

---

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Cross Community Committee on Accessibility Call on Tuesday, the 27<sup>th</sup> of February at 21:30 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Dina Solveig Jalkanen, Gunela Astbrink, Judith Hellerstein, Sarah Kidden, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich; and myself, Gisella Gruber, if I haven't left anyone off the roll call. And if I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. The agenda has been un-synched. Thank you very much and over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much and welcome to this call. This call was requested by a number of members of the accessibility group on the mailing list. The primary subject of the call will be a review of whether this group should continue, and if so, in what format.

I will be pretty clear. This meeting is not a review of what has happened in the past and is not an opportunity to either lay blame or credit, for that matter, for things. But, I would like to make sure that we are looking forward and I will take action if necessary to interrupt people if they start going into history and especially anything that is perceived as inappropriate history. I don't think it will be necessary, but we will even mute lines if that comes to be the case.

This group has a pretty long history. A couple of the people on this call have been around it for most of its life and the group has been existed

---

*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.*

---

in a number of different forms with a number of different tasks and attitudes what it is doing and it has evolved over time.

Like all At-Large groups, it is a relatively informal group. I do not recall taking votes in this group, nor do I recall taking votes in pretty much any other group that we hold on a regular basis. We have managed to succeed without a lot of process and bureaucracy and I would like to see that continuing, but we will see.

I don't have a lot more to say in terms of background. If any of the long-term members of this group would like to make a very short introductory statement, then that would be fine and then we'll open up the floor to anyone. Is there anyone who would like to do that? We have Judith and Cheryl in that order. Please go ahead. And we are setting a five-minute timer I believe for introductory statements or initial interventions. Thank you. Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I'm a long-time member of this group. The group used to be fairly active earlier on. When we were working – Glenn and I and Gunela worked very hard on a survey that we sent out to staff, but then we didn't ... After we got the feedback and they were very ... I know from other talks with other people in staff, they were very interested in that. They had never thought of those issues. We lost out when we didn't do the follow-up from that.

Also, a lot of issues, some of the technology issues, left this committee and got moved on a faster track with the Technology Taskforce. We can

---

always do that and reserve this looking at cultural issues and other advocacy issues that are not necessarily dealing with technology.

So, I'm looking forward to getting this group back on the right track and getting a much broader scope of this and getting more awareness and the ability to change the culture to make it a culture of accessibility throughout ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Judith. If I may, just a couple of points. The reference to Technology Taskforce is quite appropriate. There is a potentially significant overlap between the two if you look at the wider scope of this group and Technology Taskforce. Given that the TTF has been doing, by most people's judgment, a pretty good job, there was certainly on my part a very conscious effort that, other than technology directly involved with ICANN meetings and face-to-face meetings, that we really felt that was in good hands and didn't need to cover that kind of thing in this group. I would hope, again, that if the Technology Taskforce and this group stays in existence that we make sure that we don't overlap in their responsibilities because there potentially is a strong overlap. That was noted by staff also, but it's something was not accidental. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. In fact, one of the points that I wanted to make was that I thought we should wait for Dina to join the audio bridge. Now that she has and with Gunela also putting her hand up, I think it's only appropriate that they speak before I do.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I did ask for people with long-term perspectives to talk about where we had been without looking at recent history, but I will bow to your graciousness and we'll go on to Gunela and then Dina. And if we could reset the timer, please.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you. I just want to say that this committee has great potential to work on accessibility, not necessarily with technology because, as noted by Alan and Judith, the Technology Taskforce does a great job in analyzing various technologies and considering accessibility on top of that. Judith is a type of bridge, as is Glenn, between these two committees.

But, if we look at the original objectives and proposed actions, there were a number of issues that are not specifically technology related and the stock take that was done I think also shows that there are a number of different activities that staff may be interested in to follow-up with the guidance of this committee.

So, because of those particular considerations, I would be keen to see this committee continuing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Dina?

---

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Okay. Hi, everyone. You've seen some of my messages on the mailing list and my main objective is to see whether we can involve more active work within this committee. If you [inaudible] situated as a [inaudible] of accessibility effort. As pointed out before me, we have technological efforts, universal acceptance [inaudible] which I have been a part of has done [inaudible] outreach work. Then we have fellowship, indigenous ambassadors. The list goes on. It's a process. And I see, as Alan pointed out, a lot of work which is being carried out successfully and ICANN funds being used wisely. [inaudible].

And since this work has been such a success, it deserves to [inaudible] coordinated. This is a perfect group for collaboration. As Alan pointed out, we shall see if there's more engagement and I think a constructive way to go forward, because we agreed not to look at the past, and this call is [inaudible] Alan and Cheryl, how many active participants does the committee have at the moment? How many people engage actively? In your opinion, if we were to start more regular meetings and to see if there's a possibility for initiative to [inaudible] committee members to shine, do you see that as probable and do you see support within the committee for that, since you have met in person? Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Cheryl, if I may do a bit of an intervention to address a couple of the issues that have been raised. Dina asked how many active members there are. I think the question is not necessarily relevant at this point in that there has been a conscious ... It has been contested to what extent this was a consensus decision, but it certainly was a conscious decision, that this group would not be holding teleconferences on a regular basis but would meet periodically at ICANN meetings with ICANN staff to update each other on where we are on certain aspects of ensuring ICANN is accessible and continuing to help to change the culture in ICANN of thinking about accessibility.

I've talked to a number of senior staff about this and the message that came through is, before we started, this was not an issue in ICANN. No one thought about it. I can give you a couple of vignettes that I personally have been involved with just to indicate how much that was true. Although I will not say ICANN is the most open organization to people with accessibility issues these days, it's far better than it was a few years ago.

So, looking at the activity or the number of members, when the context of it is a face-to-face meeting with when we can arrange it – and generally we could dial-in access – is not really an applicable question.

Looking forward, however, I think one of the decisions we have to make – and that will be partly today and perhaps partly in the face-to-face meeting and going forward – is are there two components of accessibility that we want to look at? One in terms of the face-to-face

---

type of activity we had, and another one that may be teleconference based and project based. Those may well be two different groups or two different prongs of the same group and I think we have to look at it from that perspective.

One more thing. Dina suggested this could be a coordination group of a whole bunch of other things that she listed. I think that is, I'm afraid, not something that is likely to happen because the activities that Dina listed range from completely staff-led activities where we have virtually no input to working groups or other activities that are completely independent of us, and in some cases, independent of At-Large.

So, I don't think we have the mandate to be a coordination group. We can certainly monitor and comment, but we can't coordinate.

I'll open the floor now to Dina, Gunela. Cheryl, would you like to get back in at one point, perhaps after Dina and Gunela? In any case, Dina, please go ahead.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Go ahead. I will give up my turn to speak and then I can respond.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Go ahead, Gunela.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thanks, Alan. I'm just not clear on the function then of the cross-community committee. When it was first set up, got the impression that

---

it was the advantage of bringing in representatives from various parts of the ICANN community to make it a strong group to go forward and advise staff. It doesn't seem to have gone that way and that's where I'm a bit confused that there seems to be a wish to do it, but I'm not clear on the terms of a cross-community committee compared to what I first thought it was.

So, maybe, if we could get clarification on that, it might help us to go forward and see if this is the best structure for working on accessibility in ICANN or if there's another structure that we could consider instead. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Let me try to address that, and Cheryl may have better perspective given that she has the history. Let me try. I'll go on a side trip for a second. There's a group in ICANN called the cross-community working group on Internet governance and it monitors activities and general Internet governance from IGFs to ITU events and things like that.

The GNSO, now that we have specific rules for how a CCWG must operate, there was an objection in the GNSO that this group was called a CCWG and it is in the process of reforming to be a cross-community something group. Someone remind me. An E group.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Engagement.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Engagement, thank you. Which is not a group that must have an interim report, a final report, and collapse afterwards. ICANN has become very formal in these kinds of things. The cross-community committee that this group, the name it has taken on, it started off as an At-Large activity and it is still managed by At-Large. But, we really wanted to try to attract people into it and take the flavor of At-Large out of the name if nothing else. We did that. We do have people who are active. Greg Shatan is one of the examples of people who have an interest in this area and therefore have participated.

It has not had very wide participation from other parts of the community. There are some GAC members. There are people from other groups that have participated.

If we were to try to formalize it like a CCWG or like the CCEG Internet governance and get other parts of the organization to formally charter it, I think it would collapse. I think there's so much going on at ICANN, and sadly accessibility is probably not on everyone's high priority list, that we probably would not exist if we try to formalize it more than that.

So, to answer Gunela's question, it is not a formal entity within ICANN's defined types, but it is something that we are trying to make work to get wider input on, even though it is still something managed out of At-Large. I'm not sure how well that addresses the issue. Judith, please go ahead.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Hi. Yes. The Technology Taskforce went a different way. We already had observers and active volunteers from other constituencies on it, but we chose not to go the route of being cross-community because we still wanted the flexibility of having being able to manage it ourselves. So, we decided that we would not be a cross-community engagement or a community group. We decided that we would still ... We always had people from GAC and we always had people from other constituencies as participants in our group even though it was an At-Large group.

We decided that we would just work to make it more open to them and get more people to be part of it as observers and then we wouldn't need a charter.

The issue is when you have a charter like we have with the cross-community working group, we had issues and now we're revising it and we're revising each of the charters. So, there's three groups. I was on the drafting team. It came up with the word engagement group because they wanted to be engaged and they still wanted a formal charter and that was what they came. But, I don't necessarily see that we need to be a cross-community to be able to be engaged.

Within the Technology Taskforce, we've accomplished everything that we've done. Actually, the IT department at ICANN looks to us often to help them test out things. So, there's many ways that we can still be a format and be a group – an active group – without being cross community.

What I also wanted to address is that, like Gunela and myself, we were never made any decisions, we were never part of any announcement

---

that said that this group will only meet face-to-face. It just happened and was brought upon us. And I think that was a bad choice. It may—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Judith, I'm going to interrupt. I would like to turn the floor over to Cheryl first because she hasn't spoken and before we go back to other people who have spoken. But, going forward, we're halfway through this meeting already and I would like to start having people say what they want – not the form the group is going to take or not the name the group is going to take. What kind of activities and actions do you want to see if you think this group is satisfying what you believe a group on accessibility should be?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

What I would like to see is I would like to do more work like we were doing on the—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Judith, we'll come back to you. Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I really am intending to take a very deliberate light touch to this, in inverted commas, "meeting" so I'd like you to go to Gunela next and I'm happy for Judith to have another intervention.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. If we can set a three-minute timer for second interventions, please. We'll go ahead with Judith and Gunela. But, I would like to focus on what do you want to see coming out, not in the form of a group or who is chair or how many meetings we have. What do you functionally want to see this group doing? We can worry about the mechanics a little bit later. There is only a very small number of people on this group, small by any of the measures, certainly including those who have been active in the face-to-face meetings and those who have been active long term. We're not in a position to make decisions. We are taking notes from this meeting and we'll distribute them to the wider group. But, I would like to know where do we want to see? How will you judge success a year from now? Thank you. Judith, Gunela, and then Dina in that order.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

What I would like to see is I would like to see us do more work on cultural changes to ICANN and that includes more work with the departments basing on the original survey. Maybe we need to do a new survey with new questions and [where we] want to change the culture of ICANN so that when ICANN produces videos or when they think about objects or technology that comes out or any other thing that comes out, they take accessibility in mind. That has to be changed. We need that changes. So, maybe we need a new survey. And why I think we need more frequent meetings is we need more follow-ups. After we write the survey, after it's distributed, and then follow it up with the people. That cannot be done on one face-to-face each time. That needs to be a longer, dramatic process. That is what I see the role of this committee to be.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Judith. I hear a survey as one of the first activities. I will caution you saying that you want to see something essentially in the DNA of ICANN. We have used that expression for a number of years now regarding transparency. That's something that's actually in our bylaws and it's very, very hard. You do not change organizations by lecturing at them. You have to almost convince them. You have to be somewhat realistic in your targets. Gunela, please.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

I am going to go back to the Accessibility Taskforce and the objectives and actions I drafted back then. There were three main objectives: building a culture of accessibility. Judith has talked about that. Increasing web accessibility and ICANN staff have certainly done a great job with remediation and work on accessibility, but there are other aspects to that within the ICANN community. The third one is ensuring minimal barriers to participation and engagement with ICANN processes and practices.

They are the three objectives and underneath that are a number of suggested actions. This thing about we're talking about the accessibility and the DNA, it's a very high ideal. I agree with you, Alan. But, there are particular actions that can be taken. Disability awareness, for example. Doing some training for particular staff and participants in ICANN would be very beneficial. Encouraging equal opportunity, encouraging employment of staff with disability.

---

I'm not going to go through the whole list because it's a lot of them. Both [inaudible] reported and there's a lot of actions that could possibly be considered for a committee such as this to undertake. To do so would require participants in ICANN to help with that going forward. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Dina?

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: I wrote a couple of things down and I do support the request for the survey, indeed input from the members or group objectives is important. What I would like to see for this year are clear objectives, clear evaluations. A couple of times a year or by the end of the year, I would like to see more frequent meetings. In addition to that, the face-to-face meeting. A possibility for preparation for those meetings. So, [in the spirit] of engagement and outreach, a clear [indication], a description of what we will do.

Moving on, I would like to see publication of the committee work, an invitation to committee members to publish their stories of success on their working group space and update it, minimal barriers to participation into committees. So, active engagement with new members. And reaching out to the communities, telling them, "Hey, this community exists and it's actually quite cool and you can contribute." I would really like to see that.

---

And I think for active work of the committee, however it will shape itself. I'd like [inaudible] structured, [letting] committee members work on different things which they are passionate about accessibility-wise. If they want to present something during the meeting, coordinate somehow so that regular meetings and calls for the meetings would be made easy. Brining up points they want to discuss be made easy and all the committee can weigh on them. A democratic structure, if you may. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Do we have anyone else in the queue? I have hands, but they're old ones. Cheryl, the floor years. Joly put up his hand. Joly, please go ahead.

JOLY MCFIE:

I was just going to say one issue that's come up is Adobe Connect is not accessible and we have blind people who have joined our recent calls who come on and talk about this and [inaudible] quite active. If you had Zoom calls rather than Adobe Connect calls, you might have a follow more [actives].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We're not in the position to change the tools that ICANN is using without ICANN support. That's something we've been discussing much, but it's just not within our full ability.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Go back to Dina, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dina, please go ahead.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: To quickly respond. At-Large Technology Taskforce would be a perfect group to discuss that to the cross-community committee. We are very happy to direct you there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dina. Joly, did you want a rebuttal?

JOLY MCFIE: Judith well knows. She's been on all these calls and heard all this stuff as well and she knows the ropes here better.

ALAN GREENBERG: I agree completely.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. We at the Technology Taskforce have been looking at it. I think [Justine] and you are going to do a separate demonstration and I would love to talk to you offline about this. [Justine] has a conferencing solution project. I'm sure she's always looking for help, so if Dina you want to join her as well, that also would be helpful. [Justine] is based in Singapore. That's one of our plans is looking at maybe having a product



---

that can be used when we're not using Adobe Connect for major conferences. I don't know. Adobe—

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps we should focus on what this group should be doing, not the Technology Taskforce.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know it's a fun subject, but we can't do everything. Dina, please go ahead.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: This is a fun subject, indeed. I will not continue on it. I think the question – if you said you are taking notes, there's been a revival of interesting active work in this committee. People who are willing to dedicate their time to meeting more often, getting more things done, and is someone who is chairing this and ALAC chair, what needs to happen for us to have that and to be able to actively participate?

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand the question. I now am starting to get some idea of what we want to functionally do because the form has to follow the function, not the other way around. Cheryl, your hand is up and I will give the floor to you.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Just somewhat in reverse order, the Technology Taskforce is of course the exact appropriate receptacle for a fulsome discussion on things like the shortcoming of the Adobe Connect and the advantages of something like Zoom or other conferencing mechanisms, modalities. That's something I absolutely support.

What a committee such as ours may be able to do, if indeed it even bothers to continue and that's a question that has yet to be posed and needs to be answered, is to assist with some influence and ensuring to the best of our ability that that type of change is at least considered on the agendas of the staff and project management people within ICANN who are in fact the only ones who can make those changes, allocate resources, do the appropriate reviews and beta testing undoubtedly with the Technology Taskforce and wrought any changes.

All this group can do is be a possible influencer and to, in particular, act as an awareness raising agent based on the specific and unique experiences and skill sets of not only in its "membership" but those who come to meetings or approach known members with issues.

I want to go back to something that Gunela articulated and I think it answers many of the pleas for clarity that we've heard from Dina, and that goes back to those three primary principles which go all the way back to when we were in fact a taskforce under the At-Large banner, specifically an At-Large taskforce and then later a working group.

That is that cultural change, the web, and the minimal barriers. I would [inaudible] that of course the web work, which has of course been

---

specifically assisted by a number of members of our committee – Gunela notably amongst those – is one of the success stories and of course has resulted in a change in culture and expectation of ICANN staff and decision-makers in thinking about accessibility more frequently and more reasonably and asking for actual experiential input when they are making their decisions.

That is, in fact, one of the things along with the minimal barriers which takes us into other communication modalities and mechanisms that ICANN uses for its work to be done that we've seen significant improvement with our face-to-face meetings where we have not only, when one does look at the attendees of those meetings, where we have not only just one or two lead representative staff turning up to our meetings to hear what opinions are, but also to report what they're doing and what they're thinking about their projects and their budgets and how we, as a group who can articulate issues, may be able to help them in their decision-making project.

The last meeting we held was one that – I'm sorry. I can do a lot at this point already by engaging more actively. Thank you. Dina, is that directly to me, that I need to engage or the group needs to engage more? Okay, fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, please. To be clear, I asked the long-term members to go back and review how we got where we are. Judith who is the other long-term member other than myself did that. I had asked Cheryl to do that. She

---

graciously gave up her talking turn until everyone else did not put their hand up. This is her opportunity to do that. So, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Apparently the opportunities are not necessarily fair and reasonable for everyone and enthusiasm and zeal wins out over experience and effectiveness. However ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Not necessarily in my book.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I'll go back to a couple of points that perhaps won't be seen as unrequired for clarity's point. Regardless, the culture has changed and we can demonstrate that in a number of ways. I think that's something for those of you who have worked very hard on it in the past should be very proud of.

I wanted to take a moment to go back to the survey point and I would like to remind people that, in fact, Diane who was the promotor of the survey to ICANN staff in fact had been expecting I think no less than three of our group were named at one of the meetings. Gunela, I believe you probably weren't present or didn't have good connectivity at that meeting, but it was a point where your name was included in that list, but the other two on the list certainly were at that meeting – that they would specifically do some revision work, so that a survey [mark two] could go out and we could measure what we considered was a relatively poor baseline of awareness with what may be considered as

---

a change and I think that's worthy work that could be done, although I would note that Diane will be leaving us and we would need to find another champion within ICANN, so it may in fact, Alan, be a situation where that's not going to be timely, [inaudible] for it to do. If anyone is interested to know who those people are, I suggest they ask staff to look to the action items and records if they can, to Google it and find it themselves.

So, the survey and the stock take was done. We all know the results of that, but there was work planned and that has been incomplete. I will make clear I am not on that list of people who didn't do that work.

The aspect of it being a coordination group I still think is an interesting concept. I don't think it would be successful in terms of coordination. However, because one of its key benefits is its ability to take ad hoc input – in other words, from quite literally someone who is at a meeting or trying to engage in a PDP process and is having a problem or challenge, and that they have an ability to reach out and have that issue raised directly via us or with staff. It's a possibility, but it's something that we've actually only done within the face-to-face context where we've always invited people to raise issues.

The other thing I wanted to mention, of course, is that – and this was mentioned probably before the recent discourse in February to the list, the last bit of list traffic which was some time ago – was that our work has a nexus with the work of the diversity group. And of course with the diversity group, if one assumes that we will be getting some advisory groups and implementation teams together, it would be extremely wise if some of the expertise that is existing within our current membership

---

were to be actively engaged in that. Of course, it doesn't mean that the committee itself should continue needs to do the [inaudible] in fact the individuals who are passionate and have a specific skill set or experience that could be working in that. But, certainly, there will be work done on accessibility with us, without us, or despite us. I take that as a good thing because that is a product of many of our work.

I wanted to also just make one little point and that was about the survey. It was in fact designed, Judith, to be a new survey. Diane specifically asked for a few members of our committee. This was, I believe – correct me if I'm wrong, staff – three meetings ago, three face-to-face meetings ago to modify questions so that a new survey could be done. That's exactly the purpose it was to the end user, just so we're clear on that.

Finally, I do gather I'm allowed to also have a view on what the future of our committee should be, despite the fact that I put – although it's apparently questionable and reasonable amount of time and energy into this type of work over my years in ICANN. I'm afraid that with, not counting Alan and I, only four people out of 67 showing up, I believe that this is in fact a committee that is crying out to be disbanded and I would move that that is what we discuss further and find a way forward to seek the views of the listed membership and interested parties. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I would like to do a bit of a summary, but first I'd like to ask Dina what do you mean by we have 33 members, 67 on the mailing list?

---

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Exactly what I say. When I look at the working group space, [inaudible] space, it lists 33 members [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: You're comparing the list that is on the Wiki with the mailing list membership.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Those are the numbers mentioned, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But, the 33 is the list on the Wiki, the people who are listed in that [block] called members.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Yes. I do recognize that you have decided to have only two meetings and they were face-to-face meetings open to everyone [inaudible] who can make decisions [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Dina, I was only asking you where the number 33 came from. It's from that box. I will make a statement that if you looked at the mailing lists of all of our working group and all of those similar boxes on the other pages, you will find similar discontinuities between them. We have had a significant problem keeping these up-to-date and are in the process of

---

revamping the process so that those two are not out of synch, or at the very least we have one or the other but not both. I apologize on behalf of the ALAC leadership and staff that those two numbers don't match. But, there's a historic reason for that and it has very little to do with who might be interested and who might not be. That is a red herring.

What I'm hearing from the various people is we are really looking at two different types of activities, which may have a nexus point and an overlap in them. One is a more traditional, active working group, taskforce, whatever that takes particular targets in mind and says, "Can we, through developing something or through building a program or getting more people involved, try to effect something?"

The other thing I'm hearing is the face-to-face meetings we have have a very different purpose and they are partly to raise issues and alert people to what is going on, partly to build relationships, so that for instance when something comes to my attention, I have someone to go to who I know will not look at me with scorn when I talk about disabilities. That is sadly what happens some of the time.

I'm hearing the need for two different things, and although they may be linked, it's not clear they are the same group. I'll go back to queue right now. Cheryl, is that a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Put me on the end.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll put you on the end. Dina, please go ahead.



---

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Yes. I acknowledge the points you bring forward, to raise issues, to build relationships. I have a similar feeling [than] proposing more transparency and possibility for the committee members to be more active, [inaudible] looked with scorn at.

Indeed, even if we were to have regular meetings only twice or three times per year in the future, I see that it would still have to fit into the transparency requirement. There should be clear reports of the committee actions, should be invitations for people, should be engagement.

I'm thinking, just to refer to what Cheryl said earlier about membership, in the future if I can make a request, I would say that each member, each volunteer, is extremely important. They're not inverted comma members. We [inaudible] engagement. We are [inaudible] and open, friendly, and we see what competences that person has. What do they bring to the table? How we can engage them. Especially in between meeting, there's space for that, and I think this group should have someone be that open engagement and warm attitude about the community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm thinking I would like to see this [committee] active. Maybe what we want to do—

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, you would like to see this? I didn't make out what you said.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I would like to see this active. Maybe what we could do, what you suggested, is maybe have different working groups working on different issues that meet on a regular basis and we could have someone be chair of those working groups and work on those, and then we all come together.

But, I think what Dina is also saying is that she would like to have some kind of elections or vice chairs. I know in some of the At-Large groups we had different vice chairs for different meetings and they would take turns in chairing calls. We've done that in TTF of being co-chairs. Maybe we could just get ... it's a way to get young and new people involved. Maybe we could look at having someone be a co-chair, if [Cheryl] wants to keep being chair, someone new, someone young, or someone like that. I think we need to keep something vibrant.

But, I am for keeping accessibility alive, if not in a larger group then going back to a taskforce and doing it that way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have some comments, but I'll reserve them until the end. Gunela, please.

---

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

There are many different models obviously, Alan, that we need to consider, and Cheryl of course. I'm thinking if we look at the broader picture that with any [inaudible] group, they start off together, clustered together, when you are trying to get things moving. Then you spread out into the broader community. You can look at that in a physical sense or an online sense or in a particular community.

So, I'm thinking here, the accessibility work is not quite mature yet. There's still a way to go. There have been a number of milestones that Cheryl's mentioned, I've mentioned, Judith's mentioned. We all have something there that we can talk about as successes.

But, to move forward, we need that solid core where we can build on each other's expertise and then we can go out to those other groups, obviously Technology Taskforce but also Cheryl mentioned the diversity work and where it could be new subgroups, working groups, whatever, happening.

So, to have that core of the accessibility committee, be it going back to an Accessibility Taskforce under At-Large or be it continuing in a slightly different structure maybe – maybe – as a cross-community committee on accessibility, whichever structure, I believe that it has a good function.

If we go back to some of those particular actions that we would like to do, we've talked about the survey, there are a number of other proposed actions which I would be keen to see happen.

---

Then, we have particular concrete activities to work on. I think that might attract more people to the committee to go forward. That's a starting point. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Gunela. I think the last thing you just said hit on one of the items I was going to raise. It is fine to talk about active groups with lots of members who are willing to do things and rotating chairs.

One of the reasons the Technology Taskforce is successful is it's looking at toys, to be quite blunt. It is looking at technology and we are an organization, to a large extent, of techies.

We do not have the same level of involvement in many of our other groups that focus on very important areas for ICANN. People actually willing to do the work on a regular basis is a continual issue within ICANN, not just within At-Large. It is a very major issue in many parts of the organization. People get involved in the one area that they are passionate about, but there are not people to do sufficient work in general.

I would like to hear from the people on this group and we'll put out a call on the wider list, for examples of specific things that you believe this group should be doing actively. The survey is one. We don't need to hear that one again. I would like to hear what some of the other ones are, so that we can try to put a body around this that might be able to do those things. So, that is the request I'm putting out right now.

---

We are in the process with all At-Large groups and we will do it with this one sooner rather than later. That is we will refresh the membership. We will find out from all 67 people plus anyone on the Wiki page who is not on the mailing list. Do they wish to be active and continue to work in an accessibility group of some sort? We need to assess who the people are who were there, put on the list five years ago, and have not bothered to get off and who is really interested.

So, with those two, we will also distribute the summary of what happened in this meeting to the wider list to give people an idea. At the ICANN meeting, I will do my best to meet with some of the senior people who have been involved in accessibility and find out what they would like to see because what we do is no small part related to what they are going to be receptive to. And all of the people are now sensitive to the issue, but what are their priorities? We will go forward from there. Cheryl, please, I'll turn it back to you now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. I suppose it's also incumbent upon me to remind everybody that ICANN is currently looking at limited financial restraints and having left money being made available in its budgets and we're also about to go into a new phase for development of another five-year strategic plan, and where that plan puts its priorities isn't unknown at this time.

As Gunela will remember from her lengthy, vast experience in this field, one of the things that is often the earliest and easiest, along with education and outreach to cut out of any set of expenditure plans are

---

things that are seen as edge or in inverted commas “minority” issues. I can assure you that accessibility is a great risk of being seen as exactly one of those.

So, to that end, I think that it is because of that pressure and also because of course our ability to change the culture, we may change the culture, but the ability to have the decision-makers be able to let alone be willing to not just talk the talk, but walk the walk, on these things may be limited over the next few years.

I don't fear too much about losing ground, however, because I think the work and the interaction between middle and senior management and a number of project managers within ICANN and an array of our interested parties and members has happened over the last few years, and to that end, those people who hold those positions and ability to actually make change as opposed to [inaudible] about wanting it will, in the future at least – in the near future – if someone wants to know a little bit of advice about web accessibility, they know that they can reach out to Gunela, for example. If they are concerned about aspects of e-book publications, etc., then Glenn's name would come towards the top of the list along with others within the community.

So, I think what we've done incidentally, regardless of the future of this group, is form a [inaudible], a group of expertise that is recognizable and I think that's a very good thing, indeed. So, I'm heartened at that.

I'm disheartened, however, that we haven't met the primary business of today's call. We had a specific call and it was supported by the same people, in fact – or most of the same people – who are on today's call,

---

three out of the four of you anyway, to consider disbandment for the group to be inactive and that is a primary question that needs to be answered.

I would take it that there is no objection to, therefore, our ICANN 61 agenda being as it was previously advertised when this call for disbandment and consideration of the future first came out earlier in on in February. That was change from, interestingly enough, the survey review and other work to discuss at ICANN 61, which will have remote participation, etc., as we always do. The future of this committee and I think your plan as outlined to ensure that's an effectively communicated exercise is a way that I would support.

If, however, you asked me right now what I would be voting for, I would be voting for disbandment and encouragement of those with expertise to put it into appropriately structured entity and opportunities, including ones that are yet to be seen but are predicted, such as the implementation groups of taskforces, etc. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Dina, you wanted to get a last word in before I summarize?

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: Alright, just quickly. [inaudible] specified the work of the committee, I do see [inaudible] of it, even the [inaudible] meetings so that just the bare minimum. So, I think the question, if you said consensus is important issues, include the question into the survey to the members.

---

Pose the question if they still would like the group to continue. And exactly what Cheryl did point out. Should this evolve into something else?

I have two quick questions for Cheryl and Alan. The first is would it be possible to have a chair elected each year by the group? The second one [inaudible] some proposals I could already have for the committee work, is it possible for us to just simply get on with it? For instance, [inaudible] the fellowship program and inform them of existence of the committee, publish something in the online space? That's it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. In terms of electing the chair each year, in general in our groups we do not do that. To be honest, we would not have many chairs of we had to elect a chair each year, especially if [inaudible] has been suggested, we have term limits. You might want to be careful what you ask for because you may get it and it may not be exactly what you want.

At this point, I cannot stop anyone. There is a mailing list. I'm not taking down the mailing list today. It's not within my jurisdiction to do that. If you want to suggest going on and doing something, a particular project, then I can't stop you and I don't want to stop you.

In terms of what we're doing as a formal group, I have no choice but to, number one – other than just disband and take a vote immediately of which most people will not participate, and I would prefer not to do that at this point. I would like to, number one, find out how many people are interested in participating and I would like to get a list of activities and tasks from the people in this group who are vocal as to



---

what would you want to see us doing? Then I think we will bring it to the ALAC to make a decision.

I am the chair of the ALAC. I do not make decisions on behalf of the ALAC. I do not have that jurisdiction. It's not in my job description.

I have noted Cheryl's recommendation that we simply disband. It will be discussed apparently at the ICANN meeting. I'm not sure I will actually be at that meeting because I have a conflict, but that remains to be seen.

I would like very soon from anyone in this group who believes there are tasks and projects that you would like to see initiated. Let's hear what they are, so when we're presenting to the rest of the group do you want to continue to exist, give them some idea of what we're talking about.

We are way over time right now and I have another commitment I have to get to. Go ahead, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

The question is can we switch the accessibility time so it doesn't conflict with the auction proceeds?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I do not believe we can. Gisella, do you believe there's any chance we could do that? I thought there wasn't.

---

GISELLA GRUBER:

I tried looking into the schedule and how we can change things around, and at this stage, I don't see any other slots available. I know that the working groups, that does always cause conflicts and I'm very sorry about that, but if you look at the overall ICANN schedule, it is extremely challenging.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We will look at it again, but I don't put much hope in, to be honest. Remember, decisions will not be taken at a single meeting with limited participation. We never do that. Years and years ago at ICANN, we did do that. We have suffered pains from it. It is not done anymore. So, unless we can guarantee that we have a vast majority of all people present, then we do not take decisions locally in one group. We don't do that in the ALAC and we don't do that in working groups anymore.

Dina, I cannot define limited participation, because at this point I have no idea how many among the 67 plus 33 are there because no one has chosen to remove their names. I know there are people on that list who basically do not exist in ICANN anymore. Either their e-mail addresses go into a waste paper basket or they just don't care or classify it as spam. I can't tell you exactly what that number is. We will try to figure out what the number of people who are interested in this to make a decision.

I would like to present to you a situation where we are completely organized and everything is under control. We're not there, sadly.

---

Dina, is that a new hand? We are over ten minutes past our time and some of us have other commitments. If that's a new hand, I'll let you speak, but very quickly please.

DINA SOLVEIG JALKANEN: One of the most important issues in this group has indeed been consensus and not been able to make the decisions, so just to make sure I got what you said right, we reach out to the members and we see who is still involved and engaged, and after that we can asked the engaged active membership for their input. Did I get this right? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct, but I also will be talking to ICANN senior management to understand what they believe. These are the people who believe accessibility is important, and what form do they want input to take into their processes? That's a really important part because talking to deaf ears doesn't do us a lot of good. Certainly this is an area where there is a great potential for that and I don't think any of us want that. There are a number of us who are active in this group who have significant disabilities, some minor, some major. We would really like to see problems addressed, not just people talk at each other.

With that, I will call the meeting to an end. Thank you, all. You will be seeing some communications out of this meeting. Because of the proximity to the ICANN meeting, things are going to be a little bit busy and they will not get out in the next day or so. Thank you, all.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, all. This meeting has been adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Please do remember to disconnect the audio from your side. Wishing you an awesome day, afternoon, or evening. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]