

GLENN MCKNIGHT: The purpose of this call is we did extremely well in terms of our submission, so well now we have problem number two. Problem number one was getting ICANN to recognize our proposals, now we have problem number two is making sure the proposals that we all are putting are complementary and that they will not result in being disqualified because there's too many that are similar. That's the purpose of the call today – to talk about our individual proposals but I'd like to turn to staff to do a quick roll call then I will go over [inaudible] you. Please?

YESIM NAZLAR: Heidi has joined us as well. Welcome, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone. Hi. Sorry I'm late.

YESIM NAZLAR: We're still missing Mandy at the moment.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Heidi, can you poke Mandy to remind her of this call?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

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.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Let's start folks. Satish has a hard stop so the sooner we start, the sooner we get things done so we can get everything in. So would you mind, Yesim, doing the roll call? And by the way, I'm a substitute. I'm Dev today, so I'm substituting for Dev.

Go ahead, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, Glenn. Let's please start the recording.

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement Special Purpose Call on At-Large Workshop Request for IGF 2017 taking place on Thursday, 27th of April, 2017, at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Glenn McKnight, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Daniel Nanghaka, Satish Babu, and Yubelkys Montalvo.

We have received apologies from Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Lansipuro, and Aris Ignacio.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, Siranush Vardanyan, Deborah Escalera, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

As Glenn has just mentioned, we're expecting Mandy Carver as well.

And finally I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcription purposes.

Over to you, Glenn. Thank you very much.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Can everybody hear me okay? That's the first thing.

Sound check is okay?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I want to make sure I'm loud enough and I'm clear enough. Is this being translated, by the way?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

YESIM NAZLAR: We don't have interpretation.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. So I could speak at a normal rate.

Okay folks. Let's start off with that I am a substitute for Dev. Dev is tied up on the onboarding session this morning. Very important stuff that he's doing. He asked me to substitute. Heidi put this agenda together. I didn't get a chance to edit it but I put together before we get into Item #3 I have a very short slide show that I want to run through on terms of the IGF workshop protocol, so if I can have that in the center panel please, Yesim. It's only a few slides but it's worth going through so we have an idea on what our obligations are.

Starting off, "Shaping the Digital Future" is the focus. So any of the proposals that you're doing must now mention this word at least three times. So you need to be cognizant of that your proposals take this concept into consideration. So I'm just going to run through the slides.

"Shape Your Digital Future" – Emphasizing both the IGF participatory mechanisms and a forward-looking approach to the Internet Governance discussion. And I want to emphasize "participatory mechanisms" in terms of your proposals.

Satish has just put his hand up. You're more than welcome to interrupt me. Go ahead, Satish.

Satish, I can't hear you.

SATISH BABU:

Sorry. It was actually the previous slide which talked about the "Shaping the Digital Future." The next slide you have the actual wording, which is: "Shape Your Digital Future" and an exclamation mark. That is the exact

wording for the theme of the current year. So I just wanted to highlight that because I didn't see this slide. I saw the last slide.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

SATISH BABU: Sorry about that.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Satish, thank you for correcting me. "Shape Your Digital Future!" is the theme, and as I stressed, do be conscious of this theme. Do be conscious in your proposals.

Moving forward – you will need to do the online proposal. The online proposal, I've provided the links for you. I have to stress this. I've gone through this myself and as Satish had a chat about our outreach and engagement proposal, we have a separate Google Doc. People have been working on it. The problem with the online template – if you think you're saving everything you've done, you're going to be sorrily mistaken. It is a buggy form. So whatever you're doing, I recommend to you to do the stuff offline and then when you're ready to submit it, cut and paste – and I'll mention this in the checklist later – but that's one of the things I just need to caution you right now. It's a very simple proposal and this is the screen capture for you.

Next.

Format – You have a bunch of choices. You have a 60-minute break-out discussion, a 90-minute, a debate, you have flash sessions, round tables, other types of panels, so you have a lot of combinations in terms of how you do your workshop. The considerations you need to do is they adhere to this year's theme, emphasize here a gender balance in your composition of your panel, geographical representation, and really clearly understand how to engage the people in the room and online participation and innovation value added should be in your proposal because this is going to be a competition. They're not just going to rubber stamp our proposals.

Moving on, you need to register all your speakers as resource persons. When you put your proposal in and you say, "These three people at least are going to be your resource people," and if they have not been posted in the Resource page, then that's going to impact your proposals as well.

Let's just go through a quick checklist. You need to complete the online IGF Workshop Proposal, you need to adhere to their guidelines, at least three provisionally confirmed speakers – as I mentioned – previous presentations reports that you did. If you did an IGF before you have to provide the link or the report. That would be grounds for rejection.

The speaker limit – no more than three accepted sessions. And this is an interesting one. No more than three proposals from any individual or institution will be accepted for consideration. And if you go to the guidelines, they get into more details how they reject your proposals or how they will select those three. So I want to caution you on that and I

think it's important if ICANN's name is on every one of them and all the other ones that are going in – and I'm hoping Mandy has joined us, that she can address this issue – again, I said this earlier, transcribe your proposal. I would suggest doing it offline as a Google Doc together with the questions and then cut and paste and bang, submit it, because you'll find you'll be disappointed unless they fixed the buggy form. Make sure all your panelists complete the Resource page as mentioned. And the application date is the 3rd. Bang. Okay.

That is it for me and I'm going to turn back to the agenda and we'll be going into the details. So back to you, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Okay. Thank you very much, Glenn. Thanks for covering a little bit of what I wanted to go ahead and cover on that. Let me just back up a little bit and make sure that everyone's aware of what is in the actual Additional Budget Requests that were approved. I've put the work space for At-Large into the agenda, and basically let me just quickly go through those.

At-Large has a request that was approved for a request for up to two travelers. The whole idea of this is that it's synchronized so that you're going to be submitting four separate requests – one for At-Large and then three for the individual RALOs – AFRALO, APRALO, EURALO – but I would suggest if you could somehow link those together either explicitly in the Workshop Proposal or then somehow implicitly where all the themes run together so it's a coherent whole. I would stress that.

Each of the requests were approved for two travelers. Again, the conditions were: 1) that the MAG approval of at least one At-Large workshop. Again, I did speak with Mandy about this yesterday. It does not matter on the format of that. It could be, as Glenn mentioned, there are several different kinds of formats for the sessions. It can be a workshop, it can be a birds of a feather, it can be a roundtable, it could be a flash session. I believe it does not need to be a workshop session per se.

And then secondly – and I think this is very important – this is a relatively new requirement for the Additional Budget Request is that there's going to be the submission of a detailed report from each traveler – not each group, but each traveler – within 30 days of the meeting their addresses each itemized metric on your request, and then submit that to the e-mail that is on the approval text. Again, that's a condition of future resource allocations.

Again, those are the conditions basically for each of the approved requests for At-Large as well as the three RALOs. For the At-Large one it says that two travelers are approved – one from the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement and the second one from an ALAC member.

Any questions to exactly what is stated in the approved text?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. We have the first question from Satish and then Olivier and Daniel if you want to jump in as well. So we'll start with Satish.

Satish?

SATISH BABU:

Thank you. I just had a question relating to workshop topics that are beyond ICANN. For the last four years I've been submitting proposals and presenting sessions on open source. Last year also we had a session like that. Last year we had lots of our people including Glenn and Olivier and Maureen in that Open Source Workshop. This year also I'll be submitting a proposal which will not have ICANN's name on it except through the speakers. I'm just mentioning so that there is no kind of conflict of interest about this. I don't know how it fits into the whole thing. This is prepared from the APRALO proposal that we would be submitting. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Okay. Heidi or Mandy, did you want to respond to Satish's? Mandy, go ahead.

MANDY CARVER:

Two things – there are many, many, many, panels and activities done by people at the IGF who may also be active in the ICANN community. When we're doing the supplemental SO/AC Budget Requests those are specifically for proposals that somehow go to ICANN's mission and mandate. So it isn't competition, Satish, if you're doing something on open source that is accepted, but that's not what the purpose of the requests that come through ICANN funding are for. We encourage you

obviously to submit and be engaged and involved in anything that you're working on in your day jobs and your other interests.

And in fact, if you're concerned about... The MAG gets many, many, more applications than they can possibly accept, and one of the things they're trying to look at – again, I'm not on the MAG. I can't give you special insight – but the goal is to try and provide a variety of sessions and topics, a variety of voices, new voices, new topics, things that go to each year's theme, not just replications of previous things. So you don't have to put the ICANN name on everything you do. You only need to be addressing an ICANN mission-related topic for the things that you're submitting that you will be looking to the SO/AC Supplemental Budget Request support to fund.

The other thing I wanted to speak to is the format types. Heidi is correct. There are many ways of doing this. It could be a panel. It could be a roundtable. It could be a debate. The flash sessions were set up essentially for an individual or two people who are, for instance, on a research team, to present research. It isn't really what we were anticipating or what the funding submissions reflected when you all put in to the Supplemental. It's more akin if you go to academic conferences to doing a paper presentation, a stand-up session, that you would see when you went around the research hall. It's not particularly what we're expecting, in part because a flash session is only 30 minutes long, and the expectation in those is that the idea, the innovation, the research finding, would be proposed, would be described, and then there'd be an opportunity for people to ask questions. And that isn't really possible if you're trying to send multiple people to do just a flash session.

My suggestion would be looking more at things like roundtables. Those are the only two things that I wanted to mention.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. Let me turn back to Satish. Did you get an adequate answer, Satish, or did you want another one?

SATISH BABU: I think I'm good at this point.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hello. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Glenn. I have a handful of questions. The first one is the linking of the workshop proposals. Earlier in this call, Glenn, you mentioned that we need to coordinate the different workshop proposals so that they don't address the same topic and therefore don't walk on the same sidewalk, effectively. So they don't compete with each other. They're more like complementary to each other.

But then next to this, then Heidi said, “Well, no. We have to make sure that we link the workshop proposals together.” I don’t know what she means by this, if it means that we might then have the MAG looking at these workshop proposals and saying, “Well, these are all linked together.” Does that mean that we would be okay with the MAG putting all the workshops together? I’m not quite sure how that works.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah, if I may. Sorry, I didn’t mean “link.” I meant basically do you want to have something that is in a way broadly synchronized? Do you want all of the panels to look at end user issues or do you want them to be completely separate? Or do you want them to simply not replicate each other?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Heidi. That clarifies it. But then comes my next question which is, if we link them or we deal all of them with user issues or whatever we decide, I’ve also heard Glenn mention the three workshop limit that he has just told us per organization. To me, that’s something that – I’m hoping to hear from Mandy on how we can get around that. Are we going to submit each one of these as a RALO – so independently, or are we going to submit them as a RALO under ALAC? But then we do have four workshops and potentially we could only have three out of those four.

And then thirdly, are we going to have them all under ICANN? And I know that there are several other topics out there. Obviously I’d

imagine people in the NCSG and also I know the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance are submitting workshops, and ICANN is submitting workshops. That would go vastly over the limit of number of workshop per organization.

That was the second question, and whilst I'm speaking I'll add the third question, which is to do with the At-Large requests just to get a clarification. The At-Large request for travel is linked I gather to all of the workshops. Am I correct to assume that if any of those three workshops or four workshops is accepted, then the At-Large request will be accepted as well for going and having a booth, etc.? But if none of the workshop are accepted by the MAG then this request from the ALAC to have a booth then will be refused. That's all. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Lots of stuff. Who wants to respond?

MANDY CARVER: I agree with Olivier. ICANN itself – ICANN the organization – will be submitting two panel proposals. I'm sure that NCUC, there will be many. I would not label yourselves as ICANN the organization. You are a community. So no, you don't want to submit as ICANN. That's number one. You should be submitting as your organization, your entity.

Two, Olivier, I believe you're correct. My memory – and again, I am not on the Supplemental Budget Group as a voting member – but my recollection of the conversations for the ALAC position, if you will, or

the ALAC proposal, was that it was around coordinating activity at the IGF. It was not a panel or a presentation or an idea in and of itself. It was to provide support and coordination for the other activities within the constituency umbrella that would be taking place, and therefore the granting of it was made contingent on there actually being ICANN-related constituency activity in that space. And so yes, that proposal is tied to the RALOs. That's my recollection.

You referenced having a booth. That's a separate question. Yes, it's the case that last year NCUC put in for their own booth. ICANN didn't know about that. We just saw it in the IGF village when we arrived. Obviously if ALAC wants to have a separate space, that's something they can do and they can think about that. But all of the constituencies are more than welcome to be at the ICANN booth, to have materials at the ICANN booth, to organize meet-ups or standing sessions or anything else they want, at the ICANN booth.

So you should think about whether you want to take on a separate booth and what would be the purpose of having one that is separately labeled and not the ICANN booth. And then you have to look at having people to staff it, the cost of the space, signage, the materials, what you're going to do in that space, are you expecting to have looped video then you have to rent equipment. It's all of those kinds of things. But that's a separate question. If that's something you guys want to do, that's a separate set of decisions.

Again, my recollection – and we could go back to Robin and Benedetta – is that the coordinator outreach activity was predicated on coordinating

having other activity to coordinate. So that one I do believe is dependent upon other workshops being accepted.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Olivier and Satish, you guys both have your hands up still. I'm just wondering – we'll start with Olivier. Is there a response you want to do to Mandy?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Glenn. Thanks for all this information, Mandy. That's very helpful. Never mind the booth. Putting that aside, I guess maybe that's not the right location to do so but I would argue that outreach – having a small team of a couple of people – performing outreach at the IGF is probably not directly linked to the workshops. But let's hope we don't have to make that choice and at least one of the five workshops that the At-Large community are putting forward will be accepted.

My concern really is then, if we are to label the workshop proposals not under ICANN because, of course, that would then take from the ICANN quota, but I gather we would have to put it under ALAC or At-Large or I guess we have to make a choice here whether we want to even put them under Regional At-Large Organizations. So each RALO would have a quota of one and we'd have to argue our case that each one of our RALOs would be in a quota of one rather than being... because if we look at the four RALOs submitting proposals plus the At-Large proposal, that's five proposals on that At-Large. Two of these are bound to be

refused then automatically by IGF. So maybe we have to discuss this on this call. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Great. I believe Satish has his hand back up. Go ahead, Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Glenn. I was wondering if number one, whether we could distribute speakers in each other's workshop proposals. Number two, last year we had submitted two proposals [from] APRALO. One was an open source. The other was an APRALO proposal. Not explicitly ICANN but an APRALO Asia Pacific regional proposal from APRALO. Both of them got accepted.

So one way would be if the RALOs themselves submit proposals, then this quota thing will not hit us because technically each RALO as an organization can submit then up to three proposals, although I don't think we have the time for it. So one way out of this would be that if each RALO can submit one or maybe two proposals if they have the time and bandwidth, and if possible we can distribute our speakers provided the topic is not purely regional.

Last time our proposal, our topic, was "Asia Pacific and the Next Billion: Challenges and [inaudible]" – I forget the exact wording. Something on those lines where we could also have people from other regions speaking on that topic. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you so much. I see Tijani in the queue. Can I do a sound check first with you, Tijani, and then I just want to talk to you for just one short second. Go ahead, Tijani. Just say hello.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much, Glenn, and thank you all. I heard you and I think that Olivier is right. If we all propose workshops in the name of ICANN, [inaudible] our workshops will not be accepted. I think that we need to submit them in the name of the RALOs, and even perhaps – because everyone now knows that the RALO is part of ICANN – perhaps in the name of one of the ALSes so that we will not be penalized because we have several activities at the same time. And the proposal of a booth in the IGF Village, it is a wonderful proposal and we need to work on it because having a booth is not enough. We need people inside it and we need material inside it. So I propose that we submit a request for a booth in the IGF Village and we do a program for attendance and also for content. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thanks, folks. Any other questions on process or any of the guidelines to Mandy or Heidi? Is everything clear as mud for everybody?

Okay. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Glenn. Heidi touched on something else. Could we make use of an At-Large Structure within the region to submit the workshop on

behalf of the RALO? I have no idea whether that's possible and I have no idea whether that's even possible when it comes down to the external funding. In other words, at that point it words, a couple of travelers would be externally funded by ICANN. It's a muddy question mark. I don't know. I'm just wondering. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. This is exactly what I proposed, Olivier. I think that in the sake of not being penalized because we are similar components of ICANN submitting requests we may make the request of the RALO [in the name of] one of the ALSes. And I think it will pass better. It will give better image that we are not only the leadership doing everything. Our ALSes are also on board. I think it is a good idea. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Thank you. Satish, did you want to respond on that?

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I'm just looking at from the point of view of the probability of acceptance of the proposal. Technically, I don't see any reason why an ALS should not or cannot submit a proposal. From the chances of getting accepted, of course, will depend on the topics and the way it's

written and so on. But one of the factors would be the reach of the entity that's submitting the proposal.

Last time also when we submitted the proposal individually, we were... I am from an ALS and my individual entity is from the ALS, but the proposal did mention APRALO as the Asia Pacific organization and it had something to do with the topic as well, that Asia Pacific [nature].

I am just wondering if an ALS submitting a proposal will push down the probability of acceptance because it is a local organization. That's a doubt. Otherwise, I don't see any reason why we can't do it.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you. We have options and there is no right or wrong way. But definitely in our proposals the word "ICANN" is verboten. We don't want to jeopardize our chances. There's no guarantee. I have no clue on how many proposals are being submitted but my understanding is there is going to be a lot. I think what's critical in the proposal is that you're really making an effort to engage the – look at the type of workshop you're doing or discussion – that those people in the room are actually actively involved and you have an active process before and during to make sure those online people are engaged.

I don't think they want to see the talking heads that they've seen before. And I think the other thing that I didn't put in the criteria back to my slide show at the beginning was a youth factor. I just want to bring these things up, that in any proposal we folks are doing, the chances of us being rejected could happen on the fact that it's just a tired old, same

old, proposal. So I think recycling an old proposal is not a good idea as well.

Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

I agree with that point and I think diversity is a factor. So if you are going to submit a proposal from one particular RALO, unless you can establish diversity within the speakers it's going to be a bit of a problem. For example, if NARALO is going to have only speakers from North America you will not have the geographic diversity that IGF is looking for. That's why I had suggested if there's any chance of us putting each other as the speakers in each other's proposals, provided the topic permits it so that that adds to the diversity of the proposal. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you. Any final comments or questions on the process for Section #3? If not, I'd like to move on to Section #4. So just give anyone remote... Daniel, I know you're on Adigo. Did you want to jump in on anything before we move in?

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

I'm also on Connect and actually I am of the view that since we are not sure of which proposal will be selected, then at least a different proposal [inaudible] could be submitted and also even the speakers can be interchanged respectively. Thank you. Back to you, Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you. Let's move on to the individual proposals. I'll start off with the outreach proposal. As a consequence of our outreach and engagement efforts with our working group we had – Olivier and Satish, you can add – I think there was 22 people from our community one way or another at the IGF Mexico and we found that we didn't really have an opportunity to use the ICANN booth. There was a number of observations that we had, Mandy. I'm sure you've talked to Olivier and others about this.

We came with an idea, the Outreach and Engagement Group, we were looking at two things. Definitely we'd like to do a submission at the IGF but we also want to make sure that we have this outreach initiative such as the table. So our proposal is called "Shaping the Digital Future of Communities through Internet Governance." Again, pushing back their terminology we have a number of speakers that we've identified for the session. We have for balance geographically, we have Daniel and Sarah, myself and Judith, Olivier and [Ganella], Dev and Maritza. Again, some of these people are sponsored as well because, for example, in Judith's case it's through the State Department. I might get sponsored through IEEE, and others might be as well. Olivier has mentioned it as well.

We're looking at a 90-minute session. Our proposal is designed to be a very short five-minute overview presentation of our concept and then open it up to the floor immediately so that we can actually get as much participation as possible in our session with the audience as well as

online – again, very interactive proposal and three short presentations from the panel.

That's the first one. Any questions on the outreach and engagement initiative? We'll be fleshing out the topic accordingly in the next week or so.

Okay. So let me move to Tijani. Can you talk about your proposal?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Glenn. In fact, we didn't yet shape our proposal because everyone was very busy and now that the deadline is approaching, we are now working on it. But we don't have it yet crafted. We are thinking about local content as an opportunity for developing countries but nothing is yet done. I am contacting the possible speakers and I am trying to have people who are sure traveling so that we will not have problem when we will be there. But we didn't yet prepare the proposal.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you, Tijani. I know you missed the first part of the presentation but I'll send you the slides, plus Heidi added more content and Mandy. You just have to make sure your proposal, Tijani, that it fits the focus this year as well as the resource people as speakers that you've assigned that they actually sign up as resource people.

Just a quick question, Tijani. Did you submit this proposal or something similar last year or do you have any outstanding reports that you did for IGF before?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. A lot. AFRALO organized a lot of workshops in IGF several years. But last year our workshop wasn't agreed – it wasn't at the beginning and then they told us it was accepted not in the same form but they give us another format and we did it in the format they wanted, so I have the report on it also. Everything you want, I can provide you. And you can find everything on the IGF site.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Perfect. Thank you. Just in terms of the form, Tijani. It's just they want to provide a link. It's one of the checkmarks that I mentioned earlier on.

Great. Any questions for Tijani anyone?

Okay, if not I'll turn to Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Glenn. We are actually thinking of two proposals from APRALO. The first is Ali, our co-Chair of the RALO, is interested in a proposal about the digital economy, how the future digital economy is going to be shaped by the Internet but he is presenting some of the [inaudible] from the Middle East as an example for the world to emulate. The name of the proposal is, "Shaping the World's Digital

Economic Future: Learning from the Middle East.” That is the tentative title and they’re working on it. He has lined up a couple of economists from the Middle East.

My only concern with the proposal – actually I’m writing it down right now – was that we can’t have it restricted to the Middle East so we’re trying to enlarge the scope by seeing how it applies to the rest of the world. That’s one. And the other proposal is very close to what Glenn mentioned for the Outreach and Engagement Committee. In the original idea we have submitted a proposal that talks about Internet Governance as [the grassroots] where we are talking about how multiple agencies and all the registrars plus the RALOs and ICANN can come together because there are still very large areas in Asia Pacific at least which are not covered, underserved. So this is actually a model of working together as the grassroots wherein we pull in all these different agencies and coordinated action. That was submitted for the Asia Pacific Regional IGF and the same proposal we are widening in scope and trying to submit for the Global IGF as well.

These are the two proposals we are contemplating as very specific APRALO proposals.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Thank you so much, Satish. Any questions for Satish from anybody?

Okay. Final summary – Olivier, please – on EURALO’s proposal.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Glenn. The proposed topic for the EURALO workshop would be to do with the public interest. I am in this difficult position that the lead on this in At-Large is Wolf Ludwig, and so we did write the proposal for funding together yet unfortunately I haven't been able to get hold of Wolf in the past 48 hours, or rather I was supposed to have a call with him earlier today and we were supposed to put a bit more on paper but we haven't. What I will do though, because this is something that is an ICANN-wide issue I will enlist the help also of Ergys Ramaj who is a staff member in ICANN currently also following the track of the public interest, and so we would have something that's a little bit more meaty than what we have at the moment.

I've put together a little Google Doc to build the proposal but the topic effectively would be, as I said, the public interest as it applies to ICANN since it's an inherent part of ICANN's Bylaws and ICANN's Articles of Association. But then I guess when one looks at the multistakeholder system if you look at it in the wider sense of the term, with Internet governance in the world there is, again, a big question as to whether we act in the public interest and how that public interest is kept alive.

We've already had, if you recall, a few meetings ago a session on the public interest in the ICANN. I think there was one that took place in Marrakech if I recall correctly. We could take some of the themes that were developed there and transpose them over to an IGF thing and expand this discussion to not only ICANN but expand it to Internet governance in a multistakeholder environment. I haven't seen – and please correct me if I'm wrong – but I haven't seen any such discussions take place at IGF yet in previous years. That's it. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Tijani, is that a question that you have for Olivier? Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Olivier, in which overarching theme your public interest workshop will fit? Because you know if it doesn't in one of the overarching themes that they proposed, it will not be accepted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Tijani. I haven't got the themes in front of me. From memory, I could imagine it would go into something like the healthy Internet ecosystem or something to that extent. If I could have a look at the themes that we could perhaps even choose what theme it can fit in there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I have them. If you want I can read them if you want.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We have the time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I, Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much.

“Access and Diversity,” “Policy Enabling Access,” “Interconnection and Price Regulation,” “Multilingualism and Local Content,” “Enhancing Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities,” “Digital Literacy,” “Security, Openness, Cybersecurity, Surveillance, Privacy, Freedom of Expression Online,” “Internet and ICT for Sustainable Development Goals,” “Internet Economy,” “Human Rights Online,” “Use Engagement,” “Gender Issues,” “Multistakeholder Cooperation,” “[Inaudible] Internet Resources,” “Net Neutrality,” “Cloud Computing,” “Zero Rating,” and “Internet of Things.” [Inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry. Everybody’s talking at the same time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible] multistakeholder cooperation for Internet Resources is obviously the obvious one there [inaudible].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, folks. What we have is what Heidi has posted in the link is actually small compared to what Tijani has mentioned, so these themes are

important. Tijani, would you mind, where did you find those themes? They seem to be additional themes over Heidi's.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Those are on the website of the IGF.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, great. I think Heidi has posted it. I think that's a good point. So identify what the tags are where it fits in. I think Satish had a comment on that. Satish, did you have a comment on the tags?

SATISH BABU: Yes. And [since] the form itself does not ask for an overarching theme. Instead what the form asks for are three tags – three tags, not one. And these tags are exactly what Tijani read out.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay.

SATISH BABU: And I think that the overarching themes would be only decided later based on the kind of workshop proposals they get. That's what Heidi's text also states. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Excellent point, all of you. Thank you. I'm just conscious of the time and we gave some time for Mandy and if she's still on the phone we'll turn back, and I know she dealt with a lot of the same topics that probably in the latter part that maybe it's worth repeating again. But I just want to, before we move to Mandy and Item #5, I just want to ask anyone else, is there any other issues with any of the proposals that we're submitting from anyone online or remotely or in the Adigo?

Going once. Going twice. No? Okay.

Alright folks. Let's turn to Mandy, and Mandy, if you just want to reiterate your position on wise and prudent proposals or take any questions from the floor. Thank you. Back to you.

MANDY CARVER: I am available to take any questions that you may have. You have a rich resource of folks that have been through the application process before. I can't speak to what the MAG will do. I don't serve on the MAG. I think one of the issues is there's always a great many more requests than there is the capacity to accommodate them. I think that you've outlined some good strategies and you're right. They are going to look for what I have observed in the past is they want diversity of voices and new voices. There's a requirement of tags because they'd want to know how to sort out and balance various streams but you want to tie into the theme that you've identified.

I think the whole discussion about whether you want a separate booth and what you would be doing with it – Tijani's right. It isn't just that you

need to then apply for and pay for space and stuff. You need to have a program and a plan around it.

I will say again, we are happy to coordinate if you've got a program and a plan and people and things you want to do, we're happy to accommodate that within the ICANN booth as well. If you want a separate booth, I know NCUC did one. I don't know the rationale behind that decision. We didn't know about it. Obviously this is not our meeting. That's the other thing I always want to stress. The IGF is a U.N. meeting. It is about Internet Governance. It's not about ICANN. You can certainly do models and workshops and things that use examples from the ICANN environment and ICANN as an example of multistakeholderism. But remember, this is about Internet governance. The only tie that we have here is when the proposals that you're asking for travel support for, for instance, the Supplemental Budget Requests are for furthering the work of ICANN and the work of the constituencies.

The Supplemental Budget Requests, as you know, are everything from communications support or Summits or whatever else you're doing. This is a little subset which is that for some people, they have identified presenting at the IGF and therefore some support for getting some people to those panels, as part of what they're doing.

Your proposal can certainly talk about an example coming from ICANN. I think the issue is just, as a submitting individual or entity you're not ICANN submitting it to avoid the concern just as ISOC Global may be putting in panels that wouldn't prevent local chapters from also putting in proposals. And they're the ISOC local chapter but it might be... what

they're trying to prevent is someone gaming the system where you throw in hundreds of applications with the expectation that one or more would get in.

Anyway, I'm really here only to answer questions if you've got them. And if I don't know the answer I will endeavor to get information and feed that back to you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay, great. Thank you.

Okay, let's open it. We have a few more minutes of Mandy's time and then we have to talk about next steps.

First in the queue is Olivier. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Glenn. My experience with the MAG is as an observer on a few years – not this year but in previous years – I have found that some MAG members will mark all of the workshops and then they will start going through each one of them in this public room and start discussing them. If we haven't got someone that is in the room and is a MAG member and specifically supports some workshops, we're dead.

And I've seen so many workshops that sounded like they were really, really, interesting but because nobody spoke in favor of them when that workshop was talked about, that was moved further down the list and

the more it gets put further down the list then when the next round they start talking about it again, they have even less slots for a large number of workshops. So we have to think of a strategy about this as well. I know that we have Renata on the MAG but we might have other people that we might know that might not be directly At-Large but that we might wish to talk to and see if they're able to put a good word about the workshop when it comes up in the open forum discussions. Thanks.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. We're going to hold that point on a next step because that will be the next topic when we wrap up, but quickly guys, brief intersession, Satish then Tijani, please.

SATISH BABU: I would like to say that the MAG also proposes mergers of like-minded or rather workshops on a similar topic, and if there are [topics] kind of aligned within the proposals that we submit there is a likelihood of them asking us to merge them, which is okay for us, I think. Just mentioning [it].

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Glenn. I would like to agree 100% with what Olivier said.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, I lost you, Tijani.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tijani, we're not hearing you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I think we lost –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me?

YESIM NAZLAR: Tijani, could you please switch to the phone bridge? Yes, we can hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You hear me. Yes. You hear me now. Hello? Okay, very good.

I'd like to agree with what Olivier said about how the MAG is working. Last year my workshop was at first refused. And the reasons they gave was first there was not enough diversity. I had one from each continent,

I had one from each stakeholder, and I had as much men as women. So I don't know what kind of diversity they want more.

Second, they said no, the subject is not exactly Internet governance. It is other things. You know what was it? It was "Personal Data Protection." And they said it is not exactly Internet governance. So you understand that if you are not supported inside the MAG, you may not be approved as workshop. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Wow. That is quite insightful, Tijani. I'm hoping in our next steps we can get a bit of guidance, and I know that Olivier mentioned Renata's name and I think we need to move into the next steps and reach out to Renata or anyone else we know to get some guidance and encouragement and inside information as much as possible on our proposals. That's one thing we can do and I guess in terms of next steps or reaching out to Renata does anyone want to volunteer to do that? And I'll just ask anyone first of all for a volunteer.

I'm not getting any hands up. Okay.

Tijani, is that a confirmation you'll reach out to her I just want to get a yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, I will. Moment. You hear me now? You hear me?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, you don't.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, I hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, moment. Glenn, I said [at] the outreach or reaching out to those people is not the work of one person. Everyone should do that and we don't have to look to people who are in ICANN only. We have other people in our environment who are not ICANNers. So we have to push and everyone has to make the outreach so that we may have our workshops approved.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Okay. I think your point is taken and I think we have consensus from other people on the... so we're going to leave the next step on reach-out. Anyone who has a contact, anyone who knows anyone that [get] intelligence, we have until May 3rd. We have roughly a week or so to complete your proposals.

So the next step is get your proposals organized, and I think it doesn't hurt to share your proposals for feedback and a request for people to give critical comments back on your proposals. Our proposal with outreach and engagement is a Google Doc. I'll share that Google Doc

with everyone and I would suggest others to do the same. So we'll make sure that all of us know what your proposals look like, how they're looking, and give some feedback.

Any other next steps that anyone will like to suggest because we're wrapping up now?

Okay. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Just a quick question. Would you like staff to prepare a wiki page where people can submit their draft proposals for comment or would you like this to be done by e-mail? What's the best way? I'm just conscious –

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

E-mail I hate. If staff could set up a page and then we have some organic history that would be great. I would agree with that and I'm going to turn to Tijani. Tijani, is that a comment on Heidi, or is it another idea?

Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

It is both. First of all, all our submissions are on the Internet Governance website. We can [put] them on a wiki. There is no problem, but it is even not necessary because they are directly on the website of the Internet Governance Forum.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tijani, if I may [say] but I meant just before the 3rd, before you submit, just for comment purposes would you like us to just have a wiki page we can set up over the next few days? We'll set it up today so we can go ahead and have you submit your drafts for comments by the other organizers and the members of the Subcommittee on Outreach and Engagement. That's what I meant.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Second remark I have – we have to coordinate presence in Geneva. It is very important. If we want ICANN to be visible and to be credible we need to coordinate our work and we will need to have our work coordinated, even our presence, our attendance, we have to be spread. We don't have to be concentrated. This is something very important. I tried to make the same before when we started participate in the IGF and one or two IGFs it worked well. So I think that this is the main coordination we need. We need more coordination there then coordination to prepare our workshops. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Tijani.

And with that, I have to cut off the queue and any other discussion. Please post your abstract to the page that's going to be set up by Heidi so each of us can view some comments and hopefully we'll get some critical feedback from the community.

Workshop Request for IGF2017-27Apr17

Thanks, Heidi. Thanks, Mandy. Thanks, everyone, for joining us today, and hopefully Tijani, make sure you get the slides that I produced as well for this call.

Again, thanks all for joining the call today and we'll see you online. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks very much, Glenn. Thanks all.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]