings, in LACNIC meetings, we are trying to do something like [inaudible]. If we have a new ALS or if we have an ALS, we are trained to work with that ALS in the LACNIC events, on the one hand. On the other hand, we are also working with the GSE department to create a common calendar. So in that calendar, what we can do is to coordinate all the events to be a hub in order to outreach and to find information only in one place. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much, Alberto. So that's also something that we can record as – I guess we need some kind of location where all of these efforts can be shown, displayed, showcased perhaps. A one-stop location where we can showcase all of these efforts, and then that kind of helps our ALSes. It's something that's worthwhile for our At-Large structures and something that can help our RALOs as well, because one RALO can see what the other RALO is doing. That's a very good point indeed. Glenn McKnight, you're next.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay, thank you. A couple of things. Heidi's point that she was talking about, the second point, one of the things recently that we discussed on the outreach yesterday with Alfredo Calderón and Eduardo Diaz was a major effort by their ALS, ISOC Puerto Rico, with outreach to universities in January. They were bringing up the issue is, how do we finance this? How do we raise money for this? They were thinking of it as CROPP trips. Now, that's problematic, because really they're not traveling and it doesn't make much sense for anyone from the rest of North America to travel there when they really are taking care of it.

I think it's great to do community outreach and promoting Internet governance, but how does this get funded? How does some of the cost get covered? It looks like it's not fitting within the CROPP trip issue. So I just want to bring that up. How do we bring this up to the organization so that a great effort like Eduardo is doing, and Alfredo, can actually have some seed money to do what they're doing? That's number one.

Number two is Dev shared with me some ideas on the shared calendar. I'm sure that's what Alberto Soto was talking about. It's been under-utilized. It's been something that people haven't been using and sharing, and I think it's quite critical to get into that. For example, we're doing a very large event with ISOC Canada on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September. Nobody really knows about it outside of ISOC. The NARALO and ICANN people are really not aware of it, but if it was in the calendar, I think people would be more aware of it and sharing how we did it, because we raised significant amount of money for that event so that it's a free event. So those are just two observations. That's it, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Glenn. Just as a quick follow-up for you, you mentioned the shared calendar. You mentioned some resources that are already there. Might it not be used because people don't know about it? Do we need a periodic posting to the mailing list to remind people of all the resources that are available at their disposal, perhaps? Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think that's a responsibility of the chair and secretariat to make sure this stuff gets posted and solicit to the ALSes (A) to get involved and (B) what are you doing. I think we need some ALS management, and I think that's been neglecting. So we need to drill down to our ALSes and really encourage them to share information. We have been doing monthly spotlights, but that's not enough. We need to find out more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Glenn. Very good points, and I'm glad I see Ariel capturing them as we speak. Let's go over to Alberto Soto, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much, Olivier. Yes, that shared calendar is really of vital importance, and I believe that in one of the ALAC meetings in Buenos Aires, we have spoken about having a shared calendar with all the RALO events. That was a concrete proposal. For example, in Puerto Rico, there is, and generally there will be an event, and LACRALO will not be able to travel there through the CROPP program because it is outside Latin

---

America and the Caribbean region because Puerto Rico is part of North America. But we have ALSes that will be able to participate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alberto. Good points. Let's go now to – see that I'm giving Ariel a little bit of breathing time to be able to update things. That's good. Let's move to Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, Olivier. So one of the Outreach and Engagement work items has been to develop group calendars, because we have had an At-Large external events calendar for years. It was severely underutilized. So one of the goals of the Outreach and Engagement was to find some sort of group calendaring solution, and this has been done. And it's been shown on the previous Outreach and Engagement call last month, and it was also previewed on the Technology Taskforce call, something we're using called Teamup.

So the idea would be that RALOs would have the opportunity to add events, GSE would be able to add events, and I've been seeking also to the Nominating Committee which are looking to track outreach events. I'll be expanding on that to make sure all of us can really work on the calendars together.

Regarding the comments – there's a lot of comments here. Let me see if I can answer the comments regarding Glenn. The challenge with CROPP is that it's only funded for actual events already organized, and not for organizing events. LACRALO has a similar strategy in mind for its

---

engagement strategy – or outreach strategy, I should say, sorry. That's in order to, when there's a territory structures but we're more of individuals, we will try to organize a face-to-face meeting and try to get funds from ICANN to do so.

The challenge is that you need to have this well in advance in order to submit it to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, which usually happens in January, February, in the beginning of the year. But there is a recommendation that talks about how recommendation 40, and recommendation 40 talks about this idea because of this challenge of trying to fund events or fund At-Large activities, but can only do it at a particular point in the year and then cannot do anything within the following year. The recommendation there was that ICANN should offer a process similar [to CROPP] but applicable to short lead-time budget requests, not related to travel. This was the thinking that came out of the thematic group 5 when we were talking about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: All right, that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Dev. You mentioned this. That's one of our other recommendations, isn't it, that we have there, as you said. So maybe we can focus more on that than the other recommendation, the



---

one that you mentioned. What recommendation number was that, again?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Recommendation 40.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Number 40. Thanks for this, Dev. Okay. It looks like we have killed a lot of [inaudible] recommendation at the moment. I think that we're doing quite well. There was one possible suggestion, which would be to have a special request for educational outreach or something to that extent, but I think that's probably what's going to come out of recommendation 40, looking at it.

With regards to the shared calendar that Glenn mentioned and that was supported by Alberto, do you think that it should just be a calendar for At-Large and RALOs and their ALSes, or should it also include NCSG, NPOC, and NCUC?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I can respond to that. The intent here is that it would allow – the team calendar has been set up and it's been rolled out to all the RALOs for them to start updating the calendars. The intent is we would [inaudible] GSE to be able to add their own events. The group calendar solution also offers a way of... how should I put it? Not allowing each group to overwrite each other's groups, each other calendar entries. So there's some sort of – so people won't overwrite other entries and so forth, and there's some sort of security in that regard. Of course, there are links

---

we can give to people that are viewable only, and these of course you could subscribe to, subscribe to the calendar to import it to your Google calendar, Outlook, etc. So I think it's well in hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's well in hand. Okay.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: And we can of course definitely expand it to all – yeah. Yeah. We can expand it to all the other stakeholder groups if needed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Dev. If this is in hand, then I don't think that we need to add any additional request based on recommendation 21. We can just report that this is well in hand. I'm glad to say what we're actually doing here, really, is reporting. This, I would hope, is something that we will then be able to send back to our At-Large Structures and say, "Well, that's what has happened with the recommendations." Further down the line, we can see the action that has taken place, what still needs to be done, and really where we are, what are the plans for the future.

Let's, I think, move on. We've spend a copious amount of time on recommendation 21, but it was quite thin to start with. It seems to be very well set now. The next one is recommendation number 23, and that one was marked as completed. So we can leave that to the side. All of the details are there. I believe I'm on the right one. Yeah, I am on the right one. Yes. Okay. So that's completed.

---

What we will have to look at is to see if we need to report to the Board about this or report to the ombudsman or report to contractual compliance, to any of these. But that's probably something which we probably have to look at in our own time. I'd just like to open the floor if there are any questions or comments about this recommendation. As I said, it's completed, so maybe we can just move on to the next one.

I see no one put their hand up. Okay, let's move, then. Let's scroll down to number 24: "Both the areas of the ombudsman and contractual compliance should report regularly on the complaints they receive, resolved, pending resolution, and actions taken to address issues raised by unresolved complaints."

As you know, things have moved on and the compliance department have provided a lot more information than they have so far, or than they have in the previous times where at least when this recommendation was drafted. We now have the expansion of this shows that some of the content is restricted for privacy reasons, but in general they're rather satisfied with the way that this has moved forward. With thanks to Glenn McKnight on this. I think that Glenn has spent an enormous amount of time following up on this. So I think that recommendation is complete, as well. Does anybody wish to add anything? No? Okay.

Let's then move on to 25, and 25 is still quite empty. That's actually one of the ones that will go to the accountability process. Is 25 one of the ones for the Accountability working group? Ariel, I noticed that it still says "define these future challenges" there, and that's why I'm asking this. Ariel Liang?

---

ARIEL LIANG: We didn't discuss this last call, so [inaudible] it there. I assume one of the action items will be assigned to IANA. But I want to keep it there just to make it accurate for now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Ariel. Yes, good point. So that one will move to the ICANN accountability. Just to read, "The recommendation to enhance ICANN's community efforts on building a culture of transparency and accountability as called for in the recommendations of ATRT 2. Oversight of the Board's decisions now requires an effective mechanism of checks and balances capable of providing true multi-stakeholder oversight and effective remedies."

I wish the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability had read this recommendation and therefore shortened its process by several months, rather than reinventing the wheel. Anyway, that was just a small tongue-in-cheek remark. That goes into accountability. We'll speak about this in a moment when Sébastien will take us through the accountability process, the ones that are sent for ICANN accountability.

Let's move to number 26. Number 26 is the current policy management processes within ICANN, the workable policy management process system. I know that there's a lot of work going on about this. We have Dev Anand Teelucksingh with us on the call. Dev, I guess this is an ongoing piece of work that is going to last probably longer than the timeline of our ATLAS II recommendation process. But could you please

---

give us a one-minute update on what's going on with this recommendation at the moment? Dev Anand Teelucksingh?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. The Technology Taskforce has been working very hard on this recommendation. We had discussions with ICANN regarding a tool called Kavi to possibly trial that system to see whether it could meet the tools of the recommendation 26. We are also scheduling a conference call with one of the RIRs to talk about their policy development process and the tools they are planning to use. So we'll have that information in hand by the end of this month to, again, further guide us [in] what we are looking for.

We have noted the real progress made on the At-Large website redesign. If you recall from the ICANN 53 meeting in Buenos Aires, there was a very impressive demonstration done by Ariel and Laura, showing how they are able to import information such as the policy public comment, and import it directly into the At-Large website without manually copying and pasting. If this form [inaudible] driven type of importing information and sending out information can be done rather than manually copying and pasting on the Wiki, as is what's being doing now, we might see some actual work on this recommendation once the At-Large website goes live. I think that's a good summary. Thanks.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Dev, on the Kavi, didn't we have a meeting saying that it did not work for GNSO and ICANN IT was not supporting it anymore? Wasn't that Kavi?

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, the discussion with ICANN is that they have had a trial of Kavi within the GNSO and they found out that it didn't work. So the question is really [inaudible] do we need to at least do very extensive testing on this? I think [inaudible] no, but what the discussions coming out of the discussions using Kavi, we've expanded what are the user profiles of the various people that would be using this policy management process system.

So it still has been very useful as to guiding us what we want and what we don't want. [inaudible] just simply just do a short trial of Kavi, just to work through it and see how things are done. But the feedback brought from the GNSO trial was that it was not really suitable. I note there certain things, like for example, it's not very mobile-friendly, for example. It's very hard to do multi-lingual translations, etc. So those are also additional concerns perhaps that was noted in the discussions. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: But we also discussed that we weren't sure how to go ahead with the process if ICANN IT is not going to support Kavi. Why are we bothering with a trial if in general it doesn't meet some of the needs of some of the other groups? Then this tool is not something that would work for

---

us, and we were going to go and investigate new tools. I thought that was what our discussion was when we had the discussion with Kavi.

We've had several different discussions. We had them on not only once or twice – I think it was three times that we have people from the IT department on to discuss it. I really don't... I know there's some uses of Kavi, but I really think that we need to investigate a different tool because it's unlikely they'll probably use it. So why are we keeping investigating this when IT is not going to support it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. That's what I understood as well, that they were not going to proceed forward, and if we were going to go for Kavi or at least evaluate Kavi, we would really need to be absolutely so delighted with it to actually get them to support it at that point, because their plan was at the moment not to support it. Back to Dev Anand Teelucksingh, then we'll have to move on.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. So yes, indeed, and I've actually recommended a few other solutions to the ICANN IT staff, to see another solution that may be useful. Maybe we could also look at that on our future Technology Taskforce call. But I would say the discussions of Kavi were useful still, because at least it showed us what it could do and it just reinforce what we really want and so forth. So I won't say it was not useful, but it is probably not useful to really do any testing, because as Judith also has mentioned, ICANN itself has not really considered going forward with it. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Dev. Thanks for this. I think we've got enough for this recommendation that's ongoing. Let's move on. Let's go to the next one, and that's number 27. "The Board must implement ATRT 2 recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees."

During last call I was to ask the Board regarding the implementation of recommendation 27, and I would have to ask the ALAC's chairs commission first to get in touch with Steve Crocker, the chair of the board, and follow up on this. It hasn't happened yet, so that will be for next week or maybe the week after. But we will do that before we meet face-to-face in Dublin.

Let's move further down. Number 35: "The ICANN Board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the At-Large community in between ICANN public meetings." That again was one where we have to do a follow-up. Perhaps, Ariel, could we put in the status something like "in progress" or something? Because that one has got a blank box, blank status box there.

Then scrolling further down, number 40. "ICANN should offer a process similar to the CROPP but applicable to short lead time budget requests not related to travel." Yes, that's the one which Dev was speaking about earlier. Let's go for the queue. Sébastien Bachollet?



---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Olivier. You ran too quickly for me. I wanted to talk about the recommendation 27, because it's something included in the proposal of the CCWG on Accountability. What is the balance between the GAC and the other advisory committees, and what are the advice from the ALAC and the other advisory committees? I don't know if it's useful to contact Steve Crocker. I have no problem that you contact him, but it may be belonging to the same IANA Stewardship and Accountability Working Group. Thank you. You are muted, Olivier, I guess.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And you are absolutely correct. Thank you for telling me this. I'm always glad to be told this. I was saying that yes, you're correct that it could be a recommendation that then gets followed up with the accountability process. The concern that was, though, explained [inaudible] participants in ATLAS was that nothing seemed to have been done regarding the ATRT 2 advice. I'm not quite sure whether the ICANN Accountability advice now that might come out of the current process will trump the ATRT 2 recommendations. The Board has agreed the ATRT 2 recommendation nearly a year ago, is it, or quite some time ago. We're in implementation stage, and I'm not quite sure where we are on that. That was the problem. If they've agreed to a recommendation, then why is it not being implemented?

Sébastien, perhaps back to you and then we can go to Glenn McKnight afterwards. Sébastien Bachollet?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I take your point, but what the working group of the CCWG is doing, and will be doing, it's by-law changes. It's why I think if it's integrated within the bylaw, then it's not anymore an ATRT recommendation. It's a bylaw obligation. It's why, as we are working on that, that it could be taking care by this IANA and Accountability At-Large Working Group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sébastien. My personal concern on this is that the way the CCWG accountability is going at the moment, it seems to want to strengthen then supporting organizations' input and to weaken the advisory committees' input. I can certainly see this push for the GAC to have less influence than it had before. I'm not sure that we are on the winner on this one. But let's go over to Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi. Very quickly. Maybe my memory is fading, but I thought that in one of the alterations on one of the recommendations, instead of meeting the entire Board, there was a steering committee or a smaller portion of the Board. Am I correct on that, Olivier? Or am I misinformed?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Glenn. I didn't quite understand your question on this.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Just a couple of recommendations before. And I don't know which number it is, but it was a recommendation for meeting with the Board. I

---

thought we had a discussion of instead of the entire Board, I thought there was some discussion of a portion of the Board. Do you remember that conversation?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Glenn. It's actually the recommendation 35, which is after the one that we're currently looking at. You are quite correct. We haven't actually expanded on 35, but no, it does say here – "Recommendation 35: Olivier Crépin-Leblond to ask the Board regarding subset of recommendation 35." Maybe it's actually subset of the Board in recommendation 35. Maybe that needs to be rewritten a little bit. I think that was lost in translation, or lost in the drafting.

So effectively yes, we had agreed to ask for a subset of the Board and of the ALAC to have one conference call together in between ICANN public meetings. Is that correct?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, that was my impression.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Glenn, okay. Perfect. So I will let – Ariel, are you going to change this, or...?

ARIEL LIANG: I will change it after the call.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Ariel. Back to 27. Do we want to change any further things? So what is our way forward, then, on this? Because we had decided during the last call that I'd follow up with the chair of the Board. I guess I can do that and see what the chair of the Board comes up with.

Now, if Steve Crocker decides to come back and say "Actually now there are going to be some further bylaw changes; the Board has decided not to move forward with any other by-law changes prior to those by-law changes," then we can move forward. But I'm hoping that we're not going to be short-changed, as one says, in that rather than having formal advice from advisory committees where the Board will respond in a timely manner, to formal advice that we end up with having even less of an impact with the advice. That's something that I'm very conscious about and very concerned about.

Okay. Let's move on, then. We are now at recommendation number 40. "ICANN should offer a process similar to the CROPP, but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel." We mentioned this earlier. Ariel, do you know what you have to add to this from our earlier discussions that we had?

ARIEL LIANG: If you could repeat it, that would be as great.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Repeat it on the fly. That's going to be interesting. It's to do with educational – effectively, access to educational resources. This sort of

---

funding that we could get for capacity building. But not the sort of thing relating to travel, but more like the capacity building part. Was it Dev that had mentioned a few words on this? Dev, was it you? Or I can't remember now who said that.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: One of the challenges has been for CROPP is that it's only used to allow for travel to existing events. The problem is if you wanted to fund an event or fund a face-to-face event in a country, the only way to do it is to – well, file that request, but with the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, file it in January or February, and then it gets handed over to ICANN and then ICANN responds in the middle of the year. That means that that point is really the only time you could make that recommendation, so you have to have that really planned out with some good budget estimates, otherwise it might get rejected for that.

So the idea behind this recommendation was that the At-Large should have an ability to apply for funding of a short, an event that's happening in three months' time or six months' time. Because then you could really plan something [presumably] better and get the funding to do it. Otherwise it's very hard to schedule it one month of the year for something that's up for possibly up to mid-next year. That's the thinking behind it.

So I would think that's what we should really work with the Board to see whether we could really implement this, because it would solve a lot of the outreach concerns that we have, like we want to set up a face-to-face event in six months' time at this new country that we think has a

---

good prospect of reaching new persons. So that's the idea. Sorry if I'm talking too long.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Dev. Question, then, regarding this. It mentions "not related to travel." So that would not be taking any kind of hotels or flights. What would these costs be, then?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, the LACRALO document put a figure of like \$3000 US, and the idea would be that would cover the cost of the venue, refreshments, and so forth, for getting people to come to that event. It's primarily related to the venue, refreshments. What could happen therefore is that if an event is organized, a CROPP trip could then be planned to go to that event. But it would be two separate funding buckets: CROPP to go travel to the event, but the event itself is funded separately.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. Just one last question: should we link to that LACRALO proposal as an example of the kind of proposal that could fall under this?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I would think so. Yes, I think so. I have the link.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. If you could put it in the chat, then we'll have just a link to that, so that will definitely help. In the meantime, I hand the floor to Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Olivier. I'm just putting into the chat the proposed ICANN civil society engagement plan which I've mentioned on a few occasions, and I really do encourage you to take a look at what is being proposed. Again, it's open for comments, and also in particular the number of activities or regional events that are listed in the appendix.

The reason I'm stressing this is that these events could very likely have some sort of collaboration with GSE and local ALSes or NSCG/NCUC/NPOC groups that will offer exactly what you're asking for: a room, nibbles/food, and a venue for a workshop, a panel, etc. Rather than reinventing the wheel, this proposal really is including what you're asking for, so this might be the way to go. Comments are now open through the 30<sup>th</sup> of September. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Heidi. That's very helpful indeed. I see several hands up. Sébastien Bachollet is next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. I will say it very straight, but I think staff – and I say that when it was Board members, and it's not new – but some new staff are misleading ICANN in the wrong direction. ICANN is not organized with civil society. It's in the IGF, in the WSIS. We had this

---

discussion about the CCWG report, and I tried to put – and I guess I succeed – that At-Large is pushing to [inaudible] end user. We are the voice of end users. We are not the civil society. If people want to bring to ICANN this world, it's the wrong way to go. I don't know to whom I need to say that. I say that to the people who write it. I say that we are going in the wrong direction in using those words within ICANN, and we will not succeed in having the voice of end users better heard because we called us civil society. It's not the case.

We don't want to be there, because if not, we would have to be on the ISOC or on the some civil society group. But we need to be broader than that and the billions of end user, it's more important than the civil society. Sorry for to be rough on that, but it's really pushing me to the wrong way and coming again and again with the civil society world within ICANN. Sorry for that, and thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Sébastien. I can see a big debate coming up on this topic. Yes, we have spent some time on this. Obviously the concern is about, as far as we're concerned in this working group here, is perhaps not about the wording of civil society or what we call this, but whether we could obtain funding for the type of activity that we're describing in this specific recommendation.

Perhaps I think that since this has not been mentioned and this is probably a future work of this working group, let's get everyone to review this At-Large civil society engagement in fiscal year 2016 work space, and come back next week to let us know. That probably is an



---

action item. We have to re-look at recommendation 40. Come back next week with what your thoughts are, whether the actual content, regardless of what it's named, actually fits our request. And then we can argue about the name later on this. But I agree with you, Sébastien. I also cringe when I hear this whole thing of having civil society at ICANN and raising end users as such.

Let's move with Judith Hellerstein and then we're back with Sébastien Bachollet. Judith, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I also agree with Sébastien about we are end users and not necessarily civil society. But as end users, I would say that a lot of the efforts we're going to do are more aligned with NPOC than they [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Whoops, have we lost Judith? Have you lost Olivier?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [inaudible] society. It's not what we call it. I think we really need to have [inaudible] participation with the NPOC part, because they're looking at technology and how it impacts the end users or the users there. But my other question, which is I wanted to talk about [inaudible] from Heidi. When you said on the civil society proposal, are these – I looked at that, and it's just events that ICANN was going to, and that means the GSE, the stakeholder engagement, but not events that we could do jointly

---

like Glenn was talking about, the outreach in Puerto Rico or something else like that.

I think that's why a lot of people did not comment on that. It seems to be events that ICANN was going to and not necessarily events that we could organize. I had a bunch of ideas which I had briefly discussed with Joe Catapano, but I didn't put them in because it seems to be not what the document was. But maybe I read the document wrong.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, may I reply very briefly to that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Heidi, Please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Judith, this is a very open document, and I am hoping it will be discussed with ALAC and NCSG in Dublin. So yes, please add those kinds of events and we'll see what happens. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. Well, something we were thinking is that, is there money [inaudible] so if we suggest an event that we think would be good for outreach for a joint sort of NPOC or At-Large event or something like that, is there funding outside of CROPP too for these kinds of things, or is it just events that ICANN GSE is going to, stakeholder engagement,

---

that is sort of not connected? Because I ask that because separately, stakeholder engagement, Joe's group, [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Judith, you have cut out.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I set up a bunch of other events that they never tell on [inaudible] group and they don't connect with At-Large. So there's something missing in the linkage between maybe what people understanding the document or what the intention of GSE is or... And so understanding more of a collaboration.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. I think we're starting to dig really deeply into the outreach and engagement discussion here, and really I'd like to focus back on our ATLAS II recommendations as such. What I could suggest as a follow-up is that you take this discussion further and certainly include the discussion on the civil society engagement in the right working group, which I believe would be – is that the Outreach and Engagement Working Group? Which working group is it that was working on this? It certainly wasn't the finance and budget—

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I would suggest the Outreach and Engagement Working Group.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Outreach and Engagement. Thank you, Dev. Let's take this to the Outreach and Engagement Working Group. There is clearly some discussion to be had on this and some clarification required. Heidi has mentioned that the current document is up for comment as well. I would say in the interest of us being able to move forward as far as ATLAS II recommendations are concerned, we can put this as ongoing and pending, of course, the outcome of the civil society engagement, the discussion that will take place at the outreach and engagement [inaudible]. That's probably the way to continue forward. And we can take the assignee and change the assignee from finance and budget to the assignee being outreach and engagement. I think that's probably the right way forward. Sébastien Bachollet? And Judith, are you finished or do you wish to say anything else?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, I'm finished. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Judith. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Yeah, it will be short. It's just I was very concerned by what Glenn's writing in the chat about staff going to places and doing outreach where we have At-Large Structure. I just want to remind you one of the first sentence when the new CEO get to ICANN, Fadi said, "When I will go to one place, I will meet with the At-Large structure, and every one of my staff will do the same." I don't know if it's last long, but

---

we need to remind every staff that they need to do that each time they go somewhere. They can't go without informing us, because we are the heart of ICANN and we are the heart of Internet and us users. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sébastien. I note that Glenn's note in the chat was sadly we found out from a third party that ICANN North American Offices was doing outreach in Ottawa, Toronto, and Montreal, and no communication with NARALO. Let me just punt this over to Heidi and her team to work with NARALO directly and follow up and perhaps via staff channels find out what happened. Often it is a case of an error, a mistake, somebody forgetting, this sort of thing, or just circumstantial for things to happen this way. But obviously with this working group here it's about the At-Large summit recommendations, and we're not here to fix everything that has gone wrong in ICANN, otherwise we'll have a ten-hour phone call today and another one tomorrow, and another one after. Let's go to Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I do think that perhaps we could probably raise a lot of these discussions in Outreach and Engagement, because it is a challenge to coordinate with Global Stakeholder Engagement, and [inaudible] ways to collaborate together. I can relate to some of this, what happened [inaudible]. I mean, I had a ICANN Board director – the ICANN CEO come to Trinidad and I wasn't even aware of it, so I literally saw a printed, a [leak] letter at an event. So I can empathize quite with this.

---

But going back to recommendation 40, I do think though that the assignees should still remain the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. If we could also punt it [inaudible] Outreach and Engagement subcommittee in order to suggest the type of short-time funding events, I really do think it's the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. Because if you want to set up the process just as how the At-Large process works, then you want to have something very similar where the applications are forwarded to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. The Finance and Budget Subcommittee then forwards it to this new program for short-term funding, for short lead time finding. Not necessarily an event, but any budget request.

So it really should be the Finance and Budget Subcommittee that has to handle this. The Outreach and Engagement subcommittee can really only guide possible ideas – some of the ideas of short lead time budget requests that we are talking about, but it's really the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. I think that should be the proper assignee.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. So let's have two of them as assigned. So both the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee for providing the initial ground work for this, and then the Finance and Budget Subcommittee to then implement this in the next budget request. Is that the right way forward?

Okay. Let's move on, then, ladies and gentlemen. We're nearly finished with that list. And we've added a lot now on recommendation 40, so that's really good. And we have 42: "ICANN should enable annual face-

---

to-face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with a regional event.” Here we have a current status with that. AFRALO, EURALO, and NARALO were to submit requests for face-to-face general assemblies in fiscal year '16 under the AC/SO special budget request process. Sadly, only one – I believe, one request. In fact, two requests were made. One was allowed this year, and it ended up being the EURALO request. And thank you NARALO for this. I think it is NARALO that gave away their request this year, so thanks NARALO for this.

That of course puts us in a difficult situation because we now have one year with just one general assembly, then the next year should hopefully have two, then the year after should have two. And of course we're one year away from the At-Large Summit. It also takes one year to build the next At-Large Summit. So we would have a six-year span rather than a five-year span between any At-Large Summits. That being said, we don't even know whether there might be a future At-Large Summit, but let's remain positive on this. What should we add to this recommendation for it to feel a little stronger and a way forward, basically? Sébastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Just a question. If I understood well, AFRALO will not have a general assembly in Marrakech?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sébastien. I haven't got the budget requests in front of me, but from memory, I think that they're not. Or are they? Heidi, do you know

---

by any chance? I might be getting it totally wrong. I am getting it totally wrong.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, you are correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am correct?

HEIDI ULLRICH: You are correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am correct. I hoped I was wrong.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So basically, NARALO, EURALO, and AFRALO put in requests for this fiscal year, and the results were that NARALO and EURALO could choose which one between them would get it. It was EURALO. AFRALO, because the costs were basically double, was turned down. But in the request, it also said that AFRALO and NARALO would be given priority in the next fiscal year for general assemblies. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this update, Heidi. We have Aziz Hilali from AFRALO, AFRALO chair. Aziz, please, you have the floor.



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's probably muted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Aziz is on the French channel, so hopefully we should [inaudible] hear the French channel at the moment for some reason. Go ahead.

INTERPRETER: This is the French interpreter. I have no sound from Aziz. I am waiting for him to speak. I have told him he can speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for letting us know. Looks like we have a problem with Aziz.

INTERPRETER: I have sound.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have sound. Okay, thank you.

INTERPRETER: Okay. Sorry about that.

AZIZ HILALI: Tijani is the one who does the follow-up with the budget, and he took care of the general assembly question. We tried to organize this general

---

assembly in Marrakech, but the issue is that it was declined. The reason was very simple. There is a high-level meeting that gathers all of the ministers, and so for this meeting, we had to book about 35 slots in order to have these African region leaders meet. On top of that, there is the NextGen program that means that we have to increase the number of grants, the number of scholarships. So we regret to inform everyone that we will not be able to hold a general assembly due to these issues. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Aziz. That's very helpful indeed. Now we have the facts as well. So I guess when we come back to our recommendation 42, there appears to have been a will to do so and to have a general assembly, but obviously there are some times, some cases where it's physically impossible. Along the ones that Aziz has given us, the [inaudible] given us for Morocco. I mean, ultimately, of course, we have to continue pushing for more general assemblies.

I do know that our Board member, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, is pushing for these, for the Board to accept these general assemblies. One thing perhaps that we should do, again, is to remind the ICANN finance and the Board finance and budget subcommittee of the rotation of general assemblies as we had already described them in the past.

I do recognize that a Board composition is changing and memories are sometimes short. Perhaps we should remind them of our rotation and perhaps look at the next meetings that we know, especially in light of the different A meeting, B meeting, C-type meeting, to then come up

---

with a proposal for where we would like to have those general assemblies; not just as in year on year, but for the next three years. So at least we have a plan on the GAs and we don't end up having just one general assembly every year, which would then be an absolute catastrophe I think for our community as such.

Perhaps I can follow up, certainly, with Rinalia, because I did put together the first schedule for this. There obviously is some work that the Finance and Budget Subcommittee will have to do. I'll probably be sharing that timeline of meetings or expanding that timeline of meetings, and we can probably work through a schedule of how many GAs per year and what GAs need to take place.

I'm sorry, I'm being a little bit long-winded for this one and I probably haven't even meant anything. You know what I mean, don't you?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, is that an action item?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please. Yes. Let's have this as an action item, Heidi. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That was recommendation number 42. We probably have to move on after this. This recommendation is one of these

---

recommendations where we don't just send a request to the Board. I think it's going to require some interaction between the Board and us, and we can make use of Rinalia, who is in the finance committee, but obviously we also have some history of interaction with the chair of the finance committee, Board finance committee. That could be one of the discussions that we need to have with the Board in Dublin. Certainly having the document of rotation of general assemblies before Dublin, or a proposal for the rotation of general assemblies before Dublin, was a good idea.

Right. Let's continue down the list. We've reached 42, which is the last of our recommendations for the Board. I thought we would take less time than this to go through these, but I'm glad we went through them in a very thorough way, which was very helpful for completion. One of the questions, of course, was whether any of these recommendations that were completely obsolete and were to be dropped altogether, I think that we have identified a couple that have been somehow overtaken. But most of the recommendations there are now in a much better position than they were before, now much more complete than they were before.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have raised your hand. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I don't think there's anything else needs to be dropped. Actually there's something regarding recommendation 40, regarding ICANN should offer a process similar to the CROPP program but applicable to short lead time budget requests. Actually [inaudible] thinking, and I

---

remember the ICANN 53 meeting and the ALAC – or I should say the [ALT] meeting with the Board. I think there was a suggestion, there was a complaint about, you know, because there were visa requirements that had to be paid or something like that, that persons couldn't come to the events. I think it was Fadi himself who suggested, well, maybe if we gave a short-term funding that's available to the ALAC to cover these contingencies, that can be applicable. I think we should probably note that in that recommendation. It was the meeting with the ICANN Board, but Olivier, you were there. I think you were probably there, so you know what I'm talking about at the ICANN 53.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev. I do remember the ICANN CEO, Fadi Chehadé, saying this. I wonder whether there's been any follow-up on that. Heidi, has there been any formal follow-up on this, or was Fadi effectively saying maybe we should ask as a special budget request to have some funds available for visas?

HEIDI ULLRICH: There has not been any explicit follow-up. However, I do know that for Dublin, some of the supported At-Large members who were not provided funding to get their visa for Buenos Aires were provided funding for Dublin, so that is good news. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Heidi. That appears to be taken care of somehow. Dev?

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is a follow-up. It kind of gives that the Board is kind of aware [inaudible] may be receptive to recommendation 40, given that they are aware that sometimes short-term incidents require some sort of funding. So we could possibly use that conversation to advance recommendation 40. That's just a suggestion. It's not necessary for visas alone, but like I said, any short term budget request that comes up, that we want a particular traveler and we need a particular visa, that type of [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Dev, for this. I can see Ariel is capturing what you have mentioned here on the page. Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. In the last meeting in Buenos Aires, I clearly remember that someone from Africa was not able to travel because that person had to travel to another city in order to obtain the visa. This participant had no funds, and we were told right there and then that we had \$10,000 USD allocated to that end. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alberto. That's a good point to remember this, to remind us of. So hopefully that will not be a problem in the future if the ICANN CEO has committed to this. It looks as though this is being resolved.

---

I wanted to spend the last five minutes of this call – because I know that we are reaching the end of this call – the last five minutes going through any of the accountability related, the Accountability Working Group recommendations specifically. We’ve already touched on some. Ariel, I know you had a page. Unfortunately we don’t appear to have a link in our agenda to the account, the recommendations that were sent to the Accountability Working Group. So I’m a little lost [inaudible].

ARIEL LIANG: I’m going to put the link in the chat now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. So you all have the link in the chat for these. Thank you. And maybe we can link it to the other ones. Obviously this was a late edition. We have nine recommendations here. Obviously in five minutes will be very hard. We have touched on a few that were related to ICANN: IANA transition and ICANN accountability. Sébastien, this was a request from you. Which ones in particular did you wish to speak about? Because I don’t think we have time to go through all of them at the moment, so maybe we can start discussion now on the ones that you wish to draw our attention to, and then we can continue next week where we left off.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, it’s late. We are supposed to have ended this call. I don’t think that there is one specific. I think that we need to have this discussion, and why I wanted to have today, but it will be next time. [inaudible] I

---

would like to be sure that what is in those recommendation, it's well taken into account the comments that ALAC will be doing for the CCWG report on accountability. Because it's important that we build on what was done during ATLAS II. I guess it's the case, but I could have been useful to have this discussion together. But once again, as I am the only one from the CCWG from At-Large here, maybe we need to have a specific call, a joint call from this group with the CCWG or the IANA and Accountability At-Large Working Group. It would be more useful. I guess so. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. The deadline for the comments is the end of this week, isn't it, though? Is it the 12<sup>th</sup>, the deadline?

ARIEL LIANG: Correct.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but it's not even over, because we haven't finished the comments. But if it's a new request from your working group, I just wanted to be sure that we insure that everything is aligned with what are in the ATLAS II recommendations. But yes, if it's a question of timing, it's already too late because the final comment is in the end of the chair of ALAC. He will finish and publish it in the next few hours. Then it's a done deal from my point of view.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Sébastien. So let me just ask: can we have a five-minute extension to this call? Is that possible? I don't know if it's okay with the interpreters, or whether they're taken onto the next call, or...

TERRI AGNEW: Hi Olivier. I've already confirmed yes, you can stay up to 15 minutes over.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Terri. I hope we're not going to take 15 minutes. But Sébastien, you mentioned whether any of these recommendations that we have here are in line with the statement that we are sending out that is effectively frozen. So it's a little bit late, but just to reassure ourselves as a first pass. So looking at them very quickly, very swiftly, not going into a discussion of some sort. But look at each one of the recommendations. Can we just do a quick pass and check that they are pretty much in line with what we've worked on? And you could confirm this. I know I'm also [inaudible] ...

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will try to do that, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So recommendation number 3 is the first one.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:           Okay, well. Well try to do [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       “ICANN should continue to shape and [inaudible] reaching not only Board members but all parts of the ICANN community in order to develop a more transparent and productive environment.” Is this reflected of the work of the Accountability Working Group and in the work of our statement? Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:           Yeah. I guess we, if we take into account the Board, it’s taken into account in work stream 1, [helping] the rest of the community both for the transparency productive environment and the accountability. That’s number 5. It’s remained to be worked out in work stream 2, and that needs to be followed with great detail in work stream 2 I guess.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       Okay, thanks. So if I can just summarize. So recommendation 5 will be dealt with in work stream 2. Recommendation number 3 is currently being dealt with in work stream 1. Is that correct?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:           No, sorry, Olivier. It’s in both. We are talking about the Board and the rest of the community. The Board is taking care in work stream 1, and the rest of the community will be taking care in work stream 2. That means that when we say in [inaudible] not only Board members but all

---

parts of the ICANN community, Board members must remind the rest of the community work stream 2.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Thanks for this. That's for recommendation 3. For recommendation 5, "ICANN should examine how to best insure that end users remain at the heart of the accountability process in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function." How is that being taken care of by the accountability work stream?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I think it's a very important recommendation, and I am not sure that we – and when I say we, it's globally – we are pushing enough [inaudible] to strengthen the place of end user. It's the question about civil society, the question about the role of At-Large and of ALAC. It's not, for my point of view, not enough pushing advance or taking into account for the rest of the [inaudible] very important points we need to come back and push again and again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Sébastien. I think that's definitely some work that needs to be done by the IANA issues and ICANN Accountability Working Group. As I said, we are going to be working on this next week. There will be an agenda item that will be touching on that. We is, I'm sorry, the working group, the IANA issues and ICANN Accountability Working Group will be looking at these recommendations next week.

---

Number 6: “ICANN’S multi-stakeholder model should serve as the reference in encouraging all participants, individuals, or parties, to declare and update existing or potential conflicts of interest each time a vote takes place or consensus is sought.” That looks to me like something which is pretty much standard at the moment, isn’t it? Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: My feeling is that yes, it’s requested. I am not sure that it’s all the participants do it and answer really transparently of their conflict of interest. But it’s something taken into account, and I don’t think it’s included at all specifically in the CCWG report. But as – it’s more and more the way of working of each working group for sure, and the Board definitely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Sébastien. Let’s move to the next. Ariel is moving around a little bit at the moment. We’ll come back to these obviously because the working group, the IANA issues and ICANN Accountability Working Group will come back with some info on this. 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 address the relevant decision-making and requirements in the corporation.” Wow. That looks like a serious bit of work. Sébastien Bachollet, has the Cross-Community Working Group looked at this?

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Not really like that, and we talk about how the rest of the committee will be accountable to each other and to the Board as a work stream 2 [inaudible] that I really think that it's something we need to come back and I guess it would be after the transition.

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

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You can't hear me? Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, you seem to be cutting out sometimes a little bit. I don't know whether it's the silence or whether your voice is just being delayed by a few microseconds. Sometimes these things happen.

Let's go 13. 13 is, "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." Another very broad recommendation here. Has this been addressed by the Cross-Community Working Group?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess one part of the discussion is, for example, the stress test 18 regarding the GAC advice. It's a very deep discussion and I am not sure that it will end up with IANA [inaudible] transition. But I think we need

---

to remind the member of the CCWG from At-Large of the recommendations 7 and 13. It will be good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Sébastien. Then we can move to number 14, and Ariel is now on a roll. She's going faster than I am speaking, which is great. I've been told to slow down because of the interpreters. Ariel doesn't have to slow down, she just goes faster.

14: "ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws." We've done a lot of work on that already. It's partially completed because of – and with some examples of the work that has been done so far by ICANN using issuing special amendments to its contract. I know that some work in the CCWG Accountability is taking place on this. Sébastien, could you confirm this? I think there is a segment on that.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, because for example, a house review process will be taken into account. What are the role of the local laws, national laws, and even how we write the by-laws themselves. The other points were, and it's under discussion, it's regarding the human rights – how we at the global level and the one at the national level. It's something in discussion within the CCWG on Accountability. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. We have two more recommendations and two minutes, so let's go quick. 15: "ICANN should examine the

---

possibility of modifying its legal structure befitting a truly global organization, and examine appropriate legal and organizational solutions.” We’re speaking here about the globalization of ICANN. Recommendation 15. Sébastien Bachollet, has this been dealt with by the Cross-Community Working Group?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Here again, it’s taken into account for one part. For example, the [inaudible] single membership model will deal with this legal structure, but one of the questions, it’s at the, “Do we still have the headquarters in the US?” It’s something some people want to be pushed to discuss, some others don’t want that to be discussed. But it’s something which we will not deal before the transition again, and that maybe work stream 2 or even later in the discussion. But part is taking care in [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sébastien. Certainly can hear some of it will not hear until work stream 2. That’s great. Ariel, thank you for capturing these points. And finally, recommendation number 20, “Input the user perspective wherever necessary to advance accountability, transparency, and policy development within ICANN.” There is a proposal to give a mandate for a new ad-hoc At-Large Working Group on Accountability, which if course is what we’re dealing with here. Is this working with the Accountability track at the moment? I know you’ve mentioned we perhaps have not pushed enough for the end user in those discussions. What can be done on this? Sébastien Bachollet.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I hope that the five members of the At-Large will participate as a member on the CCWG on Accountability are pushing the user's [inaudible]. But it will be a no-end work. I feel that we may have pushed more for some issues, but in the same time, we are where we are. It will be, again, a discussion that we will need to have in work stream 2 and even to find the [inaudible] work stream 1.

What is also important to note is that ATRT number 3 will start very soon, in the next few months – maybe beginning of next year, if I remember well. It will be one place to push that issue again and then we will have to figure out who we want as the At-Large representative within this ATRT 3 group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. We have really now run out of time, 17 minutes beyond the end of this call. I'd like to thank the interpreters for the added time that we've had. Sabrina, Veronica, Claire, and Isabelle. The meeting next week is going to be – I think again we do another Doodle for next week? Same sort of timing. I think we've made some great progress today. So same sort of time next week, are we okay with that? Yes, please, Dev. Go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I have to give apologies, because most likely I will be in the Latin American and Caribbean Strategy session that's taking place in Uruguay. So I doubt I'll be able to make next week's call.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Dev. That's fine. We'll have to see, then, and focus on the groups that you are not involved in. That's going to be difficult, because you are involved with the majority of them. But we'll see. Let's make this a 90 minute call next week, but we might be shorter if Dev is not taking part, and we can hopefully focus a little bit then more on the other recommendations which are not meant for the Board.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's been very productive. Thanks, and this call is now – did I [inaudible] Doodle? Yeah, we need to have a Doodle for the timing next week. That's all. Thanks very much, everyone, and thanks to Ariel specifically for the exceptional note taking today and the full entertainment of flashing screens. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks [inaudible].

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks everyone.

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]**