| TERRI AGNEW: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening.  Welcome to the At-Large ATLAS II Implementation Taskforce taking place on Wednesday the 16th of September 2015 at 20:00 UTC. |
| --- | --- |
| | On the call today we have Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Wolf Ludwig, Glenn McKnight, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gunela Astbrink, and Eduardo Diaz. |
| | On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto. |
| | Currently at this time, we have no one on the French channel. |
| | We have apologies from Murray McKercher, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Siranush Vardanyan. |
| | On staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself Terri Agnew. |
| | Our Spanish interpreters today are Claudia and Marina.  Our French interpreters today are Claire and Camila. |
| | I would like to remind all participants to please state your name, not only for transcription purposes but also for our interpreters.  Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much Terri.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  Have we missed anyone? |
| | I think I can hear someone at the moment. |

---

*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.*

Okay. I believe we haven't missed anyone in the roll call, so the roll call is complete. Today's agenda is going to be a follow up on the last call that we had. We're going to continue going through our recommendations in the working group, starting with the IANA transition and ICANN accountability, which have been looked at by the IANA issues and ICANN accountability working group.

So we will have an update on this. And then we'll be looking through the list of groups that we have here in front of us, bearing in mind that in some cases we have already looked at those, when we were looking at the Board recommendations. What I mean by Board recommendations, recommendations for the ICANN Board. And then finally we'll have a follow up on recommendation related to funding of General Assemblies.

Any amendments or additions to the agenda?

Seeing none. Okay I can hear myself. I'm not quite sure where this is coming from.

Testing, can somebody hear an echo?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Certainly can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Okay. And I can hear an echo from Cheryl as well. So it's obviously… Okay, let me just continue, it's quite faint, so that's fine. I note that Sébastien Bachollet has also joined the call.

And let's move on to number two in our agenda, that's the action items from our last call. They were a lot of action items, and the majority of them have been completed. There were, there is one that's left for Dev Anand Teelucksingh to come back to us [inaudible] recommendation 21, and the one with regards to the meeting B, to the outreach and engagement subcommittee.

Dev is not on this call. He has sent his apologies. So we'll probably just leave it open for the time being. There are still a couple of action items that are open. For Heidi to find out from the North America global stakeholder engagement group, whether they conducted activities in Toronto notifying NARALO, whether that was just a one off or an error of some sort.

And there was also the ATLAS implementation team and the outreach and engagement subcommittee to be asked in an email to look at recommendation [40?] and come up with suggestions in time for the next ATLAS call.

And I'm not sure whether this has been accepted. I cannot see it at the moment.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, whether they have an update on this. Well let's keep this over to the side then, and make sure this gets done for the next ATLAS call. Now, does anybody have any comments on any of the action items on the agenda at the moment?

Okay. And it appears that the echo is from my line. That's a bit strange. We'll have to see where that comes from. Okay.

Well if you can bear with the echo for the time being, we'll keep on checking where the echo comes from, then I might have to drop off the call and then come back on the call in a moment. But we're back to the action items, and I don't see anyone putting their hands up, so let's swiftly move on then to our next part of the agenda.

And that's the agenda item number three, starting with the ATLAS II recommendation number 41. Now, the ATLAS recommendation 41 was, the ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. This was a recommendation that was meant for the ICANN Board that unfortunately fell through the cracks, and this is why it is here at the moment.

It's quite a general recommendation. It's aimed at the finance and budget subcommittee. I'm not sure, I don't think that the finance and budget subcommittee has had a chance to look at this in any greater detail at the moment. But there is a status which says here that the ALAC is to request additional recommendation be implemented under the new ICANN meeting strategy, especially when it comes down to meeting B, the AC SO focused meeting.

Are there any comments on this that we can add? Note that we can add underneath this recommendation, short of just meeting it with the finance and budget subcommittee at the moment.

Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD:    Thank you Olivier.  Maureen for the record.  I just wanted to [inaudible] meeting B, outreach activities that the new meeting strategy group has been discussing.  And we have it to raise civil [inaudible]…

We have actually raised several issues related to funding of some of the activities that might be required.  Especially as I think some of the ideas that have come up during our meeting, have involved activities that will be happening outside of the meeting.  We were told by Nick, who came to our last meeting, that the idea was actually to contain all of the outreach activities within the meeting, but this was, sort of, you know, just at our last meeting, and we, up until that time, had actually been working on ALAC, for example, looking at outreach ideas from within the community.

So we do have to sort of like…  I know that Vanda is working on a program, and there will be some issues arising out of the committee that she's working with that will require some funding.  But I can't give you any more details about that just yet.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much for this Maureen.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  And as you will notice, Ariel is sharing her screen, and so she is adding the points to the notes on the Wiki page as you speak.  Very good points that you've brought forward.

Also told that we might wish to, or the ALAC might wish to bring this point forward when speaking to Sally Costerton on the Sunday, when meeting face to face in Dublin, and also Nick, I believe it is Nick [Tameso], for well regarding, especially when it comes down to meeting

B, regarding the meeting and the way that the meeting will be arranged. I'm also told, [inaudible] comes from the screen, Laura leads the Next Generation program as well. So the ALAC might wish to address this when meeting with Laura. Sorry, Nora [inaudible]. Not Laura, Nora.

So there are quite a few things which need to be done here, and which could be listed. Let's go down the list of people queuing at the moment. Queuing next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Thanks Olivier. Cheryl for the record. I know the specifics that the ALAC should work with the ICANN Board when seeking additional funding, but I wondered whether to note here to also explore working with the regional VP might not also meet the end game that TG five came up with.

The relationship with the regional VPs was not as well established the way that it is now across all regions at the time this rec was put together. And I think that some regionally based and local forces of perhaps even new and business funding for some activities may indeed be possible.

So it just seems to mean that that… It's sort of a bolt on rather than a direct subsection of this, but it might be worthwhile exploring. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Thanks very much Cheryl. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. You're absolutely correct that it's also an excellent way of forward, bearing in mind that the regional VPs now also have their own budget that they

have a bit more control over, so they would be able to allocate some budget to outreach activities in a regional, more regional setting. And those outreach activities will obviously, since At-Large is all about outreach, will involve At-Large.

Sébastien Bachollet next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:     Thank you very much Olivier. Yeah, it's to, in conjunction with what you just said, [inaudible] that meeting, new meeting strategy have a subgroup working on the first meeting B. We will be in Latin America and Caribbean, and this meeting talk with the VP from Latin America and Caribbean. It's important to keep that in mind.

The first idea by the meeting staff was to have an outreach only, inside the building of the meeting, if I can say like that. But after discussion with the At-Large meeting strategy, we convinced them that it could be useful to have also external outreach. And which I think is still under discussion.

As you may know, the meeting strategy working group from ICANN was not in charge of talking about budget, just about the organization of the meeting, and it's where we came with A, B, and C meetings. But I have the impression that the discussion we had last week was very useful with Nick and with the VP of this region. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much Sébastien.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  And you mean the conversation we had last week, do you mean the meeting strategy working group had a meeting last week?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:     Yes.  Sorry Sébastien Bachollet.  Yeah, maybe it was even on Monday.  I don't, yeah, it was not so long ago.  We had a meeting, wait one second, I will tell you.  I think it was somewhere, yeah I guess it was last week.  We had this discussion with both meeting, people from the meeting organization, and people from the region.

And we are still working with them to finalize what could be the B meeting for Latin America and Caribbean next June.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay.  Thank you very much for this Sébastien.  That's very helpful.  And as, I believe you are a member of that meeting strategy working group, are you?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:     It's Sébastien Bachollet.  Yeah, I am a member of participating of this group.  I guess I am advisor of the chair, and I am also participating to the subgroup on the LAC, for the LAC meeting, as I have some knowledge of some country in this region.  But it happens a place I know better, will not be the place for the meeting, and it's a little bit far from my [inaudible].

But I am participating to both meetings, yes.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. So I think that as someone who is on that working group, if you can keep us updated on this, and we'll be able to then add on to this page for recommendation 41. I see no other hands up at the moment, certainly some discussions on the chat going on at the moment, with regards to the regional VPs integrating our At-Large structures, and on the ALAC in the local, regional activities, where possible and practical.

I am aware that it is working at the moment, quite well with some regions, and maybe a bit less well with other regions, and that will be something, perhaps, that we should bring up when we meet with the regional VPs in Dublin. We, I'm sorry, when the ALAC meets with the regional VPs in Dublin. But certainly, there seems to be a lot of eagerness of the regional VPs to work with the ALAC, judging from the many different projects that are currently on.

In the EURALO region, I certainly have seen some movement, and more newsletters now being published by the regional VPs office, so as to detail some of their activities, although I haven't seen enough yet, going on with EURALO, but hopefully that's a first step forward. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you Olivier. Yeah, just information I think, it's useful to know that the [inaudible] meeting in Montevideo about the LAC strategy, and both Dev and, who else? Okay. Are participating to this meeting, and I am sure that they will discuss, Vanda Scartezini, she's also there, we

discuss question of the regional strategy, but also of the first B meeting in the region.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Sébastien. It's Olivier speaking. And perhaps one action item that can come out of this at the moment, because you know, we are having ideas of what the regional VPs are doing, and the strategies and the different regions are, should we perhaps have an action item where we ask the regional VPs for a very short paragraph?

So maybe five or six lines, providing details of what activities are currently taking place in the region, that involve the regional At-Large organization. Is that a fair question? I'm just coming up with this on the fly, by the way, so please feel free to contradict me, or improve the language, or perhaps let me know that this is not something that we should do at all.

I see Heidi Ullrich has put her hand up. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Olivier. This is Heidi. Just to let everyone know, I think this is a very good idea. And not just what they've done, but what they're planning, and how At-Large structures could be involved more in their activities. I mean one way to do that is to add sessions on meetings that you are aware of in your region, where there could be some sort of collaboration between GSE and At-Large.

And I'll post that link one more time in the chat. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   That's great.  Thank you for this.  Thank you very much for this Heidi.  Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:   This is Alberto Soto.  Another possibility is that in every meeting, we have fellowship meetings and sessions, and there are other entities, organizations, the strange acronyms of which I do not remember, which actually conduct interviews with the Fellows, both ALAC and the other regions.  And this is something we can discuss, should address the Fellows and have a meeting exclusively with them.

There are some who already working in various ALSs, and other Fellows who are not members of ALSs, perhaps that could be a policy to be developed, to do outreach within each ICANN meeting.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks very much Alberto.  That's recorded as well.  I'll give Ariel a few seconds to catch up.

Okay, fine.  I think we've got plenty of information here now for this.  Sébastien, you have now put your hand up, so you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:   Thank you Olivier.  Sébastien Bachollet.  Just a last point, as soon as we will be able to talk officially about the place of the B meeting in LAC region, the subgroup will be in contact with the ALS, if there are, but

there are once in the country, and work with them to facilitate the outreach activities, and like that, it will also be easier to ask if we need any funding for the specific meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much for this Sébastien. Next is Heidi Ullrich, you have your hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH:    Sorry, that's an old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks for this Heidi. All right, let's leave it at that for the time being, otherwise we're going to spend the whole call on this number 41, recommendation 41. We have an action item there, so let's see where we go from there, and I'll be looking at everything that, all of the notes we've put so far now, and perhaps we can then devise an action plan as to what we do next.

Certainly a number of things to do for the meeting strategy working group discussions, and when the ALAC will meet with the regional VPs. If you, in the meantime, if you think of any other aspects of this recommendation, which is a very open recommendation, you work with the ICANN Board and obviously with ICANN staff as well, in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities, please feel free to follow up on the mailing list or to also add to this page by commenting on it at the bottom of the page.

I believe the comments are open.  Is that correct Ariel?


ARIEL LIANG:                  This is Ariel for the record.  As soon as you log into the Wiki, you can comment.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:       That's great.  Thank you very much Ariel.  It's Olivier speaking.  So let's now move to the next agenda item.  And that's now 3D.  Following up on the IANA transition and ICANN accountability.  A few hours ago, the working group on IANA transition and ICANN accountability met, and has posted all of the different recommendations that were sent to it.

So the page has been now filled with a lot more information than there was earlier.  What I suggest is perhaps we have a very quick browse over these, and see if there is anything that we wish to progress further at this stage in time.  If there is any other to do it, I would be glad to do it in trying a bit faster, but unfortunately, with the changes being very new, I can't imagine that anybody has read through it so far.

Today, for recommendation number three, and I'll read the recommendation, 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.

The notes from a bit earlier today were that the comments for the recommendations is on the radar of the CCWG accountability, and it is within the scope of its work.  The CCWG is making recommendations

that is part of the organizational reviews. And again, this is a recommendation from the At-Large community, but it is not really up to the At-Large itself to implement it single handedly.

Of course, this is something to do with all of ICANN, but the issue mentioned is, in the recommendation is regarded an active issue, and At-Large is part of the process. And thirdly, this recommendation gives ALAC members the ability in the CCWG to really press issues that the At-Large community feels strongly about.

So I think that somehow captured the discussion earlier today. Is there anything else that anybody here would like to add to this for the time being? I don't think we can mark this as done, this obviously is in progress until the CCWG accountability completes its work, which might be a very long time from now, but hopefully not. Hopefully it will be able to pursue its work and deal with this within the next few months.

I'm scared to say over the next few days, but nonetheless. Okay, I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so that was recommendation number three. Then recommendation number five, ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end users remain at the heart of the accountability process, in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.

And this is something which was held by the accountability working group as something that the ALAC has been advocating for all the time. In order to balance the power of all other interested parties, and the ALAC will continue to do so. So in effect, the recommendation itself has already been implemented, but obviously we're not…

**EN**

It was felt that the ALAC was not in a position to say that the end user rights were more important than other rights, and certainly there was some concern that pushing for this specifically, when one speaks about a multistakeholder model where, in theory, all of the different stakeholder groups were balanced and had, no stakeholder group had more of a say than in other stakeholder groups, there was a concern that if we were to advocate this position, it might really start rocking the boat.

So in some cases, it was felt that users should play dominance, but not all of the time. And that the end users have needs which are sometimes very similar to the needs of the other parties. So it's not a case of always wanting to be, to have the last word in everything. And there was an example here about the IANA stewardship transition, where there is almost 100% overlap between the interests of registries and the interest of users in terms of the operational aspects of the IANA functions.

Is there anything else that we feel in this working group…?

Now this is currently marked in progress. Having seen the notes, at the moment, I wonder whether we could actually, since this is something end users remain at the heart of the accountability process. Should we mark this as concluded? Or should we wait until the results of the CCWG accountability meetings in Los Angeles, and of course, the final report of that working group is published?

And then we'll make an evaluation of whether we think this is complete or not. Two options, close it now, close it later.

Oh I'm glad I've put everyone to sleep.  That's at least one thing I said I have done well today.  Seeing no one raised their hands…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      I wish I was asleep, but anyway….

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      I'm sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      I said I wish I was asleep, but anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      I'll have to speak more softly I guess, in the future.  One thing is for sure, I'm stopping my neighbors here from sleeping.  So that's some people that are not sleeping, at least.

Okay.  Leave it for the time being as is, in progress.  It probably would be a safer bet to wait until the final report of the CCWG accountability is published.  And then we will be able to make a better evaluation whether this has been, this recommendation was a success or not, and whether some action needs to be taken or not.

Number six, ICANN's multistakeholder model should serve as a reference in encouraging all participants, individuals or parties to declare in updating existing or potential conflicts of interest each time a vote takes place or a consensus is sought.

The wording of the recommendation seems to be a bit overreaching, to ask for an updating of the potential conflicts of interest, or existing conflicts of interest, each time there is a vote. Now imagine with the ALAC vote taking place on, maybe one, two, or more than a couple of votes taking place in the week, having everyone have to update their, well explicitly update their statement of interest, might be a little bit difficult, or everyone declare their conflicts of interest before each vote.

But every community group has already got some types of rules that are appropriate to what they're doing. The GNSO has, statement of interest, the ALAC certainly has also got statements of interest for all of its leading positions. So I guess that the only thing that would remain there to be done still is in the expansion of the conflict of interest issues, which will be, we are told, which will be dealt with by the CCWG accountability work stream two.

That's the work stream that does not have a deadline for the IANA stewardship transition. So we're looking at some time next year. Is there anything else to add to this, or are we quite pleased with the outcome so far?

It sounds like that everything that had to be said was said on this. Okay. Let's go down to seven. Seven is a [inaudible] review of ICANN's multistakeholder model should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN's constituency parts, adequately address the relevant decision making requirements in the cooperation.

And the first instance of notes was done on the 9th of September, when this working group did, and it certainly pointed out work stream two and today the working group said that it was, it seemed to be a fair assessment based on the previous notes. But no movement on this either. I can't think we can…

I'm not quite sure whether we have to put these on hold, or putting them in progress. I would say probably in progress for the time being. Number 13, and I'm trying to go through them quickly because I sense I'm losing half the people, if not all the people, on this call at the moment.

ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views, proportionally to their scope and their relevance. There were no comments during the, sorry, during the IANA issues call, [inaudible] issues IANA accountability call.

Certainly there, I mean that seems to be something that is taking place at the moment, and the stress tests which we have mentioned may be, certainly may be relevant to this recommendation.

So there was no feedback on this from the working group, and it looked as though it was all acceptable, the way that we had drafted this so far. 14, ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflicts between its requirements and relevant national laws. That's completed, partially completed, we can skip that.

15, ICANN should examine the possibility of modifying its legal structure, befitting a truly global organization and examine appropriate

legal and organizational solutions, and this jurisdiction issues, will be, and it happened from the jurisdiction issues will be addressed in work stream two.

So that again, is ongoing or in progress at the moment, pending the work stream two work that will be started in a few months' time. For 20, we'll continue, input the user perspective whenever necessary to advance accountability, transparency, and policy development within ICANN. And this did get a few people to cringe or wonder what that recommendation was about, or was for, the question was, who should do this?

It is uncertain, and this can be problematic as the ALAC is a volunteer based group, it would need more people to follow through. Input the user perspective whenever necessary to advance accountability, transparency, and policy development within ICANN. I think that we can, I would say we'd probably have to put this one on hold, because I'm really not quite sure how we are going to be working this one out.

It's a bit cryptic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Olivier, hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thanks.  Sorry, I lost connectivity on the piece of equipment I was actually next to.  So my [inaudible] piece of equipment undoubtedly still had me in the room.  Just on that, I agree with you to put it on hold.  But I would put it on hold with a note of subject to possible directional influence in the post ALAC review, the post upcoming ALAC review, because it strikes me that, it can be [rest], to some extent, this could be that the manner of activity that we should be expecting from ALSs and individual members, but that isn't going to be formalized in terms of constructing specific expectations, etc. until later on in a couple of processes.

I wouldn't want to link it just to the ALS review group at the moment.  I think it's probably safer to link it to the actual review, maybe as well as the review groups.  But it does need to be put on hold for now.  Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay.  Thanks for this Cheryl.  So we'll keep this one on hold, and Ariel is adding the notes from your point.  Excellent.  Thank you.  Now, back to number 25, to enhance ICANN's community efforts in building a culture of transparency and accountability, as called for in the recommendations of ATRT 2.  Oversight of the Board's decision now requires a mechanism of checks and balances, capable of providing true multistakeholder oversight and effective remedies.

And of course, this is already addressed by work stream one.  And for the time being, this recommendation will be completed as soon as we learn of the outcome of work stream one.  So that's also currently in progress, pending completion of work stream one.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up.  So it looks like we have gone through these recommendations for IANA transition and ICANN accountability.  And next in our list we have the ones for accessibility.  And there just happens to be a call of the accessibility working group a moment ago.  The only thing though, is there was no discussion around those recommendations.

I'm not even quite sure whether there should be much discussion around these recommendations.  One of them is completed partially, pending response from the ICANN Board and from the staff, that's recommendation number 11.  And the other one is recommendation number 10.

And recommendation number 10 states the next evolution of language services must adopt further extension of live scribing for all meetings, and generally extend the current interpretation and translation processes, and make translation available in a timely manner.  That was primarily directed at ICANN staff.  I open the floor for comments.  Cheryl Langdon-Orr.


CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thank you very much.  I think we can offload both completed subject to ongoing improvement.  Because we haven't even got the [inaudible] actually pilot running, and there is a serious commitment, as you've seen, on accessibility including language services, across the board in ICANN now.

So I'm tempted to say from the accessibility working group, now the cross community activities on accessibility, that whilst…  I mean, you

could even make it our call to close them, but note it's closed from our recommendations point of view because it has now been enacted as a matter of importance by ICANN.

And there will be ongoing work, obviously, that will involve both the accessibility team and the taskforce for technology as well. But that really is on an ad-hoc basis as new technologies come in now available and be tested. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Yes, thanks very much for this Cheryl. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just a quick question for you here. Did you say that ICANN language services now transcribe audio recordings?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    We have transcription of audio recordings out of our meetings in an incredibly timely manner.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    I think you met, did you say though, a live transcription?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    The pilot for the transcription is something that hopefully, with its success, will encourage that to happen, but it really has passed that on to language services, to take that up, once, and the IT people to take that up once the pilot is, I'm presuming, is successfully completed.

Gunela is involved in that pilot, and I see her hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks very much Cheryl.  It's Olivier speaking.  And let's then hand the floor over to Gunela Astbrink.  Gunela, you have the floor.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:   Thanks Olivier.  This is Gunela Astbrink for the record.  Yes, we have a pilot, which is fantastic, for captioning.  It is a pilot, and it's restricted to a relatively short period of time. And I just want to try and put the message across that we want to ask the pilot, had a good report, and that there will be ongoing captioning.  And this is also in regards to general work in the accessibility working group, that there is a lot of items on the list to be considered to be done into the future.

So, while there is a commitment to do a number of activities, I want to ensure that there is not a misunderstanding here that it has all been done, there is nothing further to consider, because the captioning project is a pilot, and we need to be clear that it is a pilot.  So it's not completed.  So I think, if [inaudible] on that statement, that there is a lot of work underway, but the work is being done.  So that's my main point.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thank you very much Gunela.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  And yes, I do note actually from the notes on the page at the moment, that it says input from technology taskforce.  So Ariel, you might wish to split this and make all of the comments from today's call under the accessibility, by just putting input from the accessibility…

**EN**

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     …accessibility working group.  And whilst Ariel does this, and does a cut and paste, thank you, I'll hand the floor over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you very much Olivier.  Gunela and I think it's very, exactly the same thing, in different ways.  I'm suggesting that as an outcome from ATLAS II we do have to close a few things.  It would be nice to put some of these things out of our unfinished remit, and into other people's hands.  And so, the ongoing work in particular, by the technology taskforce, is never going to end on this, and a whole lot of other matters.

But I don't think, I think that is continuous improvement and ongoing work, not that this rec is still open.  If you see the differences there.  And part of the rationale of creating a complete cross community activity for accessibility is to ensure an effective and uninhibited, including by lots of little pieces of lots of different budgets, in getting these things to happen.

So I just think we need to move a few things off the ATLAS II open dance card, and these things like a likely couple of possibilities.  Thanks.

# EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much for this Cheryl.  It's Olivier speaking.  And I note also from what Gunela has said, the pilot is a pilot that involves staff.  So in the input from the technology taskforce, the captioned first was something that just been technology taskforce was evaluating.  In the input we're having today, it is a wider, ICANN wide captioning project.

Cheryl you mentioned a cross community work taking place.  Is this taking place under a specific cross community working group?  What's… [CROSSTALK]….

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Okay, hang on, hang on.  It is not a cross community working group, because we went to great lengths to ensure that it wasn't.  So it didn't have to have a chartering organization or set of organizations, and all of the things that go along with that.  It is an ICANN wide cross community activity, and it was that new work space, which we spent a considerable amount of time in the call earlier today that you attended, for that accessibility group, to ensure that we get a good operational and [inaudible] build up now from the foundation that had happened from the ad-hoc group, that was run under the auspicious of ALAC up until now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for the Cheryl.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  And having been on that call, regarding that new work space, I believe that this will be updated, let's put down, to be updated soon.  And given the location of the work space when it is ready for public consumption.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      And Heidi, yeah, Heidi is on top of that.  Heidi is on top of that as is other staff, so I'm sure that might be an [inaudible]…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Okay, thanks.  Gunela, back to you, just to give you a chance.  You thought this should not be closed, this activity should not be closed. There…  If we then put a pointer to that work space of the captioning pilot and all of the other activities that you mentioned, I believe, would you feel more confident and then closing this recommendation pending the outcome of having the work space ready for public consumption?

GUNELA ASTBRINK:      Thank you Olivier.  This is Gunela Astbrink for the record.  Yes.  I think as long as there is a clear link, which has been put in now I see, of the work that is being done, and specifically that it is ongoing work to indicate that the recommendations have been attended to by a number of work groups, the technology taskforce and the cross community [inaudible] and accessibility.

So thanks Olivier.  I'm happy with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Thank you very much Gunela.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  I see a link on the sheet at the moment on the screen.  I'm not quite sure that is a correct link.  It says cross community WG.  May I just suggest that

this naming of this link should be changed somehow?  It doesn't sound quite right.

We were told especially that it was not a cross community working group.  It's going to be very difficult to convince anyone that an URL which has cross community WG is not a working group.  Just a thought.  Okay.  Let's move on then.  Thank you for this.  Let's go to number 11.  That's completed partially.  I think there is an enormous amount of information there, and it talks in more detail about the captioning, about the testing that was done.

Again, I think that will probably close off at the same time as the recommendation 10.  The two somehow are pretty much linked together.  And certainly this, the work on the accessibilities and that cross community initiative is hopefully going to be a promising thing, moving forward.

Right.  So I don't see anything else to add here.  Does everybody think that anything needs to be added to recommendation 11?

Okay.  Don't see anyone here.  There is an action item here where I need to send the ICANN Board Chair and ask whether any further information on recommendation 11 will be forthcoming, because this is a recommendation that we have sent to the ICANN Board already.  I haven't gone on to that yet, but I will soon, and definitely before Dublin.

Next, the capacity building working group is our next on the list.  And in this one, I'm not quite sure what else needs to be done.  The recipient of this recommendation was ICANN staff.   We're looking at

recommendation number two.   ICANN should increase support to programs having brought valuable members to the community.

I sense that there has been quite a lot already drafted under this recommendation.   I'm not quite sure where to go from here, and I therefore open the floor to any comments on this.   And certainly, since this recommendation is aimed at ICANN staff, I would also very much welcome the point of view of our staff being on the call.

Heidi, if you're listening, what would you suggest on this?  Knowing that there are some channels that work better than others.

Okay.  While we see a lot of different ways to move forward, I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

We can go to 12 if we're not moving with 11.  I'm a little concerned with the, there is a lot there to digest.  Defining the programs that brought valuable members to the community, and we have here leadership training, Next Gen, Fellowship, CROPP, regional strategic plans, language services, online courses, the At-Large summits of course, the RALO face to face assemblies.

In a way, this looks to me this is something that is currently going on, and there is an increase in budget and staff to programs having brought valuable members to the community.  We are seeing this real growth. So I'm not sure whether we can even actually mark this one as being somehow, for the purpose of this working group, as being completed.

HEIDI ULLRICH:                        Olivier, this is Heidi.

# EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Heidi Ullrich.  Heidi, I'm just seeing your hand.  Go ahead Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:     Yeah.  So this one I would suggest perhaps bringing in two conversations that you will be having in Dublin, and beyond.  The first one would be with Xavier Calvez, the CFO for the fiscal year 17 special requests.  If there are activities that you think will bring [inaudible] oftentimes programs will start at the fiscal year special request, and then they become core.  The leadership training program is a good example of that.

It's now a core activity.  The other person will be, again, Laura [inaudible].  She leads the department that handles the Fellowship, the Next Gen, ICANN Learn, those types of activities.  And she's also leading the discussion on auction proceeds.  So she will be speaking to you in Dublin and perhaps will issue to be discussed.  Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this Heidi.  Very helpful.  Okay, well we have some action items for this.  These are definitely action items, they're not even just notes.  So Ariel, I'll let you do what needs to be done with this.  This is stuff we need to work on in Dublin or in advance of Dublin.

Number 17, what am I saying?   12, in collaboration with At-Large structures, ICANN should put in place campaigns to raise awareness and extend occasional programs across under represented regions.   We have, well, the outreach and engagement subcommittee has added a

number of things there. Certainly the road shows, the stakeholder engagement strategy. There is a lot going on here as well with the regional VPs on this.

Is there anything else to add to what we currently have on the screen? I'm [inaudible] about reading the whole thing, just thinking that our interpreters will probably die under the speed of which I will read this. Is there anything else to add to this? An action item perhaps, I would say, following up in the Dublin meeting, perhaps, with the required people from staff.

Certainly with global engagement stakeholder staff, I think that probably is a good way forward. Perhaps raising their awareness of this recommendation during our meeting with GSE, during the ALAC meeting with global stakeholder engagement team. That's my recommendation, I would say. Any other thoughts? No.

Okay. Good let's move then to the next one, and the next one is number 18. Number 18 is absolutely bare, there is nothing there at the moment. Support end users to take part in policy development. Big, big question. Lots of outreach, lots of engagement work. How do we get end users to take part in policy development? That goes a lot further.

I would certainly say that part of this should probably be brought forward by the ICANN Academy and other facets of the ICANN academy that would teach end users more about the topics, policy topics, and somehow accompany them towards taking more part in policy

development.  Just to note, surprised this recommendation is empty at the moment as a follow up.

Heidi Ullrich, your hand is up.

HEIDI ULLRICH:        Thank you Olivier.  This is Heidi.  Several points that I would put here. Number one, as listed, the capacity building working group has a series of capacity building webinars.   The second part of 2015 will be announced very shortly, and I know already that they include webinars on policy making in the GNSO policy making within working groups, within At-Large, etc.  So there is something there as well.

As you mention ICANN Learn also has courses, online courses that will be now linked to some of these capacity building webinars, so that you will have a sequence.  You can join the capacity building working group and then take the course.  You are also welcome to create courses on your own, that you think will be useful.  And finally, as At-Large was the first of it, the [inaudible] guide series, are always very useful on information on how to create policy within ICANN, including At-Large. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thank you very much for this Heidi.  And I think I might have heard Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     You did indeed Olivier.  It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.  And this is just a relevant update.  I think the results of this [inaudible] with what Heidi [inaudible], and from that [inaudible] no reason for it to be blank anymore.  Just to mention that considerable discussion, and I think in it's inevitable progress, within the drafting team, sorry, the DTA from the ALS review group, is also looking at this, to try and onboard earlier and integrate more effectively, even perspective At-Large structures and individuals, into policy development using many of the tools, but also a bit of a buddy system as well at a regional level.

But many of the tools that Heidi just covered.  So we're coming at this issue from a number of ways, and I think it's, again, a piece of important but ongoing work that will have to be subject to continuous improvement.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much for this Heidi.  Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.  And that's a very good point that you're making here.  A new process for ALS expectations and criteria, and ALSs to be able to perform policy work, etc.  Certainly there is a new meeting strategy, and that might be also something to note, the new meeting strategy, meeting B will have a significant part of engagement.

And it would definitely be worth using the time in meeting B to also enable, support end users to take part in policy development, by having programs specifically targeted at them and helping them build

statements, and understand issues, etc.  Alberto Soto has put his hand up.  Alberto, you have the floor.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                  Olivier, put me in the queue too.  It's Glenn.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay Glenn, thanks.  You'll be in the queue after Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:                         Alberto Soto speaking.  I think that the problem of participation is quite a complex issue, because in my region, when [inaudible] I sound [critical] scenario, because certain ALS have no idea of how to participate, and when we ask about the training subjects, one ALS in the survey said we want to know what is ICANN.

So if an ALS is certified you cannot ask for a training course speaking about ICANN.   So I think that we should discuss this issue of engagement within the group, because at least with GSE, we have prepared webinars, based on a survey that dealt with certain topics that we have requested as trainers, so we have to be focused on training but at the same time, how an ALS joins or how it is certified.  We have to take the first steps that the trainers should be trained in certain important topics.

And we have to work together with the [inaudible] certain ALSs have no idea of how to make comments because they are not aware, or they do not know about the subject issues.  So this is a complicated issue.

**EN**

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this Alberto.  That's very helpful.  When you say we have to work on this issue, do you mean the…?  I mean, it's not the implementation taskforce work is it?  Do you mean the capacity building working group and the engagement working group need to work on this?  Could you clarify please?

ALBERTO SOTO:     Alberto Soto speaking.  In the ALS criteria group, we are discussing about the ALS, and how the ALS should be certified, should be part of us, should be omitted, so our subgroups we should work on how to get ready so that the ALSs that joined us have certain things that are knowledge [of their own?].

So we have to work together with RALOs, so as to define the training we need, because we have made [inaudible] as I said before.  We have made the survey, we have conducted the survey about the needs the topics they want to be trained on, and we are generating, we are making capacity building webinars with GSE.

And I think that it has to be a quite comprehensive [inaudible] all groups should be involved.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much for this Alberto.  Very helpful.  I think we can then add to the list of assignees, the ALS expectations and criteria working group.  And then that will be a good follow up with this.  I can certainly

see this building itself up quite well right now, so that's really good. Glenn McKnight, you're next.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. Glenn for the record. A number of things, starting with all of these suggestions that these [inaudible] would be useful. The only problem with that, it's always the usual suspects that actually attend that. It's almost like going back to the [inaudible] here, looking at what Alberto said, in terms of helping your ALSs particularly, you know, encouraging them to actually attend those sessions, but what we've had is we've had some really, really good people, like Carlton and Evan, who have gone on to other stuff.

So we have a big hole in really great policy people that are no longer there. So their capacity has not been filled. Obviously people like Holly have done a great job but she's only one person. And really to get good policy, you need that back and forth. I'll be at the ARIN session, and I'll be doing a report to the capacity building group on their process, how they mentor, and it gets back to what Cheryl was saying about the buddy system.

I think we have some work to do. And that's what Alberto is getting at, is that how we take those concepts, how do we put things…? Who is responsible whether it's the secretariat or chair together at a RALO, to actually motivate people to get involved with this stuff? So we have some homework to do.

And Olivier says, perhaps the ALS evaluation committee can be there, they can do it, but we have some holes, we have to fix some things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much for this Glynn.  Very, very good point.  It's Olivier speaking.  You made some very valid points here.  And you mentioned whose responsibility is it to do this?  I would have thought that the RALOs have probably got a very, very big part to play here, because they know their ALSs better than the ALAC does, they certainly are closer to their ALSs, and they probably are able to find the talent, and perhaps actively looking for talent within the At-Large structures, speaking to At-Large structure representatives, finding out if there are other people within the At-Large structures that would have the ability to, and the interest, ability and interest and the time, is also important, and the time to engage more deeply in policy issues.

So that's an important thing.  The CROPP is important for the regional outreach, but I think also…  And I don't think it's listed here, the mentoring program, we did start the mentoring program during ATLAS II, I just wonder where this has gone?  It seems to have withered away.  Is the mentoring program still in place?  Should we perhaps ask for the mentoring program to have its own activities and leaders from the community to continue its mentoring program, and have a….

Glenn, you mentioned a buddy system, which [inaudible] mentoring [CROSSTALK]…  I'll be here to help you out.  Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you.  Yes, Cheryl, I've been carrying on about buddy systems for years, so you know, correctly attributed, thank you Olivier.  There were two types of mentoring that had a focus around the ATLAS meeting, of

course.  There was the intensive stuff, which of course, Gunela was one of the beneficiaries of.  And there was the general one, which you know, meant that there was a mentoring leading up to and during the ATLAS program.

The pilot that Gunela was part of, I don't know what the meeting the long term plans for that sort of thing or not, but I do know that Heidi will gather [give us some sort of?] update, or [upgrade] on that [inaudible].  So we do need to recognize that we do have established mentoring programs running in other places of ICANN.

You need to look at why you're mentoring, and what you're mentoring for.  And there is, as I get up on my soapbox, [inaudible] rest of the meeting so I will reduce that temptation, I can prattle on for a whole meeting on the fine art of mentoring and how many different methods and layers there can be for it.

But if you're trying to mentor and get more engagement, it's different if you're trying to get mentoring done for leadership development, which is different to how you're doing mentoring.  So don't just say, what's happened to the mentoring program, we probably need to look ICANN wide, but also look specifically to meet At-Large and ALAC requirements, at an ongoing commitment to peer support and mentoring.

And they should be an ongoing commitment.  But part of what's happening in the BTA work, is also to try and engage early with perspective accredited ALSs and the individuals that are within those ALSs, as well as individual members which should join RALO, to try and

make some of what we formally probably put under the umbrella of mentoring, easier and to start earlier.

But you're going to have to have a whole specific commitment and conversation about mentoring, and I'm going to suggest that Heidi will be able to respond to what's happened to the particular program that we had our three people go through. But there is a whole lot more than what has been done to date on mentoring that needs to be done, in my view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you Cheryl. We have Heidi Ullrich then, and then afterwards we'll have Gunela. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:     Thank you. Yes, Cheryl and Gunela, I'm happy to let you know that the program that Gunela took part in, that was an At-Large ATLAS special type of mentoring, that took place the meeting in Singapore, and then up to London, primarily for in assistance in recognition for the summit. So I don't know if that's going to continue.

What I do know is that, as Cheryl said, some sort of mentoring program that is ICANN wide, would seem to be a better way to go. And I do know that there are plans for that, and again, if you speak with [Moura] in Dublin, I'm sure she would be able to update you on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay.  Thank you very much Heidi.  It's Olivier speaking.  Let's have it as an action item then please, to speak to Nora about the mentoring program, and specifically her to this ATLAS II recommendation number 18.  That would be important.  Gunela Astbrink, you have the floor.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:    Thanks Olivier.  Gunela Astbrink for the record.  Yeah, I just wanted to give my personal observations of the mentoring program.  I was delighted to see, to be given the opportunity to be a part of that mentoring program, as a pilot.  And at the time, I wasn't aware that it was related specifically for ATLAS, but the first meeting in Singapore was good with the mentoring.

But I totally agree with Cheryl that, I mean, I suppose I had participated in ICANN through APRALO, and so I had some understanding of ICANN processes.  So maybe I had an advantage to the other two people, but I felt that the need for ongoing mentoring, again, maybe not so much for me, but for others who would be newer to the processes, would be really necessary.

If that doesn't happen, people will drop off.  So certainly to have an ongoing process, and to have a recognition of a mentor as well, because it is time consuming for people who have a lot of other commitments, certainly during ICANN meetings, and even in between ICANN meetings, so I mean, I feel those two meetings, I participated, I'm now not able to go to face to face meetings because I'm not [afford?] to do so.

I am committed to ICANN, but everyone's situation is different. So I just want to say that if you're going to do a mentoring program, it needs to follow through. That's my message. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Gunela. It's very, very good points you're making. It's Olivier speaking for the transcript. Obviously, the three mentors that we had for ATLAS II, having learned so much and having become such valuable members of the community, need to be supported somehow. There needs to be some kind of a follow up, and I think that maybe…

I mean, we have a large amount, now, of notes in this specific recommendation. The discussion with Nora is going to capture this, and rest assured, there will be a big discussion about this in Dublin. And I'm sure your name will come up, and I hope that you will be able to follow this remotely, and perhaps even contribute your experience with us.

Okay. I can see we have really built up recommendation number 18 very well. I note that the next recommendation in the list, number 19, is also empty. We have 10 minutes left on this call. I'm a little concerned that will not be able to finish those recommendations. I would suggest, in order for us to complete our agenda today to stop going through those recommendations now.

So stopping at number 19, and we will continue in our next call, for this recommendation. And I just wanted to bring you up to date in the meantime, with follow up on the recommendation number 42, which has been assigned to me as an action item. So recommendation 42

states that ICANN should enable annual face to face RALO assemblies, either at ICANN regional offices, or in concert with regional events.

And in this respect, there have been a number of, certainly a number of questions on there. And one work that I had to do was to look at developing a timeline for the General Assembly, leading to a possible ATLAS 3. I spent some time on this, and I have managed to develop a first draft of this timeline.

It is linked to the, it is currently linked to the agenda. But what I suggest is, perhaps if I can, yeah, it doesn't come out at all when it's on the PDF version. Ariel, I'm going to share my screen then, if I may, and then go through these. How do I share this now? Am I in the right place to share my screen?

Ah, that's more like it. Now it has come up. Okay. And there we are. So I hope you're all able to see this. And that, if you want to see the original, it doesn't come out well at all in the PDF, at the moment, it's just a draft. It's something I hastily put together a little bit earlier today, and so effectively, it looks at the road map for what, where we have been and what the pattern is.

Pattern of General Assemblies is. It starts with Cairo, it builds up on the spreadsheet that I had built in the lead up to ATLAS II, so as to show where we were going to go with this. And so it starts effectively with the year, fiscal year 09, which has the three dates here, and the At-Large summit, the first At-Large summit in Mexico City.

I think that the columns are pretty self-explanatory. We've got the FY here, which is the fiscal year, or financial year, would be 09, and then

you have the summit year. The year of the summit is year zero, the year afterward is year one, the year afterwards is year two, etc.

The ATLAS column only has the ATLAS word, when we have an At-Large summit. And meeting type will be used later when we have an A type meeting, B type meeting, C type meeting. City, country, self-explanatory. I've used the RALO colors so as to make it easier for us to recognize the locations where the meetings are taking place.

On the right hand side, these are just for figures, so a general assembly at an ICANN meeting will have a certain cost, and that would then be translated into the fiscal year costs. If it's granted, there is a one year, if it's not granted, there is a zero. So the zero you would have a proposal, but you don't have the cost being transferred over to the total cost on the right hand side.

Code is just any code. Whatever. So, scrolling down, you will see that in year one, after the summit, there were no general assemblies. Year two, there was one general assembly that took place in the LAC region that was in [inaudible]. I'm unaware of the amounts that it cost because it was before my time.

Year three, so fiscal year 12, year three, there was one general assembly that took place in Dakar, for $75,000. And in fact, it's worth noting here, can I click on this? I'm not even sure. No.

Start again. There we go. And the reason for this is because all of the RALOs in that year pulled their resources in order to have that general assembly in Dakar. You'll notice the cost. It's more expensive to have a general assembly for some regions then for others.

**EN**

The next year, year four, so then there were three requests that were, sorry. Two requests, no three requests that were made for general assemblies. And in fact, the three places try to go for them. Only two were granted, one was not granted. So one was in NARALO general assembly that took place in Toronto. One was the EURALO general assembly that took place in EuroDIG, which is highly unusual to have a general assembly taking place outside of an ICANN meeting.

And unfortunately the Asia Pacific general assembly, which was given a cost of $105,000, much more expensive since it's such a large region, was not granted. So AP was effectively cut short of a general assembly in between At-Large summit. So all of the regions had a general assembly except the Asia Pacific and Pacific islands, and Australia organization.

The next year, year five, so the fifth year we had the summit that took place in London, that effectively meant a GA for everyone. And now we can look into the future. The year one after the ATLAS II, we had absolutely no general assemblies whatsoever. This year, we had a request by two regions, sorry, by three regions for a general assembly.

Two of them had an ICANN meeting taking place there. EURALO and AFRALO, and NARALO also asked for one. AFRALO decided not to proceed forward because of a government meeting that is also taking place in Marrakesh and therefore there was no space to house all of the participants of a general assembly.

So AFRALO decided not going forward with asking for a general assembly. EURALO and NARALO ended up being granted one general

assembly between two, and NARALO very kindly passed this, transfer this over to EURALO. So EURALO is having its general assembly in Dublin, which means that next year, with the meeting, starting with the meeting strategy with A, B, C…

Now we only know that Marrakesh is the meeting A, the meeting after that in the LAC region will be a meeting B, that of course, takes us then to fiscal year 17. So next year's fiscal year. NARALO and AFRALO should have a general assembly there, according to this chart. EURALO has already had one, so it's not eligible for this. So you would have two next year, then the year after you would have another two.

Year four you would have the Asia Pacific general assembly, and you have a LACRALO general assembly. The Asia Pacific one would take in a meeting C, which I remind you all is a big, very large meeting. The meeting B is a much smaller meeting that would take place for LACRALO.

And that takes us then to year five, if we follow the same pattern as we did between At-Large summit one, and At-Large summit two, year five would need to have an At-Large summit with general assemblies in all of those. Looking at the three possibilities for that fiscal year, it's probably unlikely that we would be able to bring that many people to a general assembly in a B type meeting, especially due to the logistics.

I cannot imagine 100, I think it might even be 200 At-Large structures going over to a place in Africa, which has the capacity, especially now that we're looking at a smaller size of meeting. So we would probably

have to go for either meeting C or meeting A, either within the European region, or within the Asia Pacific region.

And please, Asia Pacific, Pacific Islands. Asia, Australia, and Pacific Islands. And so that takes us then to a GA on that year, and the year after would therefore be a year without a general assembly, without face to face meeting by all of our ALSs, and the year after, which is where the whole list of the meetings, what side of ICANN stop is the link at the moment for the two meetings after the AGM in 2020.

2020, what a time from now. I'm told that the interpreters are okay for another 10 minutes. But in the meantime, I open the floor for questions and comments on this. I realize this is the first time you're seeing this, but it's also the first time I'm seeing this. I just put this together quickly today, so it's quite recent that it seems to be really putting some pressure on now.

Its 2020, it sounds very far, but it's also very close by, when looking at it on this piece of virtual paper. So, how do I see who has their hand up now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:      Olivier, I do. It's Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:      Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

**EN**

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thank you.  Could you scroll back to the very beginning of the page?  In the beginning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     In the beginning.   In the beginning, here we go, we are at the very beginning.  Cairo.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Right.  And we probably need to have even a little bit of [inaudible] history there, and it is most unusual for me not to bitch and moan about the poor handling of just about every Asia Pacific general assembly that doesn't happen within an ATLAS meeting.  But I'm actually going to say, that in the prehistorical days, Asia Pacific did, in fact, benefit by certainly one meeting funded by ICANN that could have been under our current construct, declared a general assembly.

It was, in fact, held outside of an ICANN meeting.  It was held during an APRICOT meeting, sorry, an APNIC meeting in Thailand.  And, sorry, not in Thailand, in Indonesia, I think.  So long ago, I can hardly remember what country I was in.  But we did in fact bring every one of the Asia Pacific ALSs together at that stage.

Now that wasn't many of us, I will admit.  We could sit around a boardroom table.  It was the founding meeting of all of our own members and [inaudible], and all that sort of business was conducted there.  So you probably want to admit to that, because it would in fact, come up in a search of expenditure, and we would certainly, should be able to, [inaudible] I'm pretty sure it was APNIC, but anyway.

# EN

And we can sort that out by looking at the dates. But there would been a significant cost associated with that. In addition, there was also a smaller meeting which was basically the executive and leadership of Asia Pacific, which was also funded by ICANN. There also was a meeting held in a non-ICANN context. It was held in Hong Kong, and it was at a technical meeting, in fact.

And in fact, a meeting which was predominated by industry players of ICANN. And again, we can look up the dates on that as well. Now, because it was where it was, and because a lot of other people were attending that particular conference in Hong Kong, it really did end up closer to a small general assembly.

But I guess we should admit to those prehistorical points as well. And I can help you with those as well dates, just not right now. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Okay. Thanks very much for this Cheryl. We'll fill this up a little bit later. This is just a draft at the moment, but that's really helpful. We can add to this. I suspect of course, other regions could also happened previous to the first ATLAS, especially when they all got created, one way or the other. Sébastien Bachollet, I believe, is the next person. Sébastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:    Thank you Olivier. Yes, I think it could be… First of all, it's a nice document, and thank you for bringing that up. I think that we can have [inaudible] the information at the formation of the current ALAC and

the creation of the RALOs.  It was on the presentation I made a few years ago, and ICANN found it where you have the date, even the member of the ALAC at that time.

And my second point, it's about the ATLAS 3.  I will suggest that you leave open the three options, even the B meeting.  And you got to the meeting staff, and you tell them okay, our goal is to have an ATLAS 3 in this fiscal year.  We would like to have your advice of where you think it's better, or you need to keep in mind that in one of those three locations, you need to have enough space to us having an ATLAS 3 meeting on the facilities of the ICANN meeting.

And that's not too prescriptive, but at the same time, it gives them the duty to find the best place, the most suitable of the ATLAS 3 during this fiscal year.  Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much for this Sébastien.  It's Olivier speaking.  As you'll notice, I also added ATLAS 3 here for the meeting B as well, just in case.  Okay.  We are pretty much running out of time now.  I realize this is a new document.  I think perhaps it will be better for you to have a look at it in your own time.

And let me now just revert back to the main screen, and then I think…

As I said, it is linked to the agenda, so you can download this document.  I might even try and transfer it over to a Google Doc, in case that would help, probably is a good way forward.  So that's the document then, as it was in the action items.

So, are there any other comments regarding this document? [Inaudible] road map. Obviously, before sending it to the Board and the Board finance committee and so on, I would like to pass it by the ALAC first. Obviously it goes further than just saying, well this is just an informative like this. It starts becoming part of the formal discussions between the ALAC, the ICANN Board, and the Board finance committee, etc.

So it will probably, I think it would have to be passed first by the ALAC finance and budget subcommittee, and then the ALAC, and then depending on what happens there, be sent to the relevant people that it needs to be sent to.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank you all for this call. It's slightly extended, but it has been very, very productive indeed. We have a lot of notes. Thanks very much to Claudia, Marina, Claire, and Camila for having remained the additional 10 minutes on this call. Thanks very much to Ariel for having performed wonders of taking of the notes and really making this very productive indeed.

And thanks to all of you for having participated very much. It has been great. The only question we have… We have one question before we go. Do we want a call next week? I know it's a very crowded week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     No! No, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay, ladies and gentlemen. Let's have a look. We have, I think the next week is going to be so crowded, it probably would be better to skip

next week, and have our next call in two weeks' time. We are making great progress, and that would enable us to have two more calls until we meet in Dublin.

So we'd have a call on the week of the 28th and a call on the week of the 5th. So a call on the week of the 20th of September, and a call on the 5th of October. And that's because next week there are a large number of people are going to Los Angeles for two days. Pretty insane if you ask me, but anyway, for the CWG accountability and there is a lot of work going on with that.

So I see everyone is okay with this. Sébastien Bachollet?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Mr. Chair, but why is it insane to go for two day in Los Angeles, then to go for two day in Paris, or to go for two day in Frankfort? It's just that it's shorter for you but, Cheryl I don't think that it will change something. And it's always difficult for going to two days of meeting anyway in this world, just for an ICANN meeting, but that's the way we are doing the work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Sébastien. Enjoy the flights, enjoy the work. Next week we will give it a rest. So let's have a Doodle for the week of the 20th of September, and we won't have a Doodle right away for the week of October, because I'm not sure people even know what they will be doing on that week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Oh yes I do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     You do?  Okay.  Let's open both Doodles then.  Let's have two Doodles, one for the 20th of September, one for the 5th of October week, and we can keep the Doodle for the 5th of October week longer than that.  Let's aim at having perhaps two calls, so two slots on the week of the 28th, just in case.

What am I saying?  I'm completely losing my head here.  Sorry.  Just one call is fine.  I'm thinking of another [inaudible]…  It's high time that I go to sleep.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     And to say goodbye for sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks to everyone.  This call is now adjourned.  Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**