
Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well good morning, everybody. This is the ALAC Working Session, ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session Number 1. We're running slightly behind schedule; it's 9:26 a.m. Welcome to everyone.

I hope that you've all had a good trip coming here and I think that we have a very, very full agenda in the next few days, and today obviously is the first of our very long days. So I hope that we'll be able to go through the whole agenda in the time allocated to us, especially since we're starting a little late.

I wanted to first extend a very warm welcome to the new members who have joined us, and in no particular order, first Titi Akinsanmi who was selected by the NomCom to serve as the ALAC representative from the African Region, so welcome Titi.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: For the Asia-Australia and Pacific Region Rinalia Abdul Rahim, who was also selected by the NomCom to serve as ALAC representative. Welcome, Rinalia.

[Applause]

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

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: For Latin American and the Caribbean Islands Carlton Samuels has been reelected, so welcome again, Carlton.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: For North America we have Dr. Ganesh Kumar who was selected as an interim ALAC selectee to fill a seat that became vacant, so a very warm welcome to you.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And then we have also Yaovi Atohoum who will serve as the RAO representative to the ALAC for the AFRALO region and Yaovi was actually already in service in the NomCom.

And then the next name is the most difficult one on the list, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, and short Sala, I believe. Welcome Sala for the Asia-Pacific Region. Oh, she is probably watching the rugby where France is playing against New Zealand and we all know the score already for France, thank you very much.

I don't know – I know you wanted to watch it, but I'm sorry. I have asked that any streaming images to this room will be blocked, so as for us to be able to do that, sorry.

Then we have... Well, I've been re-elected as the RALO representative for the ALAC from the EURALO region

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And welcome Natalia Encisco who will serve as the RALO representative to the ALAC for the LACRALO region.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And finally Eduardo Diaz who will also serve as the RALO representative to the ALAC for the NARALO region.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And so before we proceed to having a quick what we call (speaks French) in French, and I guess I'll probably sprinkle my language with some French words, since we are in a French-speaking

country as well, first I will ask Gisella to provide a little bit of...
Oh yes, of course yes. Well please, I'll let Gisella then do the
introduction for Sylvia.

Yes, please, Heidi, please go ahead.

Heidi Ullrich:

Good morning everyone, welcome. This is a very warm welcome
from At-Large staff. This is Heidi; I'm the Director of At-Large.
My wonderful staff is right here: you all know Gisella, Marilyn,
and Matt, so if you have any questions throughout the week, please
don't hesitate to contact us or just come speak directly to us.

And I would also like to introduce, she should be coming to you
virtually from Washington, or from Virginia in the United States...
Do we have her, Sylvia? I can see... Well, we have a photo of
Sylvia, but see if we can get her online. Actually she's listening to
us now – good afternoon, Sylvia.

This is [Sylvia Vevanko]. She's going to be the new At-Large
Regional Manager taking the place of Matthias. She will be
starting in November, early November, and if we could get her to
say a few words and maybe bring her through video...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Perhaps what we'll do is perhaps when she does come online, we'll
be able to introduce her a little later, because it doesn't look as
though...

Heidi Ullrich: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We're at the moment competing with a huge gain between two countries I think just – or link is obviously not that worthy compared to the other matters at play. I'll give the floor to Gisella to give us the rules of the game.

Gisella Gruber-White: Gisella speaking, good morning to everyone and welcome. If I can just remind everyone to please state their names when speaking the interpreters need this in the booths, and then this will be used for the transcripts, and we have French and Spanish simultaneous interpretation, so please don't speak too fast, they're doing their best to follow in the booths.

And we will be here from nine to six today, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Gisella, and next we'll do a quick round-up around the table, or there's Sylvia, here we go. Hello Sylvia, we can see you.

Heidi Ullrich: Can we get the phone going?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We cannot hear you yet, but it's coming up, if you do know sign language perhaps we can start with that. We are used be polyglophs here. No. Okay, well we'll have to speak to you later when the technical things get sorted out, but –

Heidi Ullrich: And could – she speaks – she's from Peru, she speaks obviously Spanish, English and a little bit of German. So welcome Sylvia, we're looking forward to having you in front of us. So unfortunately, we can't hear you, but we can see you and that's very important as well. Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, lip reading, I saw thank you very much. Okay, well thank you very much for joining us. I must also add one more thing to what we've been told. As you might notice, there's a computer in the middle with a camera over there, which means that for the first time we're actually being also transmitted on video; video streaming, which means that we cannot turn up in anything that looks too outrageous from a certain distance, and I would hope that everyone follows that.

So let's move quickly to a quick round table introduction to see who's here and then we'll go directly over to the At-Large Outreach and Inreach with Mandy Carver, who has been very patiently waiting and hasn't got that much time until her next meeting. So please let's make it brief. And we'll start first from

my left and Garth we'll start with his introduction and his ALS or affiliation, thank you.

Garth Bruen: I'm Garth Bruen from NARALO, and I have the honor of sitting in for Gareth Sherman. So you lost one Gareth, gained one Garth, if you call me Gareth by mistake, I won't complain, Garth sorry.

Ganesh Kumar: Hi this is Ganesh Kumar thank you for the welcome as a newcomer over here. I'm from Latin American ALAC region.

Sylvia Herlein Leite: Hi, I'm Sylvia Herlein Leite, ALAC member from LACRALO.

Darlene Thompson: Hi, I'm Darlene Thompson, Secretariat North American RALO.

Holly Raiche: Hi, I'm Holly Raiche APRALO.

Charles Mok: Charles Mok, APRALO.

Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels, NomCom rep from LACRALO region.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung, ISOC, Hong Kong, APRALO.

Mohamed El Bashir: Mohamed El Bashir, ISOC Sudan, Africa.

Aziz Hilali: This is Aziz Hilali from Morocco.

Saeed: Saeed (inaudible) from Morocco. I am from ISOC with Aziz and Vice President of ISOC and have worked with ISOC since 1993.

Evan Leibovitch: Evan Leibovitch from Canada.

Dave Kissoondoyal: Dave Kissoondoyal from Mauritius, AFRALO.

Fatimata Seye-Sylla: Fatimata Seye-Sylla AFRALO. Chair, President of the AFRALO.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vice President of AFRALO.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Hi my name is Sergio Salinas Porto; I'm ALAC member and LACRALO too.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Good morning, my name is Rinalia Abdul Rahim, I'm from Malaysia, I'm the NomCom representative for Asia Pacific Region.

Yaovi Atohoun: My name is Yaovi Atohoun from Benin, AFRALO.

Male: (inaudible) from Egypt.

Oxana Prykhodko: Oxana Prykhodko, Ukraine, EURALO secretary.

Wolf Ludwig: Wolf Ludwig, Switzerland, EURALO Chair.

Sandra Hofferichter: Sandra Hoferichter, Germany, ALAC representative for EURALO.

Titi Akinsanmi: Good morning everybody, Titi Akinsanmi, NomCom rep, AFRALO, South African Niger, anything else.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Good morning everyone, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Trinidad and Tobago, LACRALO Secretariat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good morning everyone, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ISOC AU and APRALO representative into the ALAC, currently serving as one of the Vice Chairs of the ALAC.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, and now I think we're also going to quickly look at the people who are sitting around just to see who is also here, because we've of course got the African ALSs who have joined us, and welcome to you, it's a real pleasure to have a summit and a whole number of events taking place with AFRALO.

So please introduce yourself and just (speaks French).

Ajan Tichami: My name is Ajan Tichami from AFRALO.

Pastor Peters: Pastor Peters from LACRALO.

Soufia Guerfali: Soufia Guerfali, Tunisia, At-Large.

Hadja Sanon: Hadja Sanon, Burkina Faso, West Africa, AFRALO.

Rasmata Compaore: Rasmata Compaore, Burkina Faso.

Moustapha Yacine: Moustapha Yacine. I do not belong to any organization, I'm new.

Sow Sadibou: Sow Sadibou from Senegal.

Edward Diaz: Edward Diaz, ISOC Puerto Rico.

Baudouin Schombe: Baudouin Schombe, AFRALO Congo.

Robertine Tankeu: Robertine Tankeu from Cameroon, from Tunisia (inaudible).

Mulenda Arnold: Mulenda Arnold, Congo.

Didier Kasole: Didier Kasole from ISOC Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo.

Female: ...Brazil, At-Large.

Male: ...for the first time, but I'm from the Ministry.

Gorgui Gueye: Gorgui, teacher, participant, Senegal.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And of course everyone is invited to take part in the debates, fully take part in the debates. If I can ask I think one of the speakers is running here. Mute your speakers, yes, thank you, and it's not muted.

Oh dear, okay and so without waiting any further, while you try and fix your speaker or unplug it or do whatever it is, sit on it, we're going to go to the first session which is the At-Large Inreach and Outreach and that's a big welcome then for Mandy Carver, and Scott Pinzon who are joining us.

Mandy Carver is Deputy General Manager for Global Partnerships and Scott Pinzon is Director of Marketing and Outreach, and the process that we have had in preparation of this meeting is that we had a Wiki page on the At-Large Wiki with questions for Global Partnerships and communications.

There were several calls in the RALOs and also during the ALAC meetings for the regions to submit their questions and I believe that Mandy and Scott have come here with a PowerPoint with the answers to those questions.

So first, I'd like to thank everyone who has submitted questions, and those who haven't next time you better send questions in, because if you don't send the question, you will not get the answer. And I'll pass the floor then over to Mandy and to Scott. Thank you.

Mandy Carver:

Thank you, Olivier and thank you all of you for giving us time and expressing the interest that you have and I am going to apologize in advance that I have another session that I'm going to have to leave for.

There were two specific questions put to me by Jean-Jacques Supernat on behalf of At-Large, asking about the status of the open positions within Global Partnerships, and then for an update on the plans for the organization of the department going forward.

Specifically, within Global Partnerships, we currently have two posted vacancies; one is for the administrative support within the department, and the second is for the Manager of Regional Relations for Europe, and we are endeavoring to go as quickly as possible in filling these positions, we've done the first round of interviews.

There are four other positions that some people associate with Global Partnerships, which are regional Vice Presidencies. These are actually under the executive. And so there are four positions posted for those VP for Asia, for Africa, for Latin America, and for Europe.

As I said, we've done the first round of interviews for the Manager of Regional Relations for Europe and we're endeavoring to fill that position as quickly as they possibly can.

The second question was an update overall for the organizational plans for the Department. ICANN really remains committed to further internationalizing the organization. Our current thinking is around using a regional vice presidential model. Now, given the number of positions and their nature, it may take several budget cycles to actually achieve that goal.

The VPs would be inside their regions, and anticipate that as those positions are filled the corresponding Managers for Regional Relations would move under the reporting structure for those Vice President. There would still be global coordination amongst the team, both through the collaboration of the staff and also the Vice Presidencies. But regional priorities and direction would be set by each of the Vice Presidents.

This process began, as we move from a single structure to a regionalized structure with the VP for the Americas, where Latin America and the Caribbean and North America all reside. So currently we have Managers of Regional Relations for Africa, for the Middle East, for Russia, CIS, for Australia-Asia and the Pacific Islands, and for Latin America. Now those are the currently staffed positions at that level.

And we have the Europe position posted and we have open lines in some other regions, the anticipation is that the Vice Presidents for

those regions should be in a hiring managerial role, and making the decisions for the priorities within their regions. And I can stop there. I don't know whether you want me to take questions before going on to Scott.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think we can take questions, yes, right away.

Mandy Carver: If there are any.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If there are any of course. Okay, no questions, so right, you can go on, thank you.

Mandy Carver: Thank you all for your time, attention and your ongoing support of the organization?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Mandy and apologies for the delay in having you start it. I hope it doesn't affect your whole day. We will obviously have further questions for the next ICANN meeting, so we thank you for being with us and for your answers.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And we look forward to seeing you again on Wednesday.

Mandy Carver: Okay, no problem.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay and so now the next person then is Scott Pinzon and I gather Scott will be speaking to us again about the global outreach and what do you have to tell us? So Scott, you're on.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you. I did prepare some slides, can those be projected?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And I understand that you will be answering Eduardo's questions regarding the city capacity of the new gTLD Outreach Program.

Scott Pinzon: That's correct.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic.

Scott Pinzon: While those slides are coming up, I just wanted to tell you that prior to this, I was in a session with the Board, and this group is

much better looking. I'm really pleased to see such robust participation here, this is a wonderful group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Whilst we have a couple of minutes, I hear that New Zealand has won the rugby game against France, but now there is a third half, which will be the cooking competition and I have high hopes that France will win.

Scott Pinzon: But all they're serving is Lamb, so ...

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We do try to make it enjoyable and not to get everyone to fall asleep.

Scott Pinzon: All right, here come the slides, if I could have the next one, please. These are the questions that I saw on the Wiki. So the first one was what is the budget for new gTLD awareness?

Actually the Board is determining that this week at their meeting at the end of this week. The ranges that have been discussed though go from one-half million US dollars to 1.5 million. So the budget will be somewhere in there, presumably.

The next question was, will At-Large be a part of the Outreach effort? That is entirely up to At-Large. I have come to At-Large

and discussed possible ways to work together over the last couple of meetings at least, and so far I don't feel like I've gotten a united response from ALAC, that I could act upon. I've heard a variety of opinions ranging from we don't want to be tools of the registrars to give us money and we'll talk.

So I'm still waiting for ALAC to decide how they would like to be involved, but I wanted to point that if there's already a spirit and willingness of people to want to talk about new gTLDs for example with your ALSs at the URL that you can see on the slide there, we have a lot of materials already provided that you're welcome to use. In case it's hard to read, it's newgtlds.ICANN.org/about.

And on the next slide, here is just a snapshot of what the site looks like in case you've never had occasion to visit there. And in the lower half, you can see that there are links to a FAQs page, Fact Sheets, Presentations, and I'll show you on the next slide.

Again, this is difficult to read, but what I'm trying to illustrate is that all of these materials are available in the six UN languages, and perhaps a particular note, we have the new gTLDs Basics Presentation with very extensive speaker notes, and those have been translated also. So if you can read aloud, you can put on a presentation about new gTLDs, if you want to, to your own ALS, or to some location in your own region.

On the next slide there's an example of the opening slide of the presentation in French; on the next slide you can see a sample from

the Russian version of it, so it is fully translated, if you would like to make use of it.

The next slide, we also produced a video that gives an overview of what the New gTLD Program is about. This is directed though at someone who might consider actually applying to run a gTLD, but nonetheless it's fully produced in six languages, so not just subtitled, not just overdubbed, but we actually use six different native speakers and shot the thing six ways. So those are available to you, and of course happy to talk more about cooperative efforts.

On the next slide, the question was what types of media are you planning to use in the new gTLD awareness? The precise answer remains uncertain until the Board decides the budget, but what we're using right now include that new website I just showed you, fact sheets, FAQs, brochures, videos, social media, we're Tweeting two or three times a day from the Twitter account, newgtldsICANN.

And we've also been working what's called Earned Media, which basically means stories that the press decides to write about us, and since the Board passed the New gTLD Program on 20 June, there have been significantly more than 5,000 articles posted all around the world, some of them very high profile, like the home page of the BBC, everything down to Hindu Business Times, I mean almost any publication you want to name. And then we also have been doing live events from mid-September to still ongoing.

The next slide gives the clue of how many live events we've put on, a little difficult to see there but you see two kinds of pins, they're in the globe at every location where we've given a presentation about new gTLDs.

The yellow pins show everything that's been done since 2008, when the Board first envisioned the program. The blue pins are the events we've done just since June 20th, when the Board finally approved the Applicant Guide Book.

And one more slide, just not to forget North and South America.

Next question, do you contract Outreach work to companies within each country? The short answer to that is no. Logistically, it would be extremely complex to try and have different entities in different countries, so this is being centrally managed. Also, our general counsel has concerns because the New gTLD Program is something like a magnetic for lawsuits. They want most of what's delivered in a presentation to be precise. So they considered it too risky, nonetheless, we are happy to consider proposals to work together.

We have posted the criteria by which proposals are analyzed in the middle of August. So there is a link there you can see. If you have an idea for an event that perhaps we could do together, you and ICANN, you can look there and see how we will weigh the proposal and we're happy to talk.

Next slide. Who decides which Outreach campaign is best suited to At-Large? For certain, the answer is you do. We would never

seek to impose a program on you, but again if you have ideas for ways you'd like to work together, I can be your contact, there's my email address, scott.pinzon@ICANN.org and we're happy to work with whatever your procedure is. It might be the ALAC itself, or the Executive Committee or I don't know, but happy to work with you.

I think this is the last question, well, the second to the last. Are we able to comment on the Outreach Campaign before it is final? The issue here is that it's taken the Board much longer to arrive at a budget than we had hoped. So in simple terms, it's the launch of accepting applications for new gTLDs is 12 January, we don't have much time to mount like an advertising campaign, if we just get a budget this week.

Of course, we're always open to hear your input and you're certainly entitled to state your views, but it cannot be gate team factor, in other words, because we only have so many weeks to January 12th, we can't come up with a campaign, submit it, and then wait to hear what people think. We're going to have to just go as fast as we can, basically, and adjust as we're in motion.

The other thing I would point out is that there's a very limited role for the individual user at this time, none of the new gTLDs exist yet. The program itself is not designed for an individual user per se. We think that it will cost somewhere around 2 million dollars to actually operate a new gTLD registry to for the first year. So the only place that individuals begin to come into this will probably be in May of 2012, when all the strings that have been

applied for, will be made public, then there's an opportunity for an individual to decide they want to object to a given string. For example if it's offensive or if it says that it represents a community or part of, and you feel that it does not represent your community, then individuals can get involved. At this point, there is not a lot an individual can do except just be aware that it's coming.

The final question is will the campaign be in multiple languages? And I hope I've already shown that the answer is yes. The actual wording from the Board was the key documents should be in the six UN languages, and we've been going along already, we have been doing others on a case by case basis. For example, we had a request for the overview video to be done in Japanese.

So some community members actually, I sent them the script and they translated it for us, we're in the process of getting it overdubbed in Japanese. When we spoke at Future Com in Brazil, some of the materials were done in Portuguese, so we're trying to respond to needs as they arise.

So those were the questions that were sent on the Wiki. I'm happy to take any further comments.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Scott, and there is already a queue in operation with no other than Cheryl Langdon-Orr who sent the first position, and if anybody else wishes to speak, could they just raise their hand, and I'll put them in the queue. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record.

Scott, two points and the second one is a question, but the first one is a point that you made which to rebut so we can have a little fun with that, if you like. I'm a little unsure about the assumptions that individuals need not be involved, when you're talking to the individuals that are At-Large structures. Because in many ways, they are key representatives of the local internet community, and may be of use for community-based gTLDs to go into the process of the new application with significant local support.

So I guess there's just that little exception there, that if I could draw you on, just to say whether, the man in the street absolutely, they don't need to spell ICANN, but this particular audience may have nexus with key ability to get a new gTLD applicant, their community, their local internet community support.

And the second question goes specifically to any possible subset of plans and one would like to think financial support in the budget as well, targeted for least developed and emerging economies. Here I see the possible nexus of the work that's been done with the JAS Work Group. And it's quite obvious that something at stand is not on the visit list that we currently have. So is that a next step that communications might be considering? Thank you, Scott.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you Cheryl. As to your first comment, I'm in complete agreement, thank you for that extra nuance; we're on the same page.

For your second question, well I have a few responses. If you looked at the map of pins that we have, we have far fewer in North America than anywhere else actually. We're still in the middle of the live events and they still are working their way to Asia, so we have gone to things like Highway Africa, which was a gathering of nearly 200 African journalists to explain to them about new gTLDs, and we're hoping that they will disseminate the information across the continent.

The idea of reaching the developing economies is very much on our mind. I actually should have prepared a list of what we have done and are doing, but I don't have it at the moment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think the group would appreciate that as a follow-up, if you could take that as a question on notice, and then get staff to send it to us.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, thank you very much. Other hands up, oh, Fatimata, please.

Fatimata Seye Sylla: Thank you, thank you Olivier, thank you Scott for your representation. I just wanted to make a point regarding the role of end users and this phase of the New gTLD Program.

In Africa, I think there is specific as end users and as for other members. We have to play a key role to raise awareness campaign to participate in the lobbying and information in this campaign to where the decision-makers in our countries. And we are doing that really. So even though there is no, we're not yet in 2012, we're already working with the government actors, and we're really playing a key role in having them to participate and understand what's going on with this program.

And I'm sure you heard about a lot about this issue of .Africa, and I mean we're all working together, participating in the meetings, and sometimes you have to intervene to adjust or to explain really what's going on, because for example like Tijani, he's in the JAS Group, so he has things to say, he has things to explain when it needed. So definitely we have a role to play in that sense. Yes, that's just the contribution I wanted to make. Thank you.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you for that comment. I would suggest another place where it's for me to picture At-Large getting involved, but it's ultimately up for you to decide and that's this area has huge potential for fraud to end users. And one of the early behaviors that we're seeing arise is some registrars offering pre-registration, so if there is a proposal for example that someone hopes to apply and get the new TLD .salsa, then some registrar might say hey for only \$35 you can pre-register and reserve dance .salsa, so that when it goes through you're set with a wonderful domain name.

Well, none of this can work, because all the top level domains have to be evaluated by an independent evaluation panel, so no new TLD can be assumed to exist. So I would like to do materials to help end users guard against pre-registration scams and other things that might arise as I have tried to start developing materials.

I'm not getting residents at the executive level at ICANN because it's like putting the seamy underbelly of the program out there. If At-Large wanted to take on some role in advising us to protect end users, that would help me then say hey, the community has asked for it, so we need to get these materials out there to help the individuals. So I just thought I would put that out there as yet another way we could work together if you'd like.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Scott, next in the queue is Edmon Chung, and we'll have Carlton Samuels. Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Thank you, so I think the plan looks good in general in reaching out to a lot of people around the world. I'm curious about one thing. We had a public comment period about the communications plan right after Singapore. How did you incorporate those comments into the plan right now, because I haven't heard much after the comments were received?

Scott Pinzon: I don't have that top of mind right now. The summary and analysis was published, I don't have it top of mind at the moment.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Chair. I wanted to pick up on the views of the terms innovation that was used by Fatimata. We have been saying for quite some time that the way to get the next billion interested in the gTLD space is that you have to innovate, and I used the word innovate and use old fashioned media, radio. The fact is if you're going to have traction in countries outside of North America in the general populous, you have to popularize the concept using the media that most of them listen to and use. We've been saying this for four years. And to date, I see no messages that are radio ready about New gTLD Program.

You have to get to that point of understanding. There's trouble in the south to get the general population understanding gTLDs and the role that new gTLDs as it is not popularized in the public consciousness. And one way to get to them by making liberal, I say liberal use of radio. Thank you.

Scott Pinzon: Thank you Carlton, no objection here, this is part of my frustration that we don't know a budget yet. So some fairly obvious things to do such as using radio, magazines, TV, sides of buses, signs on

tops of cabs and things that work in different countries around the world, they all depend on the money at this point. So we're doing everything we can without really having a designated budget, and we hope things will change by the end of this week.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Scott. Next is Evan in the queue.

Evan Leibovitch: Good morning, this is Evan Leibovitch, Vice Chair of ALAC for the record. Good morning, Scott.

I wanted to pick up on the pre-registration issue. You say that you need more information from us in order to help move forward in more end user centric components of the communications. What is it specifically that you need from us to help move this forward? The pre-registration specifically was addressed, I believe at least from one of the regions, but I don't think its come forward from all of ALAC. What do you need from us?

I feel this is an important issue, not just pre-registrations, but other things, other concerns that might come from the public as a result of this massive roll-out of TLDs. What can we do to drive more of an agenda of what is in it for the end user? What's the challenge for the end user? How do we communicate that out?

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you for the question. Ultimately, again I don't mean to determine your processes for you, but what would be very useful to me are two things that come to mind. One would be simply resounding united advice from ALAC, that you're concerned about what might happen to end users, and that you really call upon the Board and ICANN to start publishing materials to help clarify things. And as you said, it would go beyond pre-registration. We probably don't know some of the fraudulent activity that may arise, but pre-registration is an early one.

The second thing that would be helpful because you have so many feet on the ground or ears on the street or whatever metaphor you want to use, if you can feed to me examples of things that you think are scams or even just misleading, they may not be technically illegal, but could confuse end users, the more examples I have, the more I can demonstrate the need for materials to set the record straight. So those are two things that come to mind.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Scott. The clock is ticking so I think we'll stop the questions, however, there is one question which I would like to address, and that's actually if we scroll further down on our list, a question which was asked by Sylvia Herlein Leite, I don't know if Sylvia wishes to ask the question herself or whether we will just read it to the record, further down please. Sylvia? It was a while ago that you write that.

Female: It was Cheryl Langdon-Orr and then Cheryl –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, no Cheryl passed Sylvia’s question along.

Cheryl Langton-Orr: Sylvia wrote – Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Sylvia wrote to a list, it was a very valid question, I asked that it be added to be discussed.

Female: Would you please read it, I cannot see it very well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The question effectively and that’s also a question which I wanted to ask myself was the subject of the road show that is currently touring so many countries. As you know At-Large has got At-Large structures in many, many different countries around the world, and one of the incredible things that seems to be happening at the moment is that the local At-Large structures who obviously have connection with the local community and with potential applicants – because we have to remember they come from organizations that might have communities that will apply for new gTLDs.

Those people in the local structures read about an event that took place just around the corner from them in the press, or through Twitter, or through the means which are totally indirect, thus

making them completely disconnected with the process itself. I had the same thing a couple of days ago, I found out that something took place in London, and I didn't know about it. And I just found, this was strange and the most embarrassing thing was that some of my contacts came to me and said, "Oh, so we went to this event, how come you weren't there?" Really, really bizarre, so I think we'd like some kind of answer for that, please.

Scott Pinzon: What are odds of me getting out the door, if I tell you that's Mandy's question. No, I can address it on some levels. I did consider the question. And I really thought it was Mandy's.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And you've got the microphone that cuts everyone else off, so you're got the power.

No, I mean I realize it is Mandy's question unfortunately she had to leave pretty quickly perhaps if you can just enlighten us, if you can.

Scott Pinzon: Yes, first of all, the subtext of the point that you should not have to find out in these indirect ways, I fully accept, I agree. There a couple problems here, one of the examples that was given of finding out about something late was from 2009, this predates when there was even a communications department at ICANN, so

I don't know logistically who would have taken on the task of making sure At-Large people are aware of what's going on.

Today, we're mostly in the same boat, we only have, including myself, three people working on the New gTLD Program, we've laid on two contractors specifically to handle these live events, so logistically our focus has been literally just on pulling them off. And one of the examples in the question was Future Com, which was in Latin America. Our participation in that event was not solidified until one week before the speech. So there was certainly no intent to neglect anyone or exclude anyone, we're just scrambling that hard to get these things going.

Now, having said all that, again in my department we don't have contact information for you folks but perhaps we can create a better mechanism for us to keep Heidi and her team informed so that they can figure out who maybe needs to know about things that we're doing as they occur.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Scott, and that's exactly the kind of answer that I think we were looking for. Okay, I think we can let you off on this specific subject and thank you for answering it, and thank you for being able to enlighten us on this. You're invited to remain with us, because the next part of the discussion is the At-Large social media with an update in strategy from both Matt and you're also listed on there, so perhaps who should I give the floor to to start with. So Matt Ashtiani.

Matt Ashtiani:

Hi everybody, I'm Matt Ashtiani from ICANN staff. I'm currently loading the presentation, and once it's loaded, I'll begin. Sorry, if I talk too fast. I have actually a very brief presentation which some may enjoy, but I'll be as quick and thorough at the same time as possible.

Since I started working on the At-Large social media, we've had a large increase. We've actually increased our total number of Facebook friends by over 600%, we're almost at 700% and we probably are, these numbers were prepared about a week ago. So I think we've actually been doing pretty well.

In terms of our Twitter followers, I remember in Singapore noting that there was a call for a Twitter account, and I had 18 people signed up. And once I said that people in the room started immediately following us. Since that time, we're at 237, so we've rapidly expanded.

[Applause]

Matt Ashtiani:

I'm also seeing a lot of posts, a lot of visits to the page, so people aren't just becoming our friends on Facebook and just leaving it as is. People are coming to the page to see if there's new information, to see who's posting, to see the comments. The same with our Twitter page.

So now comes the second part, which is something that I asked you all in Singapore as well, which is how do you wish to proceed? Do we want to make it another repository of documents? Do we want to try something new? How do we see this going forward?

So based on what I was told, here are some suggestions that Scott and I worked on, and I have to give most of the credit to Scott because he's so amazing at this. So there's a couple of options, there is one option called a Posterous. I'm sure I'm not actually pronouncing that correctly, but the way it works is we can send a single announcement and it would go through all of our social media platforms, Facebook, Twitter, My Space if some people are still using that, so it's a very easy way to disseminate information. As for what kind, I will again leave that up to the group.

The other thing was the issue of hash tags. I know at the last meeting I was asked to create a hash tag, I tried to use the hash tag At-Large and it was about going out and partying and as a result of that, talking with Olivier, we developed a new one, and to be honest it was too long, too large, too clunky for somebody to very easily type. So one of the other options is multiple hash tags, may we do At-Large DKR, At-Large SIN, At-Large SJL, something of that nature so we also have each other, and have each other for the meeting.

A YouTube account where it may be possible to ask the Chair to prepare a monthly summary, just a quick five-minute video. Another alternative is iTunes, everybody in this room more than likely has an iTunes account, and the same with everybody

listening, we can set up a free podcast, where it would automatically be downloaded, where you don't have to worry about it, which I know is a very convenient feature to have the information automatically come to you.

And then one other thing is I have a camera sitting here, Gisella has a camera, I know Dave has a camera and I know everybody here should have one. We can have a pooled flicker account where we can all share our photos, our movies, things like that, so we are all sharing of the experience, because there's definitely been times where we all wanted that photo, or we all have wanted that video. So with that, Scott do you have anything to add?

Scott Pinzon:

I have a couple more tools I would suggest that the group might enjoy. Along with the hash tag, there is a possibility of having what's known as a Twitter Chat. This would be if you wanted to get quick broad feedback on an issue, you would set it up like a meeting, where you declare a specific time and date, where for one hour you will perhaps, Olivier or someone would post a few questions on a specific topic, and then everybody on Twitter can chime in with their personal responses, and you use a hash tag for that particular topic, so that everyone, whether they are Twitter friends with each other or not, you still see the results using a search tool.

We saw News Star do this recently with new gTLDs, they said okay from 12:30 to 1:30, we're going to answer questions about

the New gTLD Program, and just put hash gTLD chat in your answer. And they go over 200 Tweets in an hour. So this can be a very vibrant tool if you wanted to get quick feedback from At-Large enmasse that would be a possibility.

Another tool that is perhaps of interest is a free tool at a website called Socialoomph.com. So it's the word social and oomph .com. And what it does is things like can send an automated response when someone newly follows you on Twitter, it can immediately write back and say thanks for the follow, please watch hash ALAC or At-Large to keep track of the latest or that kind of thing. And even though it sounds simple, those automatic follow-backs have been proven to really start to swell the number of followers that you have.

There are also more premium things you can attempt for a fee, so the tool is available with the subset of capabilities for free, and then I think it's \$35 a month to do some sophisticated things, such as you Tweet once and it goes out to Facebook and LinkedIn, and wherever else, so that might be worth investigating for you too.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Scott and actually I just thought it was the opportune time to ask around the room just do a quick poll with a show of hands; how many people here use Twitter? And I don't know who's good at speed counting. How many don't, 50%, okay maybe we can record that.

How many people use Facebook? Oh, so it looks like more people use Facebook than Twitter. And one with their tongue out.

How many people use YouTube, or watch YouTube? Much less. Okay, not everybody, no, no, there are some people who are not – I guess it could be a bandwidth issue. It was about ten or so, well, a bit more for YouTube.

What about LinkedIn? Well, there's a fair number, that's quite a good majority use LinkedIn.

Google Plus. Okay, a bit less, with a very happy and eager Google Plus user at the end of the table, all in orange.

And then Flickr. Oh, only a handful on Flickr.

Anyone still on My Space. One person, two.

Scott Pinzon: To get the At-Large band started, you're going to want My Space.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, we'll see that in the music night, that will be the auditions for the My Space account. Right, thank you very much, any other questions for Scott or for Matt? Yes, Titi.

Titi Akinsanmi: Okay, just a quick one. I heard what the strategy is from the side of the administration. My question is, are you actively looking to work at At-Large members to help develop that strategy, because I

think it's again important, so that it's not something that's developed from your end, but that you have people from this team actively working with you as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Who wishes to answer, Scott, Matt. Scott.

Scott Pinzon: I perceive the question, I do think it's for the staff that's dedicated to At-Large to help and I'm certainly willing to advise if that's appropriate.

Matt Ashtiani: Hi, Matt Ashtiani for the record. As in Singapore, I should stress that again this time that I'm not here to dictate how to use this to anybody. The whole goal is to have the group tell me how they want it to be used. So that's why I said, how do want it to be used? Do we want it to be a repository? Do we want it to be a way to get the information out? So I guess I should have been more clear on that, but yes, in no way am I trying to say how it should be used.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Matt and in fact, the answer is in your hands. It really is up to everyone here to choose how this should be used. Oh, Cheryl already has an idea.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I often have ideas Mr. Chairman, this just happens to be a reminder, however of the very specific work of some of the work teams, and particularly the work team that was looking at the Outreach, Inreach and communication modalities in the ALSs and Regions as a result of the ALAC and At-Large review.

And there are particular recommendations there, Scott where we'd like to have a small group of geeksperts with a nexus to someone who has the right email addresses in ICANN. So if wonderful good ideas happen to come out of an obscure part of a subcontinent somewhere, we can sort of make sure that A it makes the peer review, and yes, we all believe we'd like to use it; and B actually is able to be implemented in the spaces that we're already playing in.

So we might want to take that as we make that an implementable out of our ICANN review to have a specific discussion with you and whoever is relevant in your team on that. And probably someone from IT as well. For example, as many aspects of what we have available to us in the Wiki pages that we have now, and we're not utilizing those, but that's probably something that's going to be more effectively done at the regional level, as well as at ALAC.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Scott, do you wish to –

Scott Pinzon: First of all, I would be delighted to assist in that way and it occurred to me, I should mention we are relatively close to hiring a social media coordinator, who I think we'll have on staff in November, at least that's the way it looks right now. So we will be able to give a little more focus to this area and I'd love to work with you on it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may just for a minute, AFRALO respectful of course with the highest number of internet access points being the mobile phone, the social media and smaller abilities, smaller text lines but the ability to then later link and not download, but look at documentation is going to be very, very useful.

As it is, I can barely stay in some Adobe Connect Rooms while I'm in the [Antipedian] area of Australia, when we're doing some of the shared space for some really meaty documents that we're sharing, the rooms are failing, because the bandwidth is an issue, and we've got to very sensitive to that in our regions which are going to be relying on mobile technologies in domain, thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Cheryl, and before we go for a coffee break, and strangely enough, we are actually on time, I just wanted to ask one last update on the podcasts that were started a while ago, and whether there was any continuing program on this or any plan for more of our committee to be interviewed.

Scott Pinzon: Is this relative to an ALAC specific podcast, or to the general one that we were honored to have you as a guest on.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, yes, I think when we did the general podcast, and of course I do realize we have a lot of newcomers here, Scott was very kind to conduct an interview, asking me questions about At-Large, the community, and why I got involved in ICANN. It was a while ago, wasn't it?

But anyway we did that, and the plan was to then get members of the community to go through the same process and explain their position, their point of view, how they got involved with At-Large, and what they're looking to do at ICANN. So I wonder whether this program is ongoing and if we can expect perhaps some members of our community to be asked questions. Oh, sorry, I didn't see you, yes Charles please.

Charles Mok: I would just very quickly want to say that I think it's useful to get regional opinion and suggestion on the use of social media, because it's very different from one place to another, the popular platforms and so on. If you just focus on the Facebook and whatever, the ones that you asked about, those are perceived to be global, but in fact at the regional level, many of them do not really work or for any particular region. For example, I mean just use

China of course; you can't get to any of the ones that you talked about just now.

So I think it's useful to get regional suggestion, especially when you hire the social media to be on board, they need to listen to what regional suggestion is saying, that what should work better in that particular location. It's not just the language, it's actually also the platform and of course and then you get onto the message, which might be different from one region, or even country to another.

Scott Pinzon:

Thank you, that was a very well-considered point, and definitely taken on board. Part of the budget that I hope is approved later this week for new gTLDs, we actually have a consultant online, who comes to us from 12 years in Beijing and will be advising us on what social media works in China, so I agree, thank you very much for the point.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Scott, and the answer regarding podcasts, any update?

Scott Pinzon:

So the ball is in At-Large's court. In Singapore I tried to walk through a form with you in order to help determine so what is your communication objective, what would be the point of the podcast, who are you targeting, and I haven't heard answers to any of those

questions. So as soon as you can define what you're like to do, we're happy to help you implement.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, okay, well that point is taken, and maybe we can have this as an action item, as a follow-up to get those forms filled with what we want, and what we are looking for as far as podcasts and new media is concerned. I don't see any other hands up at the moment.

Another action item with regards to the monthly statements that I would be doing, I'm fine with that, so please put this as an action item as well. And it's just time I guess to say thanks very much to Scott Pinzon who has always been very supportive of our community.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And we look forward to continuing to work with your Scott, and of course with the At-Large staff dealing with the social media. And now we have a coffee break that will last until eleven o'clock sharp. I understand that coffee is served outside, please be back on time, it's actually the first time we're only four minutes late, and I hope that we will be able to not be later than that, since we have a very packed schedule and tonight we also have an AFRALO showcase, which is going to be the fantastic event, so we cannot be

late under any circumstances. So thanks very much and see you in about 25 minutes.

[break]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Attention, thank you ladies and gentlemen, if you care to take your seats and get yourself vaguely organized. I'm not going to sit up the front; I thought I'd do a song and dance, which I may very well do.

[Applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This will be an interactive session. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And what Oliver Crepin-Leblond and myself who are your representatives on the CCI, the consumer choice and trust metrics work group, what we need from you is your opinions on what you and your region, and your ALS are wanting to set as metrics. I've got a presentation that Matt is – well, actually it's not my presentation, it's a presentation that the secretariat of the work group put together for use and believe me we're not going to look at all of the slides. We're just going to look at some of the definitions.

Let me start by making it clear to you all why it is vitally important that you give us input on this. Under the Affirmation of Commitments it is a requirement that several years after new gTLDs are launched there is an analysis of the effect on end users.

Were we all confused, was there only one of them and no one went there, are there so many that we've actually not doing any justice to any of them? We have no idea what those types of observations may be. But what we are charged with finding is a set of measurable and hopefully this is going to work. I'm not Rosemary Sinclair of course, why isn't my magic button working, where should I be pointing it at. Seth, help, magic button where should I be pointing it at. Oh, okay so I don't go onto the next slide if I don't have a magic magic button, thank you Matt.

Okay, what we're doing flip to the next slide please. In this session is what we need to ensure if I can – I give up on toys, I pay people to do technology – is to ensure that the decisions made to and from the new gTLD have measurable that are meaningful to you and to ICANN.

Let's look at what it is meant to do. The New gTLD Program is still all about security, stability and resiliency but it is to promote competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. And what we are doing right now is defining what we mean, next slide, thanks Matt, by consumer trust, consumer choice and in fact even the word consumer.

Let's slip to the next slide, thank you, because I really want to hear rather than talk at you. It's been going on since San Francisco; let's move to the next slide please. For those of you on the At-Large Advisory Committee, or who will be on the At-Large Advisory Committee, you should be advised what is it.

[background conversation]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Certainly, no problem I will hold. Ladies and gentlemen, I know you all have particular issues with some of your accommodation, we have an opportunity now to have an interaction with someone I believe from the Ministry, so if you'll just hold that thought and that slide in your head, you'll actually know – perhaps if you do the next slide, and then they can all – there we are, you'll all know that mantra perfectly by the time we finish, because that's what we're going to talk about. I would like to give over the microphone now, and we can have an intervention. You're happy to use that. Please go ahead.

Female: Thank you everyone, so I saying that I was going to speak in French because I am someone from the Ministry who was with me last night, the Meridian, with his superior. I'm ready because we've heard everything that was going on, so I called them and they came with me last night, very late at night. We were with

(inaudible) administration to explain the complaints that were submitted, and they took – the hotel administration promised to improve your stay and to make it more comfortable.

What we have seen on sight is there are problems that we have presented to the administration and the reception was not even aware of the problems that were in the rooms. Some problems in the rooms have not been submitted to the reception, but it was done over the internet and from mouth to mouth, so every time there is problem in a hotel, the first reflex is to – reaction is to contact the administration and they asked us that if we would submit our complaints directly to the administration, if the problem is not solved then, we will raise our voice, because ICANN did everything necessary on the regulatory level.

There is another problem, she is from the Ministry of Tourism, and she was there with her superiors. The Minister of Tourism does not undertake to transfer or to find another room, but it's their responsibility to see that everything is running smoothly at the hotel level, so that's why they were with us.

With regards to internet, because I think that's the hottest issue is the internet access in the rooms, I talked yesterday with the high employee of the [Sunatel] and also the state-owned information agency that has a network on optic fiber at the Meridian and they explained to us that what happened was they had – they would ask them to cover the Meridian and that's what they did, they never received the instructions to cover the other hotels, including the Almadies, that's why they didn't their work.

Now, yesterday already they Sunatel the operator sent someone to the Almadies to see what kind of connection they have and this morning the ARTB which is the regulatory agency for communications and the post office, which is the sponsor, the official sponsor of this meeting at the local level, and I told them about the problem. He told me – he asked me to explain in depth, which I did, I asked him to do everything they can because they are the head of the operator – telecommunication operators to do everything possible so all efforts be done at the hotel I hope.

So this is what I can tell you, and I can also tell you once more that Dakar is a hub with regards to events and people like Dakar in Senegal. There are many things that happen and I can almost – all hotels are full, the hotels are full. I don't know what to tell you. The glitches at the room – in the room we will do everything possible to solve them. Now, if the hotel reception knows about it and nothing is done, so we with the Ministry and all we will try to talk again to the hotel administration.

Male:

I would like to add that there is no phone in the room so the problem to the reception sometimes you need to walk back and forth many times, this is the first time when I go to a hotel, and I feel that the rooms were finished quickly, almost fell in the morning, I wanted to take a shower, the shower exploded in my face, air conditioning cannot be 23 degrees, I was very cold, 23 degree this is too cold, 23 or 30 degrees is a huge difference. The receptionist was – they asked me to pay now or in the morning, so,

but it's organized by ICANN, I don't understand. I was really in a bad situation. I came to Senegal several times and this is the first time that this happened. I don't understand, the standards are very, very, very low, thank you.

Female:

I am sorry, I apologize to hear all of this and as a Senegal – a member of this community please accept my apologies because I didn't like for members of my community, then members of my community should be in such a bad situation and arriving in this country. I am sorry but I cannot tell you more than what I just said. I see hands raised, I see there are complaints, maybe you have too much on your shoulder, but I can tell you please accept my apologies, I can't do anything more. I can't do anything more and I'm really sorry because I am a part of this community, I am among you and I am standing alongside this group. I feel really bad, really I feel bad.

Female:

Two quick comments.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I think everyone wants to speak about this, maybe Pastor Peters and Sergio, but first Pastor Peters and then I know we could spend a whole day on this, because we all have this. But afterwards, Evan is going to speak about something that he's put together this

morning that will actually enable all of you to give the problems that you have in your room. So Pastor Peters.

Pastor Peters:

As to what are the reception, the reception are aware of the problems. The very first place we go to was the reception. They were the one that allocated those rooms to us, and they assigned a porter to take us to these rooms. We go to the rooms and the rooms are opened. Now the whole issue of reception: it takes an average of at least ten minutes' walk from the bungalows to the reception, there is no telephone. You need to eat or make a request, the language barrier is there, the people that are servicing the guests, they cannot speak English, that is one problem, and then the heater in my room, the heater in my room is not even working.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Pastor Peters, I'm sorry to be cutting you off, but we will have a survey in order for you to have the individual comments. So maybe we can move on. Okay, well let's get Evan first to describe what he's put together, and then you can all bring this. Because I think we know that there are problems and then Sergio one last thing and we'll move on back over to Cheryl afterwards, thank you.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi this is Evan Leibovitch for the record. I just wanted to let everyone know that we are aware, painfully aware of what everybody is experiencing, Olivier and I went yesterday ourselves to personally ask a couple of people to show us their rooms, we've taken some photographs, and also in response to what we saw, including what we saw running around in the corridors with our own eyes, what I have done is I have created an online survey to collect responses.

So rather than each of you telling us in this Public Forum everything that is happening, what we're trying to do is collect everybody's individual experience; did the telephone work, was the lighting there in the hallways, we're trying to get from each of you what worked, what didn't, what was missing, and what kind of response you received.

So I have posted the link to the survey in the Adobe Connect, I've posted a link to the survey in the group Skype chat. If you know anybody who is staying at the Almadies who does not have access to these links here, please pass it to them, we will collect this, this will be given hotel management, this will be given to ICANN meeting staff, and to anybody else who needs to receive it.

So it's our goal, rather than have everybody individually say what was not working for them, we want to collect this, we want to have specific examples. We have specific evidence, we have taken photos, and it's our goal to be responsive and do the best we can in bringing this forward in a way that can be dealt with most quickly and most effectively.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan, and Sergio, you just wanted to say a couple of words.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Sir, I'm going to speak in Spanish, I'm so sorry. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make clear and at least to leave on record that I am concerned about the fact that we are putting forward problems in Senegal and that ICANN takes this as an excuse not to be able to go to countries which can be developing countries, such as Senegal and some Latin American countries to use this as an excuse not to carry out activities in these countries. I would like to leave on record that a good attitude and the kindness and warmth of the Senegal people to all of us has been excellent.

[Applause]

Sergio Salinas Porto: And I know those problems are out there, this can happen in my country as well, and many a time it's not the poor will of the people of the inhabitants of the country or the locals. That is all, thank you very much.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Sergio, that certainly is very encouraging comment, and I really thank you for that. I see a lot of other hands. I don't want to be way too late in this if we can perhaps speak a little more afterwards. I know Yaovi, I'm really sorry about this, but what I did want to do though, was to thank very much Fatimata and also the representative from the Tourism authorities that they come and speak to us.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's very much appreciated. And now we are going to go back to our scheduled program and back to Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Thanks very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record, and it's a perfect segway, because what we've been looking at is in the last few minutes what happens when consumers are not satisfied, and when expectations are not met and solutions are not found in a way that you are used to, and that is exactly why we need to have measurable and metrics now before the New gTLD Program actually goes live.

These are pieces of material that will be offered up to the review team that looks at this. It is in no way the work group's job to limit the work of the work group. So the scope of the work group, the future work group, and some of you may be on that future work group, it's not limited, this is a foundation set of data for them to observe and work with. It's no good then saying we wish we know what the effect was on, insert whatever, number of new registries in whatever country perhaps, if they haven't collected a before and after.

Next slide, thank you Matt. Thank you, this I'm going to skip over relatively quickly, the update report and the products that come out of this work group which is currently GNSO chartered work group is going to be something that each of the ACs and SOs can use and later in the business of the ALAC, we will discuss whether or not we will adopt a charter, and basically say we will put some more of our people in that work group, and we'll make it a *de facto* work group that is a joint activity.

Next slide, thank you. But we still have independent reporting. We can skip to the next part thank you, because we now need to get to the meat of all of this. As it stands now the term "competition" is defined by us and there's been some very long and exhaustive debates on these words, I can assure you as it will be evident in the quantity and diversity of gTLDs, TLD registry operators and registrars. So what this work group is proposing and what I now need you to respond to is, is that a valid, fair and

reasonable definition? Have we missed anything? The floor is open. Evan, go ahead.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi Cheryl, this is Evan for the record. My general concern about the concept of competition is that when they talk about competition and the people who they are competing for, the people they are competing for are the registrants, the people who buying domains, not the end users who are using the internet to reach those domains.

So on one hand this has some relevance, on the other hand it seems that the relevance is indirect to the internet end user, that we're talking about the relationships between the registries and registrars providing domains and registrants, that is businesses and publishers of information who are buying domains, and that the end user of the internet is not even a participant in this equation.

What is the role that we play in At-Large as in the end users of the internet in those transactions that are going on above us?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Evan. Before I respond to that, is there any furthering of that comment from anybody? If not, let me respond to that Evan.

I think we will see a different flavor when we go to consumer choice and consumer trust. Because it's those consumer words that bring in the internet end user.

Evan Leibovitch: Cheryl, this is Evan, and I just want to make sure my concern is that when they're talking about consumer that the ICANN idea of consumer is not simply those who buy domains, but the people who are actually using those domains, that if they're just talking about the money chain of who is buying domains and where the money flow is going, then that stops at the registrant, not at the end user.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Understood, Matt, can we queue forward to the consumer trust slide please, we'll come back to this, back one, sorry, just back one, there you go.

Notice what we've got and notice the order it is in, a consumer is first and foremost an internet user and we can also add in registrants, does that make you feel somewhat more comforted?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, I don't mean to personalize this or monopolize this, but my question is, when a registrant buys a domain and says this is how you're going to find me, the end user really doesn't have much choice in the matter, but the time that decision has been made. So the decision on which TLD to go with or if there is sufficient choice in TLDs, is the choice that the registrant makes and after the registrant makes that choice, the end user is essentially out of the equation, you use that domain or you don't get to that data.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: In fact the measurement that we want to see in consumer trust is how the internet end user has responded to the new gTLDs coming out, so this is absolutely the intent to look at mom and pop, or the student, or the whoever, that is looking to access the content, but remember ICANN doesn't deal with content. I have Holly and then I have Sala, go ahead Holly, okay Ganesh after Sala.

Holly Raiche: For the record Holly Raiche from the Internet Society Australia. Evan, just say that in fact sometimes the registrant winds up being a small business person who really is about as powerless as an end user, so I don't have a problem with thinking about in many cases, sometimes a registrant being in the same position almost as a user and a lot of what I would like to see happen in terms of information, in terms of looking after the registrant is also about looking after a consumer that in competition terms is perhaps the difficult end of not being able to understand and navigate the area.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Short right of reply.

Evan Leibovitch: I guess the point that I'm making, and I still haven't heard an answer for is that by the time the registrant who might be a small business owner, might be an individual, by the time the registrant has made their choice of what domain, the end user really has no

choice in this situation, the end user is going to either use that domain or not access the information. So at the end user point, there's really, from what I can see no choice, the choice is at the registrant level.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we look forward to hearing from you on specific metrics that we can propose to the work group to solve that issue. Sala go ahead. Just push the button on your microphone.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:Hi, for the record I'm Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro and I just like to make a comment. I would propose that the consumers take the ordinary definition according to the consumer international group, but also that it could be rephrased to also read a consumer is defined as an internet user –

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sala, if you speak in the mike, I'm sorry maybe you have to twist I don't know which way or take the microphone the other direction.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro:My apologies. To say something to the effect of the consumer includes internet users and a consumer is an internet user and includes but is not limited to registrants.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is that not exactly what that says, because if that is not exactly what that says, we need language from you and from Evan to make that clearer.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: It's not what it says, the reason, my rationale for saying that is because the internet is something that is continually evolving, whatever definition that you put now is going to determine potential policy matters in the future.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Remember we are talking specifically about new gTLDs.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Sure, sure and also we could also study the definition of consumer according to the Consumer International, thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. Consumer International was looked at as was a number of telecom organizations globally, trust me, you're very lucky you're not having presented here something that was utterly limited, and absolutely limited to the user at the registrant of a TLD level, it almost got that bad. Ganesh go ahead.

Ganesh Kumar: Hi this is Ganesh Kumar from ALAC in North America. I just wanted to make sure that the definition of the consumer needs to

be clarified. I think if you include both internet users and registrants, maybe the single metric may mean different things.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't think that – well, let's move the metric slide then.

Ganesh Kumar: Second, I would like to see if you are going to use this metric to understand what impact the gTLD has, right, we have to see whether we added the net new users, or net new registrants, rather than existing users and existing registrant, because we can't transport that addition into the gTLD adoption straight away to the costs that we are trying to measure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I'd like to come to more on that if I may.

Ganesh Kumar: If I'm an internet user, or if I already have a domain registered, I'm already an internet user, just because I'm subscribing to another gTLD, does not mean we are increasing consumer trust or increasing competition, right, it's just measuring the adoption. So it all depends on what you want to measure.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: True, we might be measuring consumer choice however.

Ganesh Kumar: Yes, could be.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that's what we are trying to tease out.

Ganesh Kumar: But that's what I'm saying you've got to be, so you need to be clear on exactly what you're measuring.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely, it's taking a huge amount of our lives to do exactly that, and why we're doing this in the round is because you need to start thinking about this, all of you. And you need to think about it from your regional and country perspectives and start helping us modify these terms while we have the chance, Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you Cheryl, I was about to point out that perhaps if we look at the attributes and see what is it we are going to measure, it will drop out almost immediately to see whether or not the term "consumer" is embracing of all of the possible aspects of what a consumer is. So let's just go to as you have been suggesting for a little while.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And the good news, you'll be, I hope delighted to hear is that we're only just playing with the consumer part of it, the parts that

we've got further along with is this competition set of metrics. So let me just roll you all back slightly, I moved onto consumer to meet I think Evan's concerns that we were not going to look at that, and indeed we are.

Under the competition metrics as to the moment, this is what we are proposing that ICANN evaluate the number of gTLDs before and after, does anyone have an issue with that? Does it sound fair? Should it be modified? Do you hate it? Go ahead Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz:

This is Eduardo Diaz for the record. I have a question, the word evaluate what does that mean, just counting the numbers, analyzing them, what's – just clarification.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

At the moment, the word evaluate is somewhat laden, otherwise we would have said count, but yes we need raw numbers and there will be various forms of categories, because we've got gTLDs in existence now, which are highly limited in their use, and very restricted. And they need to be categorized appropriately.

The second thing that we're going to look at is evaluation, again we use that word a lot of the number of suppliers before and after new gTLDs, so it's not just the matter of the actual gTLDs, we've been told anything between one and 5,000 might come our way, what is it's only 50 and no more ever occur? That's why we need

to look at how many are in existence now and how many come online in the New gTLD Program.

The number of suppliers I think is something that each of you need to think deeply on. Or do you, as an end user, not as a registrant, which many of you are, but as a consumer by our definition, end user of the internet, and you might be a registrant, how would you feel if it was only three or five suppliers.

If the whole New gTLD Program for whatever reason, somehow ended up three years down the track with only three or five major players in the field, would you feel joyful? Would you feel neutral? Would you feel that that is not an expansion of the space, its expansion of the name space, but it's not an expansion of the choice of supplier in the name space? So we need to think very carefully about these metrics.

I don't expect you to have the answers, but I do prevail upon you to help us get some terms to measure properly. This is just to wet your appetite, because I believe you've all been busy, there might a few things you need to read, not just this report, go ahead Carlton, and then Sala.

Carlton Samuels:

Carlton Samuels for the record, thank you Cheryl. To validate it might I suggest you have some metric that talks about location of suppliers, where they're physically located.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good point. I think Olivier if we – that’s an easy add-on right now that we do for geo, we look at the regional and local distribution as well, pins in the map I gather. I have Sala, then I have Garth. Go ahead Sala, and then Holly.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Just very quickly, I acknowledge that I have yet to read a lot of things, but I just like to make a comment since we’re on competition. I’m just wondering whether they’ll be mechanisms in place to assess market power, and how market power is going to be defined, and I’d be particularly interested in percentages as well, just looking at the –

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The very next point is that, let’s talk more on that. Garth then Holly.

Garth Bruen: This is Garth Bruen for the record. The term of number of registrars is somewhat subjective, and I think it’s an issue of disclosure, because we’re constantly told that there are 941 registrars, when in fact there are only 400 plus gTLD registrars, and we have five companies that control a conglomerate of accreditations and with all different names and there isn’t disclosure to the registrar that the registrant’s domain consumer or to the general consumer about the way that this market is really

working. And we need full disclosure for new gTLDs because this is a bad place to start the way it's working right now. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Garth, they're hugely important points you've made and I would like to ensure that we extract those particular words to the presentation at our next work group meeting, because that gets to the nuts and bolts of why we thought the word evaluate as opposed to simply count, because that is of great concern to us. Holly go ahead.

Holly Raiche: Holly Raiche for the record. Another comment and something that's been said within the ISOC AU framework, which is the amount of money to actually set up a registrar, how much of a barrier is it, and one of the things that may be in the evaluation mix is do you have small organizations for independent organization actually providing new domain names, and I was thinking particularly of NGOs, I was thinking of the sorts of smaller players who may simply find it too difficult to get a new domain name.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Understood and it's the analysis of those metrics when we get to that next stage that is going to be fascinating reading, I can't wait, quite literally I'm salivating at the thought of it, it's funny things excite me that happens to be one of them.

What we need to do is very much ensure that we have a snapshot of now, and as Garth said, it's not going to be particular pretty in some way, but this gives us a tool to put those pieces of information in a table in the public record and for use and then watch trends as gTLDs come out in the new program.

Regarding the NGOs, to be honest Holly, unless you got a couple of million, you shouldn't be running a registry and tough, there you go. My heart pumps blood, my sympathies, however not enough, perhaps more, -- however, if you have something like the PIR organization who wish to put a new gTLD not .NGO into the root, then you've got a pathway for all those Cheryl Langdon-Orr is a wonderful person, organizations which should be an international NGO to join that. So it should be then .NGO.

So I'm not sure that we want, we're talking gTLDs, right at the top level there, so not everyone should have one, as much as .Holly would be exciting, unless you've got a windfall, you really don't have the capability of running it. But the person who puts together .name, you may very well be a registrant in the .name environment, and that's where we have to tease these things out.

So let's look at what we're talking about now, we're going to look at the number of registry operators, the number of back end registry providers, and the number of accredited registrars. We would love to get the resellers, but we know that's in a too hard basket for now.

Moving on if I may... The English speakers there we go. A bit like Olivier, I shall have to lower my voice perhaps. I've been trying not to have the steroids but I will – anyway evaluation of the market share of those supplier before and after launch of the new gTLDs. Oh, I can't keep that up long.

New entrance and the share of the new registrations and this Garth, I think is where you'll find the snapshot now, and the snapshot then comparison very, very important. New entrance among all registrations including existing registrations, because with all the hoy-palloy and publicity and that will go around the new gTLD roll-out, it may be that a number of people go, domain name, I'd like to register one of those, and we might inadvertently find a growth in .whatever, .museum, .moby, existing ones, right.

So next slide please. There we go, next slide please, I can't do my husband's snore, and that's an in-joke for anyone.

Consumer trust, now this you need to get your teeth into right, refers to the confidence that registrants and users, Evan, and users have in the consistency of name resolution, right, from registrar to registry, and the degree of confidence among registrants and users, we've got it in each time that a TLD registry operator is fulfilling its purpose proposed. That is hugely important ladies and gentlemen.

If .bike said it was going to have a global network of free bike drop off and pick-ups, right, and it ends up to be something entirely different, then we need to know about that. So that part is, I would

be highlighting that part for you. And is it complying with ICANN policies and applicable national laws. That took us, oh Olivier, how long was it; should I not open that nasty wound.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Was it about four or five sessions, each one, one and a half hours long?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, I weary on how long it took us to get those few words together, but I believe you now need to look at them and see whether we've got it good enough and get back to us. Okay.

Next slide please and we're going to come to the home stretch here ladies and gentlemen, moving right along. Proposed metrics, we're not to establishing them yet, we're just playing with them, right. The proposed metrics for consumer trust are as follows: if we've missed anything, now is the time to put your case for a change. They are the percentage of up time for the registry and registrars, we are suggesting that surveys are conducted on consumer trust, Evan, you should be happy about that. That's end user and consumer trust.

We're proposing that the number of alleged violations of proposed registry agreements be measured and used as an ongoing metric. The number and percentage of UDRP and URS complaints and decisions be kept as an ongoing record. And that law enforcement

and GAC to report specifically on instances that raise concerns with the new gTLD registries and registrars.

But, just to take up that point, I believe it's a valuable idea. It's a little bit away from the mandate for these metrics, but it is something that I believe, as ALAC and At-Large, you should encourage your Chairman of ALAC to raise with Kurt and the Management Team for the new gTLDs because case studies are valuable, and if we have samples of case studies in ccTLDs, community TLDs, .brand, it would be ideal to have a set of case studies. So I think that's was a flash of brilliance.

Female:

I will keep you updated about the process. At this moment, at this stage, we are at the very early stage. We are just having some discussions with the local government. But if this goes further and I will discuss it with the ExCom, then I would really strongly propose to take this as a study case indeed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I would be highly surprised if ICANN did not value that offer and if they do, then we have other problems. The proposed metrics, again, in the very fuzzy-edged phase. We're going to look – and we don't even know how we're going to look yet – this is the topics we want to look at.

The transparency and clarity of offerings to registrants; the number of new registrars versus existing registrants. You know, have I just

got all the defensive registrations going on or am I actually getting new registrants in the system after new gTLDs. The choice for registrants to select amongst registrars and registries that are subject to different national laws because we've got this big round globe thing and there's all this jurisdiction differences, so we do need to have them, I guess, classified like we thought earlier on in some of our measurements. And finally, the percentage of defensive registrants in new gTLDs as determined by a number of unique websites. And this is where you can help us by suggesting some of the websites we could be looking at.

Next slide, thank you. Ah, there we go – well, questions. We have nothing but questions, questions, questions, but we have some more. Okay, I see Ganesh and then if Boudouin, if you would like to come and – can we get a mic to Boudouin – do we only have one mic, and then I see Eduardo. Go ahead, Ganesh.

Ganesh Kumar:

Sorry, Cheryl, I think you need to kind of again give me a background because this is the first time I'm hearing about this thing. You know, when you come up with any initiative and trying to measure the effectiveness of a new initiative, why reinvent the wheel and come up with a new set of metrics, because if we had measured internet adoption on these parameters before, as the gTLD adoption picks up and if you look at the same metrics, that should give us an indication of what the impact was before and after.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you want the good news or the bad news?

Ganesh Kumar: Whatever, whatever.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The bad news is those metrics you think exist, do not. The good news is this gives us the opportunity to set them up beforehand. Boudouin, where are you? Oh, you've got a mic. Go ahead. Thank you, sir.

Boudouin Schombe: Cheryl, I am concerned. My question is more concern following a discussion I had with the final users in my country. They ask many questions. They say why the new gTLDs, when we can create our own domain with .fr without looking for additional complications. And also the cost factor that was also asked in this process and the question asked is what is a registry.

We don't see them. It's resellers that are intermediates so we have difficulties to explain these new gTLDs in this hypothesis when you talk consumers this was a concern that was also raised. Who is a consumer and who is a user because after all, we are all consumers and users of our domain. So the problem was to know how to convince final users to fulfill the new concepts of the new gTLDs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

The choice of any consumer and end user to be involved in the New gTLD Program is basically at the “do they make a click on it” end of the spectrum. If you’re talking about registrants, in other words, people who wish to have a name .something, as you were describing the .fr model, there may be – and that’s why we need to measure now and then – they might build all these wonderful newfangled sort of registries and new gTLDs and no one will come. Okay?

That didn’t work. But we need to be able to measure it. So from a consumer perspective, we need to find out if the influx of however many new gTLDs make it through the process and get put into the root and then get registrants within their particular domain, we need to see – has that had an effect on consumer choice, consumer trust and consumer confidence? And it may be a very interesting answer, but we can’t predict. But what this Work Group is about is making clear, identifiable definitions that we can all agree on and saying, Here is a set of measurements we need to take now, before we go this next step into new gTLDs.”

The Review Team that will follow will be in position to make recommendations which is where we come to perhaps feedback into RAA and other issues. But what this Work Group is all about is making sure we get the metrics at pre-launch correct. But it’s not our job to sell confidence in or convince people that New gTLD Programs is or is not a good thing.

But, remember, in new gTLDs, you have the opportunity of many scripts, the multilingual opportunities, the fit for small and niche group purpose could be quite exciting. Okay? I think it's Eduardo. Go ahead.

Eduardo Diaz:

Eduardo Diaz for the record. If we can go back to the previous slide, I just have one question. The second bullet where it says “number of new registrants versus existing registrants” – if I register... if I already have a domain and I now register another domain in a new gTLDs, am I considered a new registrant at that point?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

You may if it is not a defensive registration. If it was a new purpose, perhaps a new mechanism you want to get product X or service Y into a particular language or geographic location, that would be new. But if you've just registered it because you don't want anyone else to, that comes in under the measurement of the defensive ones.

Eduardo Diaz:

Okay, so my question is how do you know if I'm registering a domain defensively or for a new product? I mean, how do you measure that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The defensive ones – one would assume – have a high correlation with original name, right? If I’m registering .apple, .orange and .banana, perhaps I’m interested in fruit, and that would be all separate. But if I’ve done orange.fruit, orange.orange.orange., we can see that parity. Okay? Yaovi, please go ahead.

Yaovi Atohoun: Thank you. Yaovi. It’s a comment from what the question from Boudouin and I think when we had a previous session on outreach, I was asking myself as a user so what is the interest of all these things, but I found out it is very, very important. Even if I have... easily today I can go to .com - there’s something very cheap; me, as an end user, I have to know the routine, I have to get all the information about a new gTLD. The advantages of this thing are very, very important.

So just to mention how it is linked to the outreach. Even if you are not going to pick a new domain or continue a domain, the outreach is very important, even if you are just using the domain or you are a registrant, it is very, very important to have the information, all the information about the new process, the new utility. So just to comment that the Outreach Program is very, very important for we, from the AFRALO or the end users so that we can contribute to the whole process. This is just a comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I’m sure all of us agree with that, Yaovi - it’s critical. These things are not single strings – pardon the pun – they are, in fact, an

interwoven rope that we have to make strong, and that is a metaphor I keep thinking about from the end user perspective.

But remember, if you will, we have what... We're running – are we up to 2.2 or are we still on the underside of two billion internet users at the moment. Well, there's seven billion people on the planet – they're not all going to fit on .com and .net. Final comments – I see Boudouin and then I see Holly. Go ahead, Boudouin.

Boudouin Schombe:

Cheryl, with the new gTLDs we can have two times two, maybe you have more communities, so this more important. With regards to this, those who have domain names and want new gTLDs, if you want to work with the country name – I am thinking very fast; sorry – the question was as follows: Those who have the domain name with .com, .net, etc., they are in a country and we have to do new gTLDs. Should we work with the country code and transfer from .fr to go to the country codes so what are the problems, what are the advantages for the users? What can we tell to the users?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Such a good question. The reason why this is a good question is because the people who don't know about .com; they don't know about existing TLDs. The Country Code TLD operators have varying models. Many of them have been running for several years, and their model may be one that is not able to meet all the needs of their local internet community.

If that's the case, then what I would be saying to those who perceive that they need more and may, in fact, as a community for example - a language group, a cultural group, an interest group - they may see a new gTLD as an opportunity. The question is – is it one that might need to be done just in Congo, in [Makin] country or is it one that needs to be done under Africa as a whole?

These are decisions that the meeting of people together to talk can only decide. And that's why I'm planting these seeds in all of your minds because Olivier and I need back from you, but you also now know what you need to talk about in country. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Raiche:

Holly Raiche, ISOCAU. Just a question – what about also in terms of metrics by language group as well?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I think the measurements of script and language diversity is important, and we have listed those as specific measures. We're lucky because there is actually fairly few – and we've already got the measurement of the internationalized domain names that have come online and they are all new gTLDs. So we are able to take our snapshot now and, yes, we need to look very closely in the future because it may be that a name is only meeting the needs of a particular region or a particular country, and that is going to help decision-making processes in the second or third round, because as that need is in another region or other country, they might need to

accept a similar but not confusingly similar name. Okay, Mohammad, please go ahead.

Mohammad El Bashir: It seems as we are going to collect information pre the launch of gTLDs, it will also be good to look at the objection processes that will be in place. We'll be keen to see if there's registrant users, internet users who are complaining or objecting to the application that will be put forward. So if we follow that process and we also have some sort of metrics coming from ICANN, I trust that that will be good. It will be good to have this information because it's very useful. I hope we have cooperation from ICANN just as basically this information is available in terms of data escrows and all that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have absolute cooperation from ICANN. This is an ICANN Board decision to explore these definitions in metrics and they require all of the component parts of ICANN; all of the ACs and all of the support organizations to have input on it. So it is being taken seriously and it is incredibly important that these measures are public, transparent and ongoing.

Don't just give us a table every 12 months at the Annual General Meeting; run it as a dashboard because some of us would be interested in watching those flows and ebbs of metrics. With reference to the complaints, that is why we thought having input from the government representatives was so important. It is very

likely that their own in-country consumer protection organizations may be a source of complaint that we are unaware of. Not everyone has the ability to escalate something to as formal a thing as a UDRP.

But if it's a misleading domain and people are complaining that in a particular .whatever they are feeling that there is misappropriation or misleading behavior, it will be their local in-country consumer organizations who will hear about that first. Let's face it – Aunt Mary doesn't think of ICANN when she thinks of making a complaint about what she's bought online. Aunt Mary thinks of, "Who is my local member or my local mayor or my local or regional consumer protection organization?" We need ICANN to tap into those metrics as well. Yes, go ahead, Rinalia, and then Evan.

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Thanks, Cheryl. Question about sectorial breakdown of registrars and registries as a tracking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, it's delightfully easy now. We've got pins on the map, at least for the registries and registrars. That needs to be put in an easily digestible form and then we need to see what happens geographically and sectorially, and they are two different things, of course, as we roll out the new gTLDs. That's an essential measure. I couldn't agree more.

The question is how do we tease down into some of the issues that Gareth was referring to earlier. Cause when you peel off the layers of the onion as it is now, there really is only a couple of major players and that needs to be made obvious, and if they have swallowed up all the new gTLDs in two years time or three years time, we need to know that.

So unless those points on the map and in the sector graphing has changed, then I guess we would all be in a position to question the success of the New gTLD Program, certainly on some of the metrics we've put out. And guess what? We have to be diligent on this - the end user and At-Large community. We are the watch dogs on this; we have to watch it carefully.

I'd like to just make sure that we have time to wrap up and I do want to pass to Evan and I want to give Olivier, who shares the joy of this Work Group with me – no, he does not want to speak at all, but... Okay, Evan, go ahead. Okay, Aziz. And then, yes, Sebastien, you will be the last speaker which is only appropriate, sir. Go ahead, Evan.

Evan Leibovitch:

I want to sort of hark back to the distinction between the end user interests and the registrant interests, and one of the things that I haven't heard yet is when talking about issues of trust and choice, we're not talking about, in fact, the most high level trust and choice which is use the DNS or don't use the DNS, as opposed to

which TLD, the choice of using any TLD as opposed to using no TLD.

It's not a coincidence that in the Google Chrome web browser there's not a separate window to put in a search term or a domain name. You type the name of the company and maybe it's a domain or maybe it's a Google search, and you get to where you're going using the same method.

You have people that are capable of getting to the information they want on the internet, totally bypassing the domain name system. When Wikileaks went through problems and all of the registries refused to give them a name and all they had was an IP number, people still found them. So I guess what I am sort of distressed to not hear is when we're talking about issues of choice, it's all within this little money making, domain selling business as opposed to the ultimate and user choice of whether or not to use the domain system at all, or just totally bypass it and use search engines or other means to totally not even use it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Evolution is evolution and it will occur in the naming number and nomenclature on the internet as well. The purpose of this Work Group, however, is to do a before and after measurement for metrics, and establish criteria on terms pre and post new gTLDs. So it's just that we're sticking to our paddock. Is it still worthy of looking at – certainly. But it's not the mandate of this group and it

would be a creeping of scope that would cripple the group's ability to function.

Should we have the discussion – absolutely. And it probably is a perfect opportunity when the Review Team that will follow the At-Large community perhaps will have already a set of opinions that they can feed into that Review Team process cause that's where that belongs. Aziz.

Aziz Hilali:

Cheryl, my question – the new gTLDs – I would like to ask the question regarding those who will submit candidacies with regards to the domain names for a city in Africa, for example, or something sacred - a plant or something that is sacred to this country and that is also a big brand in America and Europe, and automatically with the price of \$185,000 plus infrastructure, it's up to \$1 million. Won't these same marks, the brand who will win. You probably know about .Bakel. This is a city in Senegal that is a charismatic brand and it's a plant also. So how ICANN or the decision makers will rule. Shall we give the priority to something that is sacred rather than something that is commercial? How is it going to be?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

It is my pleasure to tell you that the objections process, as soon as the strings, the proposed strings for new gTLDs comes out, there is a community and a government objections process, so it won't even get through the assessment and funnel if we do our job right.

That fail-safe is in fact already engineered into the system, but what we all need to do is make sure our communities, our governments and our decision makers know about it in a timely manner and we may be able to have some fora or leaders' group in certain regions and countries that can stand united and those types of things will never get through the assessment process line and therefore will not come to auction.

Remember the waiting if you have community support as opposed to .brand. There is different waitings as well. But we recognize – ICANN has recognized – that if it came to a community-based organization or a .brand with big pockets or even a country and a .brand with big pockets, when it goes to auction, we know who will win.

So that the art - and the art is good - is to make sure it never even gets that far and guess what – advertisement time for Evan. His Work Group – Avery and he are leading up a revitalized new gTLD Work Group. One of the tasks will be specifically looking at these objection processes and measures, and I suspect you'll be putting your name down to that immediately. Eduardo – tiny, tiny, tiny. I have a Board member who wants to talk. Go ahead.

Eduardo Diaz:

I'm sorry. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Just a quick question. Are we going to measure those objectives too, I mean, the ones that they don't get through? Is that something of the measure that we're going to do?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have not under the terms of reference of this Work Group, but it is a perfect thing for something like our new gTLD Work Group to keep a metrics measure of because that will be in the public fora. We will see strings come out and we will see them be objected to. So perhaps it's something we can either ask ICANN to make sure is recorded or it's something we can do the watch work on. Sebastien.

Sebastien Bachollet: Thank you very much. I want to congratulate you for the job you are doing because it's a very important point, and I will say that ICANN failed in the previous front to do something consistent with that and it's really very important that you go ahead with that and you succeed in it.

I was wondering if we can... we have some snapshots that were done at the end of the first round. I don't know if it's the same metrics that you are willing to push ahead, but I would like to know if you don't think that it could be interesting to do it again and snapshot now on the situation, and then to see if some of those metrics done at the end of the first round could be useful for the next round or the second round or the third round – I don't know where we are. It's a question, but I think there are very few people who will push that and if this group can do it, I think it will be very useful for ICANN in general. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Sebastien. I think on behalf of Olivier and I, we can say so noted, and what we will insure because, yes, what we are exactly doing the snapshot taking now. What we need to do is look at the snapshot taken then and that isn't on our agenda, but I'm sure we'll push it to the agenda at our next meeting.

Remember, this meeting is an outreach opportunity for us to get At-Large input into the work that the Work Group is doing, and that is going to be something that I look forward to seeing in a Wiki page, should the ALAC decide to adopt the charter and endorse our work going through the existing Work Group, then we will have a multilingual Wiki page set up and that, ladies and gentlemen, is where anything that you think is a good idea, any challenge, any question can be put and Olivier and I will as promptly as we can, as mere humans, respond to it and take it on to the Work Group. Final calls for anything. If not, I'm plum tuckered out, desperately need a drink of water and will hand back to the Chair. Sir.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and thank you for your fantastic presentation. Certainly a lot of input from At-Large and that's really, really great because that's exactly the sort of input that was required by the Working Group and we have been asked to spend the time on it and I'm very glad that we did spend the time and have so much input to bring back to the Working Group.

If I could just remind everybody to speak slowly for the interpreters who came to me earlier and asked me for their survival. I'm the first perpetrator of speaking too fast, so I do apologize for that and I have asked Heidi from time to time to wave at me and either hit me or something to tell me slow down.

The next part we have – and unfortunately we have half an hour to deal with this until we have the lunchtime break and working lunch – we have half an hour to go through the At-Large improvements and the review of the Milestone Report and also the next steps.

So the Milestone Report is actually linked to the agenda that we have, and just to give you a quick background and what I will do is to just read basically the purpose of this report which is in the report itself that gives a very short intro of what this Milestone Report is all about.

Initially... Well, every part of ICANN has to go through an improvements process where an external organization is contracted to review a part of the organization and produce a set of recommendations for the improvement of that part of the organization.

The improvements or the recommendations are gathered from interviews of members within the organization, outside the organization, from observing the processes, a whole number of parameters that get taken into account. This then gets reviewed by the community and the recommendations are amended and there's a great deal of input from the community itself to improve the

improvement recommendations – it’s a double improvement process.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr at the time was Chair and initiated this and, in fact, I don’t know... Do you wish to say a couple of words about the early days because this happened prior to my actually arriving on the scene. So maybe a couple of words from you, Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I think what’s important to note, and why every one of you should be very proud of how we, as a group, Regional, At-Large structure and ALAC, approach that is in the early days it was like every other review. The independent reviewers did their remunerations and interviews and various other things, then they made their report.

Then the ICANN-convened Management Work Group look at those recommendations, go through other iterations of public comments and discourse and review with you and everyone else in the ICANN community. Then they make a set of recommendations which were - with one exception – adopted by the ICANN Board. There was a modification from the recommendation for having two voting Board members selected by the At-Large and that was reduced to one. So we ended up with a very interesting set of 13 primary recommendations.

By the SIL meeting we had done something rather special and which no other reviewed group in ICANN had done. We had taken those lumpy recommendations and put them into a set of implementiales and a bunch of sub-units, so we listed enablers, things we believed would need to be done for each of these recommendations to be implemented.

And instead of leaving it to the 15-person ALAC, or some sub-committee thereof, we put it back to the regions. We formed the Work Teams which were led by regional people, which were populated by ALS members and regional people and, of course, which ALAC members had the right and privilege to be engaged in, but on an equal footing. So this is the best example of a bottom-up input *via* this Work Team model that we came up with that is unique in ICANN and I believe should be seen as best practice for the future. Thank you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. So picking up from where Cheryl left off, the four Work Teams worked very hard and produced an expanded set of recommendations from the original 12 which they dealt with, the 13th one being the selection of a Board member and we have that Board member actually in the room, Sebastien Bachollet.

So the 12 recommendations were worked on and from there, thanks to having a consultant also come on the case, Seth Green, whom I think many of us have interacted with – I'm not sure

whether – he is online. So may we ask him any questions or could he add anything or is this technically a bit difficult?

UF: No, I think it's fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Think it's fine. Okay. Can we ask him to maybe add a little bit of his point of view, his input in this please? And I don't have a magic button to get Seth online so someone will have to check in with Adigo. Okay, well, in the meantime then, let's just pursue. So these recommendations gave another set of recommendations, an expanded set, and this, of course, has to work hand-in-hand with the Board's Structural Improvements Committee because the whole process is actually part of ICANN's DNA.

So the whole set of recommendations has now been put into a report; that report was published. I would think that At-Large Advisory Committee members have read that report and have then voted on that report, on whether it reflected the views of their community and their convictions and the vote, having passed the report, was passed on to the Structural Improvements Committee.

I'm glad to announce that the Structural Improvements Committee has met this morning at the same time as when we were meeting, and just about an hour ago have all agreed to pass this whole report on to the Board for Board consideration. So that's a good point forward.

Now the process is far from finished because the improvements process actually includes implementation of the recommendations that were made. So we've done a lot of work so far, but there's still plenty more work coming up for us. And so one thing which I would like to achieve today is to take the next steps at what we are going to do from now on.

Now the four Work Teams that were in place have lived for, I would say - is it nearly two years - have been very, very productive, but it is time now to move into the next step parts and that will require probably the formation of a new Working Group with someone leading that new Working Group, and so what I wanted to actually suggest already – and this is a suggestion and it's open for discussion – so if anyone thinks that it should be handled in a different way, then this is the time now to discuss it.

I was going to suggest that, as the person who has started the improvements process, that person might have the knowledge, the experience, the background, the overall view of the improvements process to be able to carry it to its conclusion, and was therefore going to suggest Cheryl Langdon-Orr to lead the Working Group that we are going to form today to continue and bring this – the Task Force – okay, we'll call it, sorry – a Task Force and lead the Task Force to take it there.

So the Task Master, whatever.... No, TM – that will clash with another acronym so we'll have to find something else. Anyway, the floor is open for discussion. Okay, well, there's no discussion.

That's interesting, so either, I gather, either everyone is terrorized by Cheryl or [laughter]... Tijani Ben Jemaa.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: Thank you, Olivier. There is no better decision than to put Cheryl at the head of this Task Force. She started the recommendation report that was approved on the basis of which we created the work teams for the Implementation Report. She was everywhere, in all the work teams. She already had done the first report. So if she is not in this final Task Force, I will be very unhappy indeed.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Tijani, for your intervention. Just to remind everyone – the improvements actually cover an enormous amount of ground and I have had... we've actually got some of the ground that have been dealing with other parts of At-Large which were all included in those work teams. Work Team A dealt with the ALAC's continuing purpose within ICANN. Work Team B dealt with the increasing participation by At-Large structures.

And a number of things have already actually come out of that. The increasing participation is a core part of ICANN and certainly we are already working with other working teams to push this forward. The improving ALAC and At-Large strategic, operational and financial planning processes is actually already partly in use for our input into the strategic plan into the ICANN overall Operational Plan and that will translate and we really are hoping that this will progress, will translate into us having, well,

what we need to operate to expand and that's money, that really is the core of the game for this - the funding for our activities that we wish to continue to offer to our members and to actually get new members coming from around the world.

And the enhancing of the ALAC's policy advice process is extremely important since one of our core jobs is to get the views and the comments from our members out there, the people at the edge, to have the actual input directly into the ICANN policy processes. And if we do not streamline the way that we do this today, when we have 300, 400, goodness knows, 1,000 organizations – and I'm hoping that we will reach that number, of course – when we have that number of people speaking, it will be absolutely impossible for us to be able to stream the information from the edge to the top of the ICANN pyramid.

So it's important that we today make sure that we have processes in place to make sure even the faintest voice out there gets listened to because the biggest criticism, the biggest failure that we would have would be to not be able to actually convey that information from the edge to the top. So any comments, questions? And if not, then I will ask. Okay, Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Just to give notice to those regional leaders in the room and those members of particularly this region – this is vitally important that

some of this work is done hand-in-glove with you, as leaders, and with your individual ALSs, right down to rank and file members.

There will be many opportunities for sub-committees and committees of the whole and cross-regional committees. What we need to do is find ways to work smarter, not harder, in the engagement process, and I think that's going to take some seriously clever thinking. So if I may be so bold as to suggest an agenda item for the Costa Rica meeting, I would like to see perhaps a half-day exercise devoted just to this when we have the opportunity of the regional leadership and ALS members in the room. Thank you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond;

Thank you, Cheryl, and that's a very interesting suggestion and I wonder if... I'm ready to second that and maybe put it as an action item because I certainly believe that we have to push forward with this. I see a number of nods so, Matt, an action item to... Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, fine. You can read minds, can you, Heidi? Great. [laughter] I better shield what I'm thinking of. Okay, great so – no, it's just the tiredness and the zoning in and out sometimes that lets you wander off in a direction or the other. Anyway, another coffee will take care of it. [laughter]

So what we need then today is to form this Task Force, bearing in mind, actually, that some of the recommendations in there will actually be dealt with and be tackled by already existing Working Groups that are already there. There is one thing which Evan has

just reminded me of, and that was the question of the vote which took place.

Out of 14 votes that were expressed, we had a number of members who abstained and a number of members who voted no in this specific vote and I thought it would be fair to allow them to express themselves if they wish to as to why they abstained or voted no. So first – one abstention and three nos. Okay, so thank you, Matt. So the one abstention is actually sitting right next to me and that's Evan and I thought perhaps – Evan, do you wish to say anything about your abstention or...?

Evan Leibovitch:

I carefully considered the report, and although I totally with most of what is in there, there's one or two contentious points that I had a problem with, and I think some others will also mention this. And it had to do with the section to - I believe it came out of Work Team B - about ALAC member participation and it used the word sanctions – that there be some kind of a regime considered that if an ALAC member was considered to either not attend meetings or not participate in votes, that it was ALAC to actually invoke sanctions against the person.

Myself and I think some others who might want to talk also here, had a problem with this in saying that if a region sends somebody to ALAC, this is an accountability issue to that RALO, and not an issue to be dealt with by ALAC - that while one may want to consider issues to recall somebody that was elected if they're not

effective, that is a choice for the region; that is an issue for the people that elected that representative.

In the case of the Nominating Committee, that's a different issue that needs to be dealt with, with them. But I was very strongly of the opinion that the word sanctions was inappropriate to have in the report. It may have been passed by the ALAC Review to the Improvements Team, but the Improvements Team had the option to consider and reject that before putting it in the report. So that's simply an explanation of why I abstained on it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. And we have a queue already regarding this. Next is Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair. I voted – this is Carlton for the record – I voted no and I voted no on principle because if you look at the specific letters in the report, it says “create and implement a transparent sanctions process in the first instance.” I believe it is simply wrong-headed for you to speak of sanctions for volunteers, on principle.

Secondly, I believe that any kind of reference to discipline for membership must go back to the root. I am trying here to insure that we preserve the bottom up process. When a member is elected to ALAC from a RALO, it is the business of the RALO to keep

and make that member accountable. I do not believe it is the ALAC's business to impose that from above.

What I do believe, however, is that the ALAC has a duty of care to insure that the RALO has the information that it needs to at least guide their response to the accountability of that member. Similarly, with regard to a member that is promoted to the ALAC by the NomCom process, I believe we should revert to the process to keep that member accountable, and therefore, what we might suggest is a better vetting process for members who are proposed for sitting on the body.

I also believe that the proper response is for the NomCom to develop a recall process for that commission. I think it is very important for us not just to give... to keep the spirit, the letter of the bottom up process – conserve that – but we also must in spirit do the same. And that is why I voted no.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton, and your comment is on the record, so that's great. Next on my list is Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa: I disagree with Carlton. Although we are volunteers, we should not stop the advance of an institution, the operation. A municipal counselor is a volunteer, but there are provisions in the regulations if he's two or three times absent, he will be eliminated. This concept of sanctions was introduced during the initial report and

the initial report was approved. Then the Work Team working on this subject was presented this work during two or three sessions at ICANN, similar to the one we have today, so I don't know why its reserves were not expressed when it was presented.

Finally I would like to say that if the term sanction is displeasing to many people, we can replace it, but the concept of saying that if we are volunteers we can do whatever we want to – we can come, not come, vote or not – this is troubling to me, and this would lead to ALAC's work being impeded. So it's a RALO and NomCom who selected him – it's their problem, but also it's ALAC's problem.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you, Tijani. Carlton, what I'm trying to do is first get everyone's point of view and I know we've also got an extensive email discussion that took place. I'm not sure that we actually have the time to debate the actual issues there, and what I was going to suggest then is that all of this material gets taken for the Task Force to deal with because I think this is certainly something that might be divisive.

But I can also hear much common ground as to everyone thinking, "Well, we can't just come here and do anything. There is a responsibility for each one of us." How that responsibility gets put forward is something which we are going to have to discuss because clearly there are differing points of view. Okay with you, Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Well, not really, Chair, but I will abide by the ruling. [laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you and I appreciate it. Next is Sergio.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. For the record I'm Sergio Salinas Porto and I will speak in Spanish. I voted against; I was one of the negative votes and that is because of 9.4.5.2; 9.4.2.3, 555 and 9.4.5.6. I believe that more effort should be invested by RALOs and ALAC for members to be more acquainted with their rights and duties.

Applicants' rights, people who are being candidates for elected positions, should be clear for those who take them on. Performance Reports could be a possibility once the fiscal year is over, once the tenure year is over, by letting the RALOs know how their ALAC members are performing. But ALAC could not sanction RALO's reps because they are sovereign and they choose their reps. It's not the other way around.

We are here because there were regional ALS groups that voted for us to be here. That is why we need to go back to our ALSs and tell them about their actions, and not the other way around. ALAC should not have super powers on the RALOs and that was my point. There is no possibility of sanctions against the region members. Regions should sanction their own people – not the other way around. ALAC cannot sanction ALSs. That's all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sergio. And I can now see a whole rainbow of different views in there and I'm sure that will all go into the input process. Next on my list is Darlene, and then there'll be Wolf afterwards. So Darlene, please.

Darlene Thompson: I'll be brief. As you mentioned, we did have an extensive email conversation on this. Sorry, my name is Darlene Thompson, for the record; Secretariat for the North American RALO, so I'm not speaking as an ALAC member, but as a person from the region. And right now it is very difficult for the regions to be able to track what their ALAC members are doing. I mean, sure, I can because I'm here and I can see them, but the regional people don't have that, so they don't know if they're showing up to meetings when they're here, traveling. Sorry.

They don't know if they're showing up to ALAC telephone conferences and they don't know if their elected reps are giving any kind of substantive input, rather than just saying, "Me too, me too," on any vote or anything like that.

We need much better lines of information coming from the ALAC back to the regions saying on a regular basis, "Here is what your rep is doing." I don't believe it should be at the end of their term; I think it should be continuously, every few months, so that a problem can be dealt with, and perhaps that person needs encouragement.

Also I think at the beginning of every election, the ALAC should provide the RALO with a job description – “Here is what you should be voting on – this type of person that can do this job.” That way, the RALO will know what they’re looking for in an ALAC person, and also then the ALAC person can say, “Hey, here’s what I bring to the table and will be able to do this job for you.”

That way, both parties know up front what they’re in for and what their expectations should be. So again, I agree it shouldn’t be about sanctions from the ALAC, but if the ALAC cannot sanction and right now the RALOs do not have enough information to be able to track their elected members, so things need to be improved. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Darlene, and I do have to point your attention to the fact that on Tuesday we have a session at 14:00 that will deal specifically with the development of ALAC metrics and that is something which Gisella will be able to speak to us about – what can be tracked. And perhaps that is already a first step into moving in a direction where I’ve seen quite a few people nod their head with the mention of metrics. Maybe that is something that is one of the solutions or partial solutions to the problem that we are facing here today. Next on my list is Wolf, and then Sandra. So, Wolf, please.

Wolf Ludwig:

I have a feeling there is a certain misunderstanding who is in charge. Is it the responsibility of ALAC or is it a shared responsibility? In my eyes it needs to be a shared responsibility. And I agree I don't like the word sanctions. This is an inappropriate term in this context and I entirely agree with Carlton when you deal with volunteers.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that a volunteer community, by the time, needs some professionalization as well. So we are not just here for our own purpose – we have a mandate to represent as user and consumer communities on a regional and At-Large level and therefore we have to fulfill certain requirements and obligations. And I entirely agree with some votes from my colleagues that as far as regional selected ALAC reps are concerned, I think the region has a particular responsibility.

Coming back to Darlene's question – for me, I think I have, as a regional officer, together with Oksana who is the Regional Secretariat, we have a special supervision function in this direction. I need to know what are our elected members – even the NomCom selected ones – is doing, the way he/she represents our region at At-Large, and I must have a solid idea about this.

And then I can consult with my region to say, "This is a person who has done a marvelous job," as we had many examples in the past, or I may bump into a case where I feel this time it was not sufficient and then I have to argue, I have to discuss with the person. And I cannot delegate this responsibility to At-Large, but it must be solved in a cooperative way with the ExCom of At-

Large and with the other colleagues and I think it needs to be called shared responsibility.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Wolf. And I think that you meant ALAC – the committee rather than At-Large dealing with this, so... Thank you. Next on the list is Sandra, and then José Arce. And we're very close to lunchtime and I'm sure you're all very hungry. So, Sandra first. Sandra.

Sandra Hoferichter: Sandra Hoferichter for the record. Thank you, Olivier. I just want to be very brief. I absolutely agree with many things said, especially by Darlene and Wolf, and I don't feel this is contradictory to the Milestone Report because it is about shared responsibility – ALAC and the regions has to find a solution and I know that Beau Brendler - I don't know if I spell his name right, but you might know him – he made a proposal on the mailing list to set up a Working Group who goes into detail and this Working Group or the share of the Working Group does not necessarily have to be an ALAC member. It can also be one of the regional representatives. And I think we can... I mean, that would be a proposal I would strongly support. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sandra, and next is José Arce.

José Arce:

I'm José Arce for the record. I will speak in Spanish. For the record, José Arce is my name. I'm the Chair of LACRALO and I would like to make a brief comment because I know you're hungry and about these issues that were discussed about the sanctions.

I agree with the fact that we don't call them sanctions, but what I do want to highlight is that there should be some kind of consequence because of the actions of the members of ALAC. What we're discussing at the meeting of the officers that there should be some kind of consequence for the inactive ALSs, so if we agree - most of the regions - there has to be some consequence for the inactive ALSs and there should be some consequence for inactivity of some ALAC members.

I don't think this is thought in the same sense if we say that there has to be some consequence for an inactive ALS rather than for an ALAC member. This is food for thought only. That's all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, José. Certainly with regards to the inactive or non-active ALSs, I know that the Secretariats are currently engaged in a discussion process, so that, I guess, is a parallel discussion. I'm not sure whether one can learn from one discussion and bring it into the other discussion. It might be possible.

But clearly I see there is some consensus around the room about not being completely inactive. There is a consensus about having metrics of some sort and that's something which we're going to be

dealing with later this week. And so I think while we're not going to solve this subject today, but certainly it's a really good base to build now the working Task Force that will be able to work on these issues.

I was going to propose a couple of things. The first one – with regards to the Task Force – is that... what I was going to propose was that anyone from ALSs, regional leadership and ALAC members can attend. Is anyone against that? I'm not going to have any vote because it just takes more of our time and our lunch will probably be finished by the time we get there. But does anyone object to having anyone being able to join this group? Sergio.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sergio Salinas Porto for the record. I will speak in Spanish. Let me ask you something if I may. Will there be a possibility of having an interpreting efforts at the Task Force meetings so that we can have the involvement of members from the different regions because if we only speak English, at least in RALO ALAC, many organizations cannot speak English and would certainly like to be part of that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

That's a very good question, Sergio, and I am unable to give you the answer right now. It obviously has to do with financing of this, and that's something which I haven't considered. So we will be getting back to you on this, but your question has been noted. So

perhaps as an AI we do need to find out and establish... find out the costs. Tijani.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Thank you, Olivier. I believe Christina came to the last meeting and she told us it would be possible to have the translation for a Work Group when people were requiring. And she asked us there was a Work Group there were some people from this room who have to see which Work Group whose members want to participate but are not able due to linguistic barriers and we were not able to find a list of those Work Groups. So on principle, there is an agreement Christina told us here, but I do not believe there is any restrictions or constraints to have interpretation in Work Group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

I just do not wish to commit today to saying yes when suddenly I'd be told no because that certainly would disappoint everyone. What I wish to say is to keep the door open, bearing in mind that we have spoken with Christina about this and that Christina will be seeing us later – I don't know if it's even today or later... Today. Oh, okay, that would be fresh in our minds. She will be coming later today. If I could, I would say, "Yes, absolutely, we should be able to work for something as important as that," but now we just need to find out on a step-by-step basis.

What I was going to ask before we break off for lunch is to have a show of hands for volunteers as a starting group in this Task Force. The fact being that we can add more volunteers, of course, for all

those people who are not here at the moment and of course, we will have a call for volunteers from the regions. And on top of that, bearing in mind that the main Task Force might have to be cut into smaller sub-Task Forces such, but that really will be up to Cheryl who will be leading the effort, depending on how many things have to be dealt with at the same time.

I don't think that we would have the whole Task Force deal with absolutely every single issue; but then maybe I'm speaking too early and it will be up to Cheryl with her very extensive experience in those things to choose at that point.

So the first thing was just a show of hands as to who wishes to be part of this effort. And if I could have someone record that from staff please. Or perhaps, can we all say our name into the record and then we can get it from the transcript.

So Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I gather. I see Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I see Sergio; Jose Arce; Cintra – cause I see Cintra and I see Tijani and it unclicks in the head. It just goes totally wrong. Tijani; Dave Kisoondoyal. It's a little bit like when you have these words in colors and you have to see the color and the words are different and it just makes a mess to your head. Salanieta. We have Edmon Chung. We have Sylvia; we have Darlene and behind I saw a hand without a body. Oh was that?

Evan Leibovitch:

A head without a body?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: No, a hand without a body. I just saw a hand. Was that Ganesh? Did you put your hand up? No, because from this perspective, I just see hands and so it's difficult to recognize you by your hand, let alone with the distance by your face.

Evan Leibovitch: It's the new Zombie RALO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: [Laughing] The new Zombie RALO, right. Okay, well if anyone else – and I know you can all participate also, members of the audience, if anyone else feels that they wish to participate, and they don't wish to commit themselves right now, then of course, we will acknowledge and bring them into the Task Group. Cheryl, do you wish to say any further words before we close off for lunch? I see you are very hungry; I think we all are. I would like to thank absolutely everyone.

Just the one Action Item, of course, is the follow-up on this Task Force. Okay, thank you. And so I would like, before we break off for lunch, to give you what the arrangements are. There is a tent outside which sells sandwiches and drinks, etc. The good news is that it's not very far; the bad news is that it only accepts CFA francs, and for those of you who haven't got CFA francs, there are two cash machines that are located on the premises. The good news is that they are on the premises; the bad news is that they are

over in the hotel next door. But you are able to get the cash from over there and you are able also to bring back the food to this room.

What we will have is a working lunch with Cheryl Langdon-Orr who will be standing far away from us because her mouth will be full at the same time, who will be leading a team building exercise, I understand. Is that correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That is correct, Olivier, and it's Cheryl for the transcript record. Before you let the denizens loose upon the sandwich sellers, I wondered if I could suggest that I set a tiny little task for them to think about before they come back. That's all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sorry, Cheryl, I didn't hear the last word.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That would be because you weren't listening, Mr. Chairman.
[Laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I was. I have two ears – one for Evan; one for you – two Vice Chairs.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, the one for me wasn't open. I wondered if I might, before you let everyone loose on the sandwich sellers, just set everyone a little task cause I can think at least it's going to take about 20 minutes for that logistics to work. So I might just set a little task for them to think about while they're standing out there buying their sandwiches.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: To set everyone on the task?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A task – I will set a task.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Ah, okay, fine. Great. Yes, I'm sorry. The ears are... the whole thing is actually frying at the moment. So, well, do you want to go ahead with it?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you're ready, sir, yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm certainly ready. My ears definitely are not anymore, but I'll try and listen.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, the concept of when you come back here with your lunch will be for the ALAC and regional leaders – new and old – to gather around this table, right, with your lunches. But we’re going to start some ice-breaking and some discussions and perhaps learn a little bit about each other and our methods and mechanisms.

While you’re at lunch, I would like you to be able to come back into the room to share with us, if you will – and there ought to be none that don’t – what animal, mythical or otherwise – you believe you are – in inverted commas – and also what person – alive or dead, or even imaginary – you would wish to have an afternoon’s conversation with. And by discussing those two things, we’ll learn an awful lot about each other. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. So what animal do you think you are; what person would you like to speak to? Does it actually also matter if you’re an animal that cannot speak to that person?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Magic will be in the room.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Magic in interpretation, I would gather, as well. Okay, right. Well, thank you very much and bon appétit, everybody. Oh, and one more thing also. One last thing from Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: I want to thank everybody. We've received 17 responses to the survey. The answers are actually been somewhat distressing as I guess we expected. If you have not done the survey, please refer to the link that has been posted in both the Skype chat and the Adobe Connect room. We have it here or ask me. The information is going to be very valuable as we go back to the hotel, as we go back to meeting staff. And I will also be publishing a link later that will have a summary report of what everyone has said. One person has actually responded that their sink is missing.
[laughter]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan, and this morning session is now adjourned.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Great, well thank you very much. That was refreshing; I'm sure we'll have more discussions like this, hopefully, in the rest of the week; but in the meantime, we have to get back down to our order and our long agenda, with item number seven on there, which is the JAS, Joint Applicant Support Working Group final report, in which we'll deal with a review and the next steps. At this time, we have Rafik Dammak, who is one of the co-chairs of that Working

Group that is available that is accessing us remotely; and we also have, of course Carlton Samuels, who is the other co-chair of this Working Group.

As we all know, the JAS is an extremely important part of the New gTLD process because if ICANN starts a New gTLD process without having an applicant support system in place or as a roadmap of some sort, then of course the criticism from outside of ICANN that ICANN is only concerned about rich countries; namely North America and Western Europe, basically just opens a flank on the side of ICANN. I'm not quite sure whether I've said that correctly, but let's just not look at that and say that we are going to have a support process.

Before I continue rambling, I think I'm going to give the floor over to Carlton Samuels, who is going to be leading this specific session. I understand there is a progress report and also questions, etc. So Carlton, the floor is yours.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon everybody; my name is Carlton Samuels, for the record. We're trying to reach Rafik Dammak, who is the co-chair of the JAS Working Group. Just to give you a small introduction until we get Rafik; the work of the JAS Working Group actually got ceded way back -- in the At-Large, as far back as March of 2009, at the At-Large summit held at Mexico City.

The Chair has spoken about some of the concerns from At-Large, and he was merely echoing those concerns that came at that time. We were concerned that the digital economy was important to everybody's well-being around the world, that there was some effort made by ICANN to ensure that developing economies and areas of the world outside of the traditional large economies could participate. We were looking for substantive ways to make this possible.

With the coming of the New gTLD Program, it was felt that perhaps one of the most significant ways that ICANN could show its true colors, in being a truly global, all-embracing organization is to encourage the development of registries in the developing world, and the support mechanisms that will enable a sustainable approach to the operations of these registries.

So out of that, some agitation, the Board resolution which signaled that the Board actually accepted the notion, and ALAC was very responsive in working with the GNSO in chartering a cross-community work group, the JAS Working Group for short, and that took on the topic.

We were charged with coming up with a plan that was sustainable to allow the community to support an ICANN led process of finding support for persons, groups, communities that were desirable of participating in the New gTLD Program by establishing registries and associated supporting structures. The Working Group has been active since June of last year; it was ably led in the concept by members of our community; my friends Evan

Liebovitch, and Avri Doria, who is not here, and was a member of the community but then co-resident in the GNSO, to lead the Working Group. The Working Group, you can read the report, it shows you the Working Group has been meeting twice a week by teleconferences since that time.

There were two interim reports that were produced, and they are hosted on the website, ICANN website. And finally, we got to Singapore, where the substantive development there was the Board committing a seed fund of \$2 million to aid in the effort, and the GAC made some spirited interventions in support of the objectives to which the JAS Working Group had subscribed.

As you would imagine, the early going has not been without some pain, and some controversies. You would imagine that in our first dispensation where we chartered a work group and then discussions about chartering was then one of the big things on the then Chair of the ALAC, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, to negotiate our way around that.

It was a challenge. In the end, we came up with something we could both live with, so we began to work to develop some advice to the Board and to ICANN as to how we might achieve this objective of supporting entrance into the registry space from developing economies and other areas, other groups historically outside of the process. I'm very pleased to tell you that we have produced, I believe, a monumental work based on extremely focused effort of everyone.

We had lively discussions; please understand that the final report, which outlines the Working Group recommendations for support of JAS applicants is now produced. It remains for us to ensure that the entire community understands what has been recommended.

It remains for us to continue to ensure that the Working Group remains focused in the objectives to which we are severally committed; it remains for us to ensure that the clarifications, additions, specializations, anything that might improve the recommendations that we're giving, be given hearing, and we encourage them. And we hope that you will continue to work with us to see through these recommendations. I wonder if Rafik is on; is Rafik on?

Female: Yes.

Carlton Samuels: Okay, so I'm going to ask Rafik Dammak, who is the co-chair of the JAS work group to pitch in here with a few words. Rafik? The floor is yours.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Carlton. Hello, everyone. I wanted to be with everybody in Senegal, but I could not. I am happy to participate in the discussion, especially to talk about the JAS Working Group. It may be hard to speak after my colleague, Carlton, but maybe I can make a few points in relation to JAS and especially to core

(inaudible) ICANN meeting. So we have produced the final report and we have public period open for comment, so first I would like to encourage everybody to submit comments and feedback to the report.

And there is a Public Forum this week with a planned topic for a chat which will be agreed if we have individuals and organization like also stakeholder groups, situated speaking and making statements during the Public Forum to support the work done by JAS.

Any service will be welcome, especially for this meeting, and I heard Peter say that non-commercial stakeholder groups we are discussing about datum to support JAS work and I heard that also ALAC is going to make a statement but I'm not sure, so maybe I can get confirmation from here.

And I do think stakeholder groups and ALAC can cooperate on that marker, because we have common ground about the JAS work and the need to support applicants from developing countries, and to make this New gTLD Program inclusive, and that because everybody has had a lot of expectations from this program, and we cannot waste this opportunity. So I will be happy to get feedback, comments, and questions; maybe I'm not going to be present for the whole session, but you have Carlton present there, and so that's my final word. Thank you everybody.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Rafik. That was the co-chair for the JAS Working Group, Rafik Dammak. He's from the NCSG group of the GNSO. I mentioned earlier that this work came out, because it was a work, I think it's a work of love for most of us that were involved, and the At-Large representation, I can tell you I was very proud and pleased to be a part of.

We had a very strong At-Large team working on this. It started with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, with Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Cintra Sooknanan, Carlos Aguirre, several others. The Chair of the Working Group, who will tell you he was lurking, but he's been on a lot and participated and was well received, was there. Some others, who I probably won't get the names, but I can tell you, you will see a list of them in the report, that are on the team.

And we had some members from the GNSO who were always with us, and came in very strongly in helping us to fashion what we have come up with; Avri Doria, of course, who is a member of our constituency now, was instrumental as I say, from the start in helping us to fashion this, and she was very, very important in fashioning the report along with Evan Liebovitch and Cintra Sooknanan and Andrew Mack, from the business community, took part. Is he here, is Andrew?

Oh, I see Andrew there; thank you Andrew, welcome, glad to see you. Andrew was also a member of the drafting team, so I'm saying this to let you know that the group that produced this report represented a broad swath of the ICANN constituency, and I want

to thank them for their efforts on behalf. Alex Gakuru was there as well, and we had folks who came in from the GAC who participated.

The work we did was time consuming and was intense, but again, we managed to fashion a report for production by the help of the staff that is associated, and here again I want to thank the staff who participated in making the report what it is, and providing stellar support; Karla Valente, our own Gisella Gruber-White, Seth Greene, Rob Hoggarth, they did some really good work and Glen de Saint Géry, several others were very, very important in getting this report together.

Now, I'm not going to spend all the time going through the slides; I'm going to tell you that. I'm just going to ask Mark to advance through them at a slow pace, and I will kind of just point you to things I would want you to focus on. So this is not going to be one of these presentations that goes slide by slide, at all. It's just to let you focus.

Tomorrow we're going to have a more fulfilling intervention; so here goes. Mark? Yes, I want you to look very carefully on here as I talk about why we are providing support; it reinforces the message that we want to send to the community, it's very important that you have a look at those reasons, and ensure that you have a message that you can share around them. Next slide.

The clarification that we provide here for the terminology; like in every ICANN situation, there's going to be a lot of terms that

come up. We want to ensure that the terms are consistent and that you begin to use these as part of your own internal messaging systems so that we become familiar with the terms as we go along.

Next slide. The support, why we support; it gives you the background, because context is important for you to understand what the overall message is. So what we tried to do here is to give you context so that you can begin to see how the message was developed, what we did to ensure that the message was correct, and what we will do to ensure that the message is transmitted. Next slide?

The time line information is there for you, and that's just to ensure that you make people understand that this was not a hurry come up process; we've been at it for a little while, and some of us have been thinking about it. I can tell you, at the summit in Mexico City in March of 2009, that was when the idea of what we could do – we always had a notion, in the At-Large, that as part of its internationalization, ICANN had to make specific, do specific things to ensure that the global community understands, that it sees itself as a global citizen, and therefore was in touch with the needs of the entire community. We've always had that proposition in the At-Large; in 2009 what we tried to do was to find a way to make that concrete. Next slide.

The final report; as you read the report, it's important for you to understand the structure of it, because it will help again to allow you, in the messaging, to point others to where they might get the information quickly, and it might bear some fruit. So it's divided

in these sections, and the headings are very clear; why we should provide support, who should be provided such support, how do we figure out and determine those who qualify for support, what kinds of support can and should be given, how the process should work, and how does this relate to the generic New gTLD Programs, the processes there, and so on. Next slide.

The first sentence encapsulates why, and I just gave you a chance to look at them up there. There are a couple of things that we, in the At-Large, are committed to; inclusiveness is one of our interests. Inclusiveness, in our context, means that we bring in; we do whatever we need to bring in the underserved communities, those who do not have enough and those who are not reached at the moment, into the process.

That is our inclusiveness. And we want to do it now; and here forward, so the argument is why do we want to have an applicant support program in the first round. It is because our constituency cannot wait. They are underserved now, and we need to do what we have to do to make sure that they are brought into the mainstream. That is a principle argument. Why now? It is because they are underserved now, and they have been underserved for quite a while, and we want to ameliorate, we want to make better, we want to intervene to improve that situation now.

When we say underserved communities, we just don't mean communities that are economically deprived; we have communities that are excluded because of language, that are excluded simply because they are outside of the mainstream, and

so on. We want to ensure that those communities have an equal chance to come into the light. So underserved communities, in our context, is not just about economics; it's about all social aspects that are absolutely important to the idea of development, the idea of inclusiveness to which we are committed. Next slide.

There they are; these are the communities, these are the kinds of needs that we think should be considered for support. Notice cultural, linguistic, and ethnic communities underserved in the present constructs. Languages, language communities that are now excluded; we're looking to include them and to make them a part of this inclusive community to which we are committed.

Civil society groups that are actors in the public interest – note them. We are not excluding entrepreneurial candidacies at all; we are not hostile to the idea that entrepreneurs can, in fact, serve the public good. It's very important to note that. That is why the business community enthusiastically engaged in this effort. Next slide.

So the contrast; notice the elements that we are not arguing positively for within this context. I should make one small point on the second bullet; our friends in the GAC has raised the issue of whether or not governments or government entities should expect support within the JAS concept. As it stands at the minute, there is no consensus around that issue, but there is significant support for the idea that at least some levels of government can and should be supported.

We are still open, as I say, to explore a mechanism by which we can determine what those should be, but in our minds, even though it is written there in the final report; the suggestion from the GAC is worth consideration. The time just did not allow the Working Group to reach consensus around this particular issue; but we are not saying it is locked out. We're saying that it requires further study and further engagement in the community. Next slide, please.

A big issue of course, and that came up in the responses to the interim reports, was what we consider service to the public interest. We have spent a lot of time trying to ensure that there is some clarity delivered to the community in the thinking of the JAS Working Group; so we have listed some of the attributes that we think would be relevant to a determination of what is the public interest, within this context. They are up there on the board. Next slide.

Of course, the touchstone for the report is to ensure that we lower or remove the economic barrier to entry. So fee reduction is a natural lightning rod. You would imagine that that would be a bit controversial in this environment, but it is the view, consensus, substantive view and consensus view of the Working Group that you must begin to look at a fee reduction scenario to lower the barrier to entry; remove or lower significantly the economic barriers. There is also the issue of how do you pay?

Let us assume that fees are reduced, but then you still have a barrier, because of your cash flow situation. The next bullet gives a

way to answer this question, the schedule of fees and payments, a schedule of payment, as it were.

And then there are some other things that could be done to reduce the burden by seeking to lighten the load, as it were, of some of the process and operation requirements, as well as give example of ways that these could be mitigated. The development fund was a major idea; we are saying that not only – we considered the \$2 million provided by the Board as a seed fund, and the idea is to set up an organization we called a foundation, that essentially would do some fund-raising to create additional streams of income to allow for even further and greater relief, economic relief to JAS qualified applicants. Next slide.

There is a notion that – let us assume that you got a benefit, and you're successful. Then you have, we would assume, and we want to ensure that you understand that you have an obligation to give back something, help somebody else. That's what this recovery is all about – fee recovery is all about. So it is a way for you to give back, that is a successful JAS qualified applicant give back to the community and it's a way for you to participate in the sustainability of the program. That is what this is all about here. Next slide, please.

That slide just gave more details into thinking of why we need more funds, and what we are proposing as mechanisms to gather more funds; not just funds, but also other resources that are required to aid the effort. And you can read that in detail in the reports, there are some extras to the report.

Next slide. Those are some of the sources for funding that we have contemplated. They are not exhaustive, it's just in the JAS Working Group's estimation, some areas that we think could be plumbed for funds. Next slide.

And so to ensure that we all are transparent and keep everybody honest, we are also proposing some areas where any funds that are attracted into this initiative and provided to support the initiative, where those funds might be applied. That list there is not exhaustive, of course, but it gives you an idea of the thinking of the work group.

Notice we are trying very hard to establish a couple of things; one, that the funds are usefully applied, two, that there is some sustainability, three, that once applied there is some possibility for successfully raising and operating a registry. Next slide.

This slide tells you a little bit about the thinking, again, that we do not suppose that all that is needed is money to support new registries; there are services, there are administrative and other knowledge support that would be required. So we are not just fishing for money, we are also fishing for other resources that might be applied to ensure that the registries become functional and sustainably operated, so a list of them is up there to give you some guidance as to what other kinds of resources we anticipate will be required. Next slide.

I'm not going to go too much further into this, because it's longer and I want to give you some time to ask questions; but the

eligibility requirements are there, you can see them in the full report. Again, I urge all of you to read the report to ensure you have the talking points correctly. You can use these slides as a basis for your own messages and development of messages, and we welcome your support and comments.

The entire report is up for public comments; we urge you to look at the report and make comments as appropriate. Tomorrow we're going to have another session on the Working Group; we invite your attendance and your continued support. Thank you all, we'll take questions now. I see Mohammed.

Mohamed El Bashir:

Thanks Carlton; I've read the report, great recommendation, but the concern really about – when do we have the time, really, to reach out to the potential applicants, or at least send a message to stakeholders in those communities who are going to benefit from this support? Because it's really a concern; currently, you might be right about timeframes after the comment period and what's next in terms of Board approval or not, but it seems to be a very short window from January to April. We're talking about stakeholders from the developing countries, who might not even heard about the New gTLD Program.

I've been sitting in an event, the region, where Rod Beckstrom was talking about the New gTLD Program, and believe me, those are big brass, they did not know about it. So imagine stakeholders in the developing countries; they didn't hear about it, they don't have

the time to apply, and we need to ensure that the mechanism is there that when they are interested, they can apply and they can get support. I don't want to look negative, but these are our challenges that we need to work with, but very good work.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Mohammed; I can assure you that this has been one of the things that we have worried about constantly in the JAS Working Group. Let me tell you specifically several things that we've asked for. We have asked the staff to begin to tease out the process and create process maps, so that would-be applicants would have something to follow.

We've asked that some of the what we call non-financial support that would be required would be to help would-be applicants to navigate, once they're identified, and of course, the identification comes from ensuring that the messages that go out go out far and wide in appropriate ways, so that would-be applicants who could be supported hear the message.

We know that there is a PR and messaging component that has been developed by staff on the New gTLD Program; we've asked them to give some priority to creating JAS specific messages and ensure that those go out. We are asking – that's one of the things that we are asking the Board for; we are asking the Board to ensure and to add its voice to our voice, so that the staff gets the importance of creating the messaging and sending out the

messages and doing all that it can in overdrive, as it were, to ensure that the messages go out.

So just to say, I'll leave it to others on the team who might be here, who would wish to add something to this. We recognize that there are challenges to do with publicizing this effort, and we have made some specific recommendations to ensure that we overcome this hurdle. We are depending on you and others to emphasize our concerns, and add your voices to the suggestions we have made to ensure that there's adequate response. Would you like to say a few words on this, Cheryl? Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you, Carlton; Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. There is politics involved here, of a fairly high order. I believe, I firmly believe the Board is now, or if not, by Monday or Tuesday will be, en masse; because they are, I gather, attending the briefing, the forum that is running tomorrow, whenever it runs. They will be far better versed, they have taken time and care to look at our recommendations, but we do need to see that the implementation of our recommendation is different to the recommendations being implementable when the New gTLD Program runs.

I'd like to hope that we're not going to get caught up with the "it can't be done by them" argument; and realize that when you open up the doors for applications, that's the beginning of the process, and there is a period of time through which a number of the recommendations we've brought forward are probably

implementable. We do recognize that it's been very short order, in terms of time now, but I actually think the intent is to go as far as possible along with the recommendations that we've made.

There will be limitations, and it's quite possible that they will be limitations that will disappoint some of us; but there is – I think this is a pivotal moment, where there has been due consideration and care put into that, there's barely a senior staff member on the ICANN payroll that isn't thinking JAS, and in some cases, waiting for the decision, the deliberation of the Board and the outcomes to be discussed. It is a very important, and I think recognizably very important issue.

The matter of outreach, however, is something that perhaps Andrew, the business constituency might wish to think about. We haven't got any indication, nor have we got it from Scott today, that the plan – and remember, the poor damn communication people don't even have a budget to communicate this yet – this is bizarre, but anyway – I have a real fear that with the limitations, and I mean between \$500,000 and \$2 million, any of those numbers just aren't big enough to do the job properly, that there should be a reliance on us as at the edge community members to ensure that as Mohammed said, the people who need to know, get to know. And that's going to be vital, and I would like to think GNSO, in particular the business constituency, might play a role in it. Thank you. Andrew?

Andrew Mack: Andrew Mack, ya'll know me. First of all, a couple of things.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Slowly, you're being interpreted.

Andrew Mack: Slowly, because I am being interpreted? Okay, thank you; I will do my best. The – first of all, let me say that despite all the challenges that have come from being a part of this Working Group and this little community, it has been a rare pleasure and a great honor to work with – I will say to serve with so many of you here in this room.

For those people who were not part of the Working Group, I think it's hard to imagine a group of people that was more devoted to their task, and to a task that has so much complexity, so much politics, so many interests, so many time zones, etc., it has been a real challenge and a real honor.

Speaking on behalf of myself, and I think many people in our group would feel the same way, specific to – and please let me also provide a word of thanks for the many staff members who participated, and participated so actively, and with a lot of energy and a lot of enthusiasm and a lot of creativity, and helped us keep on task and really added to our process tremendously.

To Cheryl's first point about outreach, this did come up today in the GNSO meeting this morning. There was a generalized sense that outreach has been lacking; I can tell you from personal

experience, because I was in Brazil last week for a client, and this whole New gTLD process came up, and people looked at me like “Wow, what are you talking about?” We have to be really mindful of the fact that the world does not know nearly enough about ICANN, let alone about this process.

And I see honestly, a real significant challenge, because we do have a limited time window, we do not wish to slow this process down, and yet without a real concerted effort at outreach, the underserved communities, the underserved users, the underserved languages are just not going to be – they’re not going to know to get in the line, and this is going to be a significant issue.

With specific regard to the BC, of which I am kind of a member, not a full member yet, but that’s in process – not for lack of interest; I was not involved in the actual voting on this, but let me give you the rough sense of where the BC is. They were, generally speaking, very supportive, as you can imagine; and yet they had two big concerns, which caused them to abstain on the final JAS report. I don’t think will surprise you hugely, but I think they are addressable concerns. The first one is around their understanding of the idea of lowered standards. What I heard was the BC position is that the JAS should not lower the bar for technical or legal requirements for new applicants.

They were concerned that this would cause additional complexity and put the pieces of the system at risk; my perception is that this is an addressable issue over the medium term, and it partly is a question of us sitting down with them and understanding their

concerns to a much greater extent. The second one, and I did not cause this, for those of you who have been in on the calls, their position is that the BC has long maintained that we need incentives for applicants to offer versions of their TLDs in languages and scripts used in emerging markets.

Okay. I'm not going to use the "B" word, but there is, as you know, and many of you in this room have signed letters to support the idea that however we do it, we need to put greater emphasis on and create incentives to and facilitate the expansion of the net and the expansion of this New gTLD process specifically to provide the ability for people who are not using Latin scripts. The last thing that we would want is for the whole process is put people who are not using a Latin script further behind in their work on the web.

Again, I think that this is an issue that we have addressed in a number of ways; it is a soluble issue, in my mind. The sooner we get to both of these issues, the sooner we will get the kind of support, I think, that you mentioned, Cheryl. I agree completely that the business community, not just the business constituency but the global business community can play a substantial, positive role in helping get the word out about this.

What I have seen, in Nairobi when we were at IGF, and recently in Brazil, is just the incredible energy of both the NGO sector and the private sector, in the sense that they are seeing – they are hearing that things are happening, they are wanting to participate, from all of the examples that I have seen. If we can find a way to link in with them, they will help carry the message – that it does not need

to be just a centralized blast from ICANN, but again, it will be up to us to mobilize that community. Make sense? That's my report, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

If I may, Carlton, Cheryl for the record; just to your point, Andrew; of course one of the limiting factors is in fact, the GNSO on that. It's a GNSO issue that we are fighting, in terms of multi-stranding. I won't use the "B" word, either. They're very clear in their original report, that that's a no-no, so there's a role for the business constituency to make the changes where it also needs to be, which is within the GNSO.

Andrew Mack:

Your point is very well taken, and I guess my sense of things with the JAS group, generally, is that there are a number of issues that still need to be addressed, no question. We recognized from the outset that we would do as much as we could and go as far as we could, and advocate the positions that we really thought should be, and there are some practicalities.

My sense of things, having sat in on some GNSO meetings, is that this is still a ball in motion and that – there we go. I'm sorry, my apologies, but this is still a ball in motion and we have the ability to push for them to become more actively involved and more partners in this process, and I hope we will do that. I know we need to, especially on things like outreach and reaching out to multiple scripts. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. Ladies and gentlemen, we have exhausted the time allotted to this session.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton, that was Andrew. No Cheryl, that was Andrew. You said “Thank you, Cheryl.”

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was mutual.

Andrew Mack: We look alike.

[Laughter and applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: People have been making that mistake over and over.

Carlton Samuels: Over and over and over again. And they’re both sides of the table; but thank you to Andrew and Cheryl for that conversation, because it puts on the record some of the expectations we have from the business community generally, as opposed to the business constituency in the GNSO. That was the issue. We are exhausted

of time, so I'm going to turn it back to the Chair of the ALAC, Olivier, to take over. Thank you all.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. I just wanted to extend a special thanks for you and for Rafik for Chairing this group. I know it's been extremely hard. So since we have to respect our timelines, since we have a lot of more things to discuss; I will now invite to the table –

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, of course, that's right. Tomorrow, Monday, will be the day where a lot of this will be debated, and I'm sure that the whole community will come and support the JAS Working Group. I really hope to see all of you in the room when this takes place, and no doubt, seeing such a show of support, the Board will be able to notice that. So hopefully we can do this. And Evan wants to make one additional statement.

Evan Liebovitch: Sorry, this also has to deal with the meeting tomorrow and why it's important to show up. This is a broad community initiative; this is something that the ALAC is involved in and arguably helped to initiate. The GNSO has been heavily involved with; the

Government Advisory Committee has thrown its support in, I believe there is an unprecedented level of community support behind this.

If ICANN is to demonstrate its sincerity with the multi-stakeholder process, it has to be able to address this, listen to us, and that's why it's so vital to come out tomorrow. Make sure that you hear what's going on, make sure that you participate, if you're interested in it. This is an issue that's been important to us since the summit, and before the summit, and it's been one of the core ALAC and At-Large initiatives, and I really would like to see as many people as possible come out. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, Andrew, for joining us as well; if we all stick together we can do this. Next in our agenda is point number eight; discussion with Christina Rodriguez from the Language Services. She's Manager of the Language Services, and David Closson, who's Director of IT Operations. We are going to have a big discussion here as well; we have about 45 minutes, if that's correct.

We might need to cut this a little bit short, but I think that everything is ready to move forward. So welcome, thank you for joining us again. And I hear that we've got quite a lot of movement in the Language Services, so perhaps I should just give the floor over to you and you'll be in charge to be able to tell us all the great news.

Christina Rodriquez: Hello everyone, how are you? I have, I think, very, very good news for everybody. I hope everybody gets as excited as I am. I have been so excited; I can't wait to tell you.

Evan Liebovitch: And you can say it in any language; we're interpreted here.

Christina Rodriquez: I talk better if I do it in English; believe it or not, I would. Anyhow, first you will be seeing more interpreters, new interpreters, because we are adding the interpretation support for the GAC. So since the GAC will be receiving interpretation support, our team, or our troop of interpreters has been increased, or grew, from eight to 14 now.

So you will be seeing, from time to time, a different face, so don't be afraid. Say hello, it will be great for them to meet each of you. And they're very excited; these are people with amazing, excellent background, and they are very proud and very happy to be supporting here at the ICANN meeting, and At-Large, and everybody else.

This is also the same people that will be, or some of them will be supporting us in regards to teleconference interpretation. We are putting together – it has finally come to something real that is happening. Additional telephone lines have already been installed on some of their houses, so they have a second line to be able to

provide the service, and I've been speaking with our technical interpretation director, Jeremy, who you see from time to time around.

He's putting together a device so there will be not only the fact that you will be receiving the service from our own interpreters, but also it's supposed to be super clean, super good, with the device. It's going to be able to clean the lines, incoming and outgoing, so you should have no problems there with regard to the quality of the interpretation you receive, through a phone call.

Another thing is that I've spoken with [Katie], the groups, the Working Groups that you have; I want to propose that you do receive support, interpretation support on all of the Working Groups. But I want to compromise on that; I want the community to compromise to making a minimum of three people per language.

I think if I compromise on providing the service, you can compromise as well in bringing more people. It's somehow, from my point of view, an incentive for you and for the community to grow and to increment the amount of people in your Working Group.

The services for interpretation for the teleconference should begin, I believe, somewhere around the first week of December, and this is because Jeremy will be traveling to all the installation of the equipment, so that we can provide all the services. Everything is ready to go, and you are getting what you so much have been

wanting to have. I'm sure you will be happy. Thank you very much. I'm so happy. Any questions?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think that Sergio has one.

Sergio Salinas Porto: My name is Sergio Salinas Porto, for the record, and I'm going to speak in Spanish. Dear Christina, it is a pleasure to hear what you have been saying. I need to at least wear my hat for five minutes to say that this is excellent for us; it's awesome, and we are as excited as you are to be able to get this news. But I'm concerned about one issue, and I would like to know if we can solve this in a way, and it's the limit you set for three people.

Many times, it happens that there are two people involved, that there are two people who are interested, but not three. We give them the possibility, we want to give the possibility to those two people to participate, and there won't be more than three people in the Working Groups, this is at least in the Spanish field. There's people, there's not always three people that are involved in one issue or interested in one issue, but there are two. How can we solve this?

Christina Rodriguez: In response to what you're suggesting, or to your predicament here, let's say; I'm thinking my first proposal, my first idea was actually to be able as I said before, the impulse for other people to

join the Working Groups. I think from somebody in the community as well, although I don't participate as somebody in the community, but I have the feelings, I believe that more people should actually join the Working Groups.

I think, I truly believe that sometimes incentives like this are a good thing; however, I don't want to hurt those that are so willing to be on those Working Groups by not giving them what they need. So let me sit down with Katie and rethink this, and maybe lower the three to a two; but a firm compromise, there won't be less than two, and go from there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think we can make this as an action item, please. Thank you, next is Tijani Ben Jemaa, and then we'll have Yaovi afterwards, and I'll take a list. Tijani?

Tijani Ben Jemaa: You know that I'm one of the people who asked to solve this kind of problem; I was really behind this sort of effort. This is fantastic, this is a great effort and we thank you. Especially that you are going to use good lines for the interpreters, with the two cables, so there's a lot of safety in this process. Up to now, with Adigo, we had problems with lines and interpreter lines were at the root of the problem, so we've eliminated these type of problems. I wish that lines used by Adigo to call participants in teleconference calls so that we would eliminate such situations as we had in the past

month, where quality was really so bad that we couldn't do anything with the outcome. Thank you.

Yaovi Atohoun: My question is not directly regarding translation, but teleconference. The teleconferences conference calls AFRALO as in two languages, how to activate automatically the audio, because sometimes we have certain conditions. We have a good internet connection but the telephone line is bad, so what I would like to ask; automatically, is it possible that for all our conference calls we would be able to have access to voice, even the operator calls, my line is bad. I can still follow what's going on. This is my question, thank you.

Christina Rodriquez: I understand your needs, but actually that's not my terrain, my function.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we should just point out, at this point, from Yaovi's intervention – so Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record – we have established in the past, and this is very much an IT team, that the Adobe connect rooms do have the capability of voice as well as broadcast. In the [FOI] work group, which I'm going to

have to go off to shortly, we have started getting people in various parts of Africa reasonably, not brilliantly, but reasonably successfully connecting to the Adobe connect room with that in.

I think what we should do, Yaovi, if I may suggest, is we need to prevail upon IT to continue to look for the right solution, particularly for our emerging and developing economies and those of us who are more mobile. It would be very nice to be able to do some of these interactions and calls, literally, from one's mobile phone, even if it is a smart phone, obviously; but the quality of the lines has been a major issue. But I would also suggest there must be smarter ways of finding our way around it.

Certainly I think Yaovi's point is one that we can address partly with the Adobe connect room that we have now. But there may be other solutions that IT need to look at, and that would mean that Language Services staff being integral to that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Christina, do you want to comment? Okay, so next in the queue is Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Thank you, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, LACRALO Secretariat. First of all, great news, Christina, regarding interpretation. It's good for the Working Groups that might have interpretation on calls. I guess my question that comes to mind is translation of materials used by the Working Groups. Because typically there's

some draft statements, draft comments, and these need to be translated, I think, in a reasonable amount of time. My experiences in LACRALO assure that there's been great difficulty when statements have been drafted in Spanish, and statements have been drafted in English, and attempting to reconcile the differences and understanding what the other was saying, at least using machine translation has been very difficult. I wonder if you can shed some light on what, as part of the interpretation provided on Working Groups, what could be done regarding translation?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev. Christina?

Christina Rodriguez: Regarding translation, as another support service to the ALAC and At-Large and the Working Groups and the RALOs and so on, I believe that you can – if you put it through Katie or Gisella, will take care of those translations for you, to work on. When you were saying, when you mentioned machine translation, I believe you probably were talking about e-mail list translation? Or is it that you guys use machine translation to produce a translation of your documents? That's what it is?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: There's a quick clarification, Dev Anand Teelucksingh again. Well, that's another issue, the machine translation of the e-mail list; but I'm talking about like when draft statements have been

posted up to the Wiki, and somebody has taken a pen and drafted a statement, that has been drafted in Spanish or it's been drafted in English, typically it's been difficult to try to understand what the sequence has been. A lot of time is wasted trying to understand what each other's saying, so when somebody drafts the statement in Spanish, can it be sent for translation to be properly translated, in a reasonable amount of time.

Christina Rodriquez: Okay, my proposal will be why don't you let me look at the documentation or some samples of the documentation, whether with Katie or Gisella, and come up with a clean and steady response to your question before the end of the week? And if you can put that on the agenda as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, we'll put this on the agenda. Thank you. I actually have a couple of questions, and I think one of them follows on from Dev Anand Teelucksingh's one, the issue of machine translating on the list.

My knowledge of Spanish is pretty awful; I know what to order in a tapas bar, but more than that doesn't get very far, and certainly speaking or writing in Spanish is something that's totally outside my territory. One of the problems that I've had is being able to follow all of the LACRALO mailing lists, and certainly what I do read in English sometimes sounds as though it's come from Mars rather than from the Latin American region.

So the question, the first question I'd like to ask is where are we with regards to automated translation of the mailing list, because I think it's an integral part of the discussion in Latin America, as we know we have two regions that speak different languages and it's extremely difficult if we do not have a good performing tool.

There are good performing tools out there, a good performing tool to be able to interact, because sometimes discussions that might start as being very courteous when being translated, end up being very close to World War III without anyone actually having said what is actually being discussed at the end. So it's a big concern, and I'd like to find out if something is being done about this, and how far we are progressing on this. Perhaps Sergio would like to add a couple of things before I ask for an answer? Thank you.

Sergio Salinas Porto:

This is Sergio Salinas Porto. I only wanted to make a correction to something that you have just said, Olivier. And this is not that there's two regions; there's one region with two different languages. It's one region. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Actually, it's one complete region with more than two languages, because I guess Portuguese is also in there, as well. And AFRALO is affected equally, however AFRALO, I believe, does not have any automated translation at the moment, but maybe we can also think about having something like this. Definitely our French speaking regions within AFRALO would absolutely be very happy

about this, in order to have more input into the process. Anyway, let's find out if we have an answer on this, please.

David Closson:

Good afternoon, this is David Closson, Director of IT at ICANN. I'm filling in for one of my developers who wasn't able to attend the meeting. So what we've been doing to handle mail list translation, I'm here to speak about that today. I'm sure some of you on the LACRALO mailing list are aware of this; we used to use a piece of software called SysTrans, and more recently Google has come up with their own translation API, which showed market improvement.

Some may beg to differ, but we found most seem to think it is an improvement. However, in translating e-mails dealing with encoding, it can be very difficult, and some of the things that we run into in using the Google API, other than avoidable conditions, like somebody sending an email to both of us at once, which then of course gets one of them translated back to the same language it was originally sent in, or the vice versa, where somebody just sends it to the wrong list initially. Sending in English to the Spanish and then it gets translated back to English again, so obviously that's going to be a very poor translation, unusable.

There's been things like subject entities which have appeared, which are really HTML encoding; bugs, such as apostrophes which show up at HTML encoded. I could paste some of them up onto the screen, if any of you are interested. This is an example; I'm

going to put it in the presenter chat up on the screen there, to the left. That's the word "I'm", the contraction I'm, and let's see if we can get the encoding. I actually pasted it into the presenter chat in HTML encoding, and as you notice on the screen, it came out as "I apostrophe M", as it should. It's doing a good job of converting it for me.

I'm not actually to send that in as [scaped] so that I can actually show you the encoding, unfortunately, because the Adobe connect is translating it for me, the HTML: into...

Well, sorry about that. Basically what it would look like is a series of characters such as – let me try to be quick here – "I and #39:M" is what you might see, instead of the contraction "I am, I'm". So we're working on little bugs like that. We'll get that worked out. Also, you might have seen the subject lines will have a prefix in them that say "Windows-1252?" or "ISO8859-1?" things like that – those are bugs that we're working to get resolved.

The other thing that we've noticed that can really help with the translation tests that we're doing for Ingles and Español is to structure your emails as good as possible. That would be to use proper Spanish, if I may use it that way. We've seen what appears to be dialect being poorly translated.

Dev, I think, sent an email in; those of you that are actually on the LACRALO list, as a test, which was a well-structured, what I would consider a perfect email, and it was an excellent translation

there. It was very short, that's the other thing that seems to help, is keeping the email as brief as possible. That can help as well.

Now, moving this into other languages, we don't know what we're going to run into, but obviously we've decided that until we can get this to a point where it's usable by those that use the list, I don't know that we should move on to other languages. Now, if there are other tools, I heard references to another tool; then is this other tool something that could be used for email? Because if there are other tools out there that I'm unaware of, I'm more than willing to look into that. But with respect to emails, it can be very difficult. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much, and when listening to this, and of course to the problems that we do have, it reminded me of episodes of Star Wars, with C3PO on one side, and trying to actually achieve Babelfish with the Hitchhiker's Guide. So we're halfway, or somewhere between the two, I gather.

I guess it's a very tough problem, and if it was an easy one, it would probably be able to be fixed overnight, but that's certainly – it's good to see that you're working on it, and please keep us updated on this, because it's something that is really an important channel for RALO communication.

David Closson: Thank you so much; we're also willing to open it up to another language, if we have participants that are willing to test that, for the email translation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, I would imagine that French is probably – French/English would probably be the next natural step for the AFRALO region, and since we're in Africa, maybe that's the time to start it with. So yes, please, let's go ahead. I think I see nodding heads around the table.

David Closson: Dev, would you like to add anything to this, since you've been helping us so much?

Dev Anand Teelucksingh: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, just to say thank you so much for your efforts. I know this has been a very challenging exercise, and like I said, the problems you identified and ultimately solutions will be forthcoming, but thanks again, because I just want to stress how important it is for LACRALO region, for this to work.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Dev. Next question, first I have Sergio, then we'll have Carlton. Oh, and Cintra as well.

Sergio Salinas Porto: Thank you, Olivier. I'm going to be very brief. I would just like to ask David – thank him for being here. I was able to put a face to your emails, and that's so cool. Also I would like to suggest to set up some kind of handbook or manual as to how to use the system so that all the RALO members can come as close as we can to that style manual as to how to write an email and such, and that would be very helpful to the translation and I guess it will be much lighter in relation to the arguments that come out from not understanding.

David Closson: Thank you so much, that's an excellent suggestion.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sergio. Next is Carlton.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Chair, Carlton Samuels for the record. Just to make a point of clarification. The LACRALO region is actually probably the most complex in terms of languages because we have to include French as well; because we now have At-Large structures in Haiti and Haiti is a member of LACRALO region.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. Next, Cintra Sooknanan.

Cintra Sooknanan: Thank you, Cintra Sooknanan for the record. David, I just want to note my appreciation for the work that you've put in; it has not been easy. There are still bugs in the system, but I just want you to be aware that it is the type of work that we do, it's policy-related and therefore it is difficult to compress in e-mail and it's also difficult to stick to one particular style. So just to be careful in making recommendations on how things should be added to the list because we don't want to put words in peoples' mouth. Thank you.

David Closson: Yeah, I couldn't agree more. Thank you so much.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. Any other questions or suggestions or burning issues with regards to translation, interpretation? Wolf Ludwig.

Wolf Ludwig: Just a small remark for clarification. Sometimes it seems to me that this somehow became the most important issue amongst the most important issues. Just small hint for understanding; in Europe, we have quite a strange situation that tiny minority speaks English as the mother language. We do not even have one ALS in the given country where English is the mother language; but since the creation of RALO we use English as a working language because if you talk about Internet governance, it happens quite often that you have to deal with this language whether you like it or not.

I'm very much a fan of cultural diversity, of multilingualism, whatever; I'm always on the forefront for this issues at any other opportunity; but I have difficulties if you start bringing up the language issue as one of the most crucial ones of our At-Large community and I simply would appreciate if some other regions could be a bit more pragmatic as we try to be at EURALO simply for practical reasons using this language and we get along quite easily with it. It takes some time, it takes some effort, but I think it is also a direction where we can sync and where we can go.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Wolf. Next is Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Just following on from you, Wolf, of course. The complexity in Asia Pacific is somewhat a quantum leap above it, again. We work in English, and we work in English because – what are we now? 63 major languages? All of which with huge numbers of people speaking them; we're not talking minorities at all. It would be beyond belief to try and have that at certain levels.

However, and there is a 'however'; I am an absolute believer in some things being done, such as the ALAC discussions, in English in the main, but there are some considerations, such as the productivity of meetings like this.

If we don't have interpretation in meetings like this, we cannot be productive because these are heroic adventures of incredible long days with incredibly complex conversation; and if one has to constantly work in a language which is not your first language, it would be far too taxing. I think we need to see primary language use for certain purposes one way.

I also think we need to work closely with ICANN and particularly, David, I suspect, with the ITC solutions for – not so much the coming into ICANN, other than for identified things like some of our work groups, etc. where we need those edge pieces in – but how we, as the conduit out from ICANN, can get into those particular language usage groups. And I think that's there's possibly some smart ways we might be able to organize this.

I couldn't agree, Wolf, with you more. But at the same time, I also know that at the end of the day, I need – at the end of the week, I need to have the volume of the English in my ears, because it just helps me focus on what people are saying. Which is very different from inter-sessional work, so I think we need to look at fit for purpose, and effective use, and the advantage of having some of that chat being able to be, in some way, translated, would be extremely handy. So much of what goes on in our Adobe connect meeting rooms, we often – we did one, we did; some of the work groups that I've done before, we just opened several pods.

We had a French pod, a Spanish pod, and an I don't care what other pod – it could have been Burmese, it doesn't matter. What it meant is, those in those language community sub-groups could

chatter, chatter, chatter, and then put it through a machine translate, and bring it into the main chat. So I think with a little bit of smart thinking, I'd like to hope that you guys work shop with this. We might be able to get some smart ways out of this. I had great hopes for some of the Google translation tools, they've been bitterly disappointing, but there you go. The human translator, the human interpreter translation of particular documents still has to be at an expert standard, and that is where we are failing in some of our teleconferences.

Let me tell you, to hear conversation as conversation in another language channel is not what we need. We don't – we definitely need to look at the expertise and the familiarity of the interpreters we use on our phone bridges. The guys and girls and all hail to you – bravo to you all.

[Applause]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

The guys and girls that Christina's put together are phenomenal, but we can say, you know, DNSSEC and they know what we're talking about. We can say – this is letter soup, in this place, and it's that familiarity, it's having the way I speak versus the way Dev speaks. They're becoming expert, and I think to build that resource up for ICANN is hugely important. I rest my case.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Cheryl, and since we are running – yes. So a few words more from David.

David Closson: I apologize, I should have made myself a little bit clearer, but I didn't prepare enough for this speech. I was going to have one of my developers join me; but one of the things I said about keeping the e-mails as short as possible, I should really clarify that. There are two things that have come up with doing translations via email that would be very helpful; one is to read it in your own language and make sure that it makes sense. Sometimes we don't proofread things well. Somebody that speaks the language would understand it, but if we try to translate it through a machine, it would ---

The other thing is making sure the paragraphs aren't too long. Yes, you can cut it down to maybe three or four sentences or whatever makes sense; but I've seen some e-mails that are pages, without a line break. It gets very difficult when we're parsing that, with the software, to figure out where we can actually make a break. We can only take so much text at once, and send it through the API for translation, so we have to break it somewhere. If we can't find a line break, it can be painful.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, David. It sounds like – I hear from around the room we need guidelines, and maybe that's one thing which we will be developing, hand in hand with you, of course. In the guidebook, yeah. Okay, we are running out of time. Any other things that you

wish to add to the discussion? Or should we all go for a coffee? Alright, well thank you for joining us, David and Christina. You've got a very hard job, but it's an integral part of the integration of voices from all around the world, so we're very grateful ...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Portuguese would be on my shortlist, after French.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Here, here.

David Closson: And thank you much for inviting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And Portuguese is already in the GAC so there's only one small hop from one room to another. Who knows. Right, thanks. And now we'll have a 15 minute break; 1-5. We're meeting again at 4:02, but make it 4:00. And we have a number of things to do, so yeah, 15 minutes for coffee and I hope that we can all be back in time. I remind you that if we are any late we will have to start quickly because we have a Showcase this evening and that Showcase will start at exactly the time that is advertised. Thank you.

[break]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, we're going to be starting in about a minute, a minute and a half. Please take your seats ladies and gentlemen. I will send the hound dogs for those people that are not here.

[background conversation]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, right, we're starting again; it's 16:06 local time. We've got four more items that we need to deal with. We have less than the allocated time that is there and we're running late. So the first item we're going to have in our agenda is the At-Large Working Groups with next steps and the first one is the Future Challenges Working Group, which Evan and Jean-Jacques Subrenat are co-chairs of, and we happen to have Evan here. So Evan, you have a few minutes to speak to us about this and give us an update. Thank you Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay, thanks Olivier and knowing the challenge for time I will try and take less than the 10 minutes. Essentially there is going to be a meeting on Thursday of the Future Challenges Working Group. At a very high level, this working group is an attempt to take ALAC from being simply responsive in dealing with public comment

periods and other things that are given to us to react to and to actually step back and create an affirmative agenda for what is in the public interest and to use ALAC to assert a public interest rather than react to whatever ICANN happens to be doing.

So I would invite you, rather than go into a deeper description right now, I would invite you to come to the meeting on Thursday, be part of this working group. We hope to make it into as much of a “think tank”, if you would, as a nuts and bolts thing. We’re using slightly relaxed procedures compared to other working groups in the attempt to try and come up with creative solutions, novel ideas and attempts that, like I say, will try and help use the bylaw mandated facilities we have to help ALAC and At-Large set an agenda in ICANN rather than just respond to it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much. Evan, yes you were well under your 10 minutes. I just wanted to add one more thing, which is in a recent exchange of emails with Steve Crocker, we had a very positive feedback from Steve who said that this kind of improvement or movement in At-Large and in ALAC was exactly the sort of thing he was hoping would happen at some point. So we certainly have encouragement on this. So first we have Garth and, the first time I called you Gareth it was actually Garth, but my french accent just gives me away, so it’s Garth.

Garth Bruen: No, I don't think you did. In some languages they can't even pronounce my name. Trying to order food over the phone can be troublesome. But like Olivier said this is Garth. I was just wondering Evan, is there a time and place because I know it was changed from Friday and I don't see it on the schedule yet.

Evan Leibovitch: I'm sorry. It's been changed from Friday to Thursday for a couple of reasons, not the least of which is that we have some people that are leaving on Friday and we want to make sure that we have as good an attendance as possible and so it was moved to Thursday for that reason. Has that meeting changed not been publicized? Oh, okay. So, it's in the schedule.

Now, one thing to make sure is this is not in the public Dakar meeting schedule. This is an At-Large meeting, for all intents it is a private At-Large meeting. We've had circumstances in the past where we've had public meetings that have been, I can't think of a better word right now than infiltrated, by commercial interests. And right now we are trying to set an At-Large agenda. And at least at this incubation period we want to keep this to ourselves.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Evan and if I'm not mistaken was it Holly, next. Holly has found it. I don't know what you've found but... Okay.

Evan Leibovitch: She's found "it".

Holly: I've found Evan.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Holly. Cheryl next.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Evan, I think it would be worthwhile if we promulgated out to the Skype chat and as many other places whilst we have people's interest captured on this, the URL for the Wiki page, which of course is an ongoing opportunity for people to have input and make comments, etc, etc.

Evan Leibovitch: That's perfect and especially considering our condensed timeframe right now, so rather than spend more time describing the group in detail, we'll just point you to the Wiki page which has specific agenda items on there and we'll give you a bit of a flavor of where we're going.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Evan. Any other questions or suggestions? I was wondering, do you expect more members Evan? Perhaps I'm asking when Evan is not listening. Evan, pay attention please.

Do you accept more members, I'm sorry, I know you were...Do you accept more members in the working group or is this a closed working group or how does it work?

Evan Leibovitch:

Okay, when I say I mean closed to commercial interest. This is an end user group. Within At-Large and ALAC we want as a great a participation as possible. All I ask is that you come in, we're looking for creativity, we're not yet ready to drill down to any detailed levels. We're looking right now at high level creative solutions of how to embed the public interest into the DNA of ICANN. And as of right now, every possible tactic and strategy is on the table and we wanted to thrash it out.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you Evan. More questions, suggestions...? Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz:

This is Eduardo Diaz for the record. I have a question. Do you we have already some strategies that we have thought about or this is just from...?

Evan Leibovitch:

It's not all just totally fun and squishy. We have identified two specific areas that we want to try and tackle. One of which is asserting At-Large into, shall we say the DNA of ICANN, by making assertive strategies as opposed to simply reactive ones.

And the other one has specifically to deal with bringing to ICANN's attention bad behaviors by certain parts of the community and trying to bring to ICANN's attention some facts and analyses that may have in the past been shouted down or dismissed. And it's up to us to assert these. I'll call your attention to the Wiki page where these are listed in more detail, but we have specifically picked two focus areas to start with. Is the link posted if somebody's got it? Okay, great.

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo again. SO you're looking for people to help in this group?

Evan Leibovitch: Absolutely.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. And actually, I've just noticed that on our schedule we have a coffee break from 15:30 to 16:00 and then this starts at 16:30. So we have actually warped for 30 minutes. And Heidi tells me she has put it in there as a cunning plan to not be late. So we're ahead of time. Any other questions? Right, well thank you very much Evan for this very fast update and I do hope that you will get even more members involved and certainly I hope that the work that will be performed here will be very fruitful. There's certainly much anticipation for this to take place. So, all done.

Right, going on next as Heidi is very baffled next to me...and I'm reading the English version fortunately, the French version is even more baffling. The next part of our agenda is the other At-Large Working Groups that will update on what is happening with those. I know that both Cheryl and Matt have been working together on this and if I could ask for an update on those.

For those of us who have not been here or are new to these meetings, we had, in the last meeting, a long amount of time to choose whether working groups were still current or whether they had passed their prime. Looking through the Wiki pages we find a number of working groups which don't seem to have any activity for a while and some of which were actually for specific purposes, those purposes having long been passed. So there is a reorganization of them and a streamlining of them going on, and maybe I can ask Cheryl to more eloquently than I, give us an update on this please Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. What I will do I will do is a very brief introduction and then Matt needs to be prepared to follow on because I do need to attend the Framework of Interpretation Work Group, which I believe everyone would agree is fairly important as a topic, which starts at 4:30 but is only in B56 so I can get there.

What we discovered when Matt and I trolled through the pages is that surprise, surprise it is a slightly bigger job then we first

anticipated. But it's an ideal opportunity to get the nomenclature standardized. We found, what, some 96 pages I think at one point Matt wasn't it, that were all named the same thing. Work Team – insert whatever it was – Meeting Notes. Not terribly helpful to go that way. They're all different dates, but yeah, we have to fix a few things as well.

What this will be doing however to the pensioned off work groups is we've established a standardized template as to what we're putting on the top of the pages; the pages will be closed once we've finished fiddling with them so no further comments or anything can come in, which should minimize the Spam issues that we occasionally get.

But at the top of the page it says what the purpose was, when it was convened, that it was closed, why it was closed and links to the various appropriate archival material and in particular the reference material. Because what we discovered was we're not far away from losing touch with some of the reference material and what we don't want is for future work groups who want to build on any of this to have trouble finding things or need to reinvent the wheel that's already been done.

Many of these work groups were productions that went before the 2009 Mexico based At-Large Summit, and as we would work towards a new summit in the future, these are pieces of material which we can't afford to lose touch with. The other thing I suppose, before I had over to Matt, is the matter that with Wiki's there is a worry. And I'm into onomatopoeia, which is always a

dangerous sign. And people have gone in and modified pages when particularly they were in the social text Wiki. And we are having considerable challenge to find materials which we know exist, but are effectively in archived or old rolled back pages.

For example, the Asia-Pacific Regional At-Large Organization's history on its Executive Members and leaders – it appears to only start in 2010. We're fairly confident we had some before then. And so, all of the processes for elections and selections etc, have somehow been sort of wiped off the map. They will exist and we will track them down.

So two things, and Matt will pick up now, we want to get some standardized nomenclature, naming of pages, standardized templating, places, shapes and methods that pages will be put together. And we also would have situations such as Statements of Interest, which we will be requiring our membership to put forward. They can all live in one repository and then we can just link to as many numbers of work group pages or other pages in the ALAC space that we need to. So rather than duplication, a sensible sift and sort. Matt, over to you.

Matt Ashtiani:

I just want to say I think that was a really good explanation of it all. I think when Cheryl and I were working on it we began to realize that documents are in multiple places when there's no need. We should have single repositories. And one of the harder things to do, and I know during my training with Heidi came up, I would

put “geographic work group” and then she would say good job but there are many geographic work groups, we don’t know if that’s the GNSO...

So, one of the things I really want to go for is we all kind of stick to a standard of the name, which again is up to the group, but I think just the most standard thing is “At-Large”, name the space, and then we can find it much more easily. And then also, templating. I think we should try to have work groups have some kind of similarity just so ease of use.

I mean I feel like a lot of people in this group have enough experience that they can find the information they need. As a newcomer it was a bit difficult for me. So I think if we as a group can work together to implement some standards so that those after us – sorry I talk fast, a lot of coffee today – those that come after us can definitely access the work space, find the information they need in both a historical sense and also going forward.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Search terms.

Matt Ashtiani: Oh yes, there was another issue that Cheryl and I were talking about which is search terms – we don’t actually really use them. And as far as I know, I think the Board may be one of the only groups that do use it. So we have a problem with the search terms in a sense that we’re not implementing that. For example, a lot of

times the only way you're going to find the page, if you're looking in the top search function, is if you know the exact name of the page. Instead of maybe just looking for "work group" and then you can find the general list of the work groups. So, just coming up with some standards of putting terms at the bottom of our pages.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Matt, I understand that there are also some standard templates that were designed by Marilyn. Maybe Heidi can...

Heidi Ullrich: This is Heidi Ullrich for the transcript record. Earlier this year Marilyn Vernon, working with staff and I believe with Cheryl and maybe Olivier, we created templates for the standing working groups. So there is a template for those working groups. Perhaps the link to the working group pages can be put into the Adobe Connect. But you'll see that they're basically very similar in terms of we put the meeting, we put members, we put a short summary of what that working group was working on.

So please let us know if you would like to change those templates. Again, I think as now we're going to be using those working groups to implement the At-Large improvements much more than we did in the past, this will now be a good time to really look at those pages when we have a new call for membership for those working groups.

Now for the ad hoc ones or for the newer ones, for example, the Future Challenges Working Group, of course if you'd like to do a slightly different type of format that would suit that working group better, by all means do so. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Heidi. Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz for the record. This is one suggestion. I think that's a great idea that you're working on the Wiki. Also, I would suggest that on the index to the left, to a group, for example, if you have working groups you put one index in there so you know they're there because they're all over the place.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Eduardo. Heidi?

Heidi Ullrich: Yeah, thank you Eduardo for that. Believe me when, this was last year, when you switch from social text over to confluence the format that Cheryl and I created and just showed you was in perfect logical order, at least according to us. And since I've been back I've realized oh my gosh what's happened to that, what we call the tree. So yes, when we get fully staffed, which will happen in the next two weeks, I will look at that more. So I'll make that, if I could chair, an Action Item, because every time I go onto the

Wiki my breath is taken away in despair. Yes, I'm sorry. Really. It looked much better. I don't know what's happened.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Heidi and I did gather that your breath was not taken away by the beauty of it or the song that we sometimes hear that was with, that was with the film wasn't it, right. Any other questions or suggestions – and actually in response to Eduardo's question I think that there is a thought that the index can be done by hand and can be just re-shuffled, etc. But in fact what happens is the system is so clever that it actually is the file structure.

So if you save the document in a wrong location, the index automatically gets built from that wrong location, which means you need to move the file over to another location and that then shows a problem when you have links between locations and it just gets into a massive spaghetti bowl – no disrespect to Italian's but it's just a mess.

So moving on, any other questions or suggestions on this specific subject? Now, I understand that the New gTLD Working Group, which was chaired – do you want to. Okay, so I'll let Evan describe the developments of the New gTLD Working Group, which is one of our main working groups with a lot of past challenges and a lot of future work as well.

Evan Leibovitch:

Hi there. In keeping with the way the actual working group itself is going, I'll start things off and when Avri comes in I'll pass the microphone over to her. The New gTLD Working Group is not a new working group; it's an old working group about new gTLDs.

And so this actually had its start at the At-Large summit in Mexico City where we put together initial policy on the gTLD Program that included, amongst other things, what has since evolved into the Joint Applicant Support Proposal, but also dealt with other issues, such as the objection process and trademark issues and other things like that.

As we move into the phase after the Program, the next stage in the next gTLD Program – Avri, you're sitting up here. As we move into the next phase now, At-Large has some new challenges; some questions have been answered and new questions have come about. Specifically that the At-Large community has been tasked as being one of the groups being allowed to accept, process and put forward objections to gTLD applications.

We've been charged by the Board coming up with that and it's going to be this working group that is going to go forward with how to do this. And essentially shepherd all of At-Large's policy regarding the gTLD Program as it goes forward.

And on that note, I'll yield the floor to Avri, who is taking over as chair of this group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Wait, wait Evan. A point of order here, Avri is suggested as, proposed as someone who would be taking over the group. There was a discussion on the list and there hasn't been anybody objecting to this, in fact, I've read only praise for this. So I wanted to give just a last chance, if anybody wanted to stand as well to be able to run the group or if we actually give our full support to Avri in which case we can actually move forward. Any comments or suggestions?

Evan Leibovitch: Sorry, my apologies. Essentially what had been done is I had proposed Avri; we have had opportunities for comments on the mailing list and on the Wiki. So far all of the comments we've received have been positive in favor and encouraging of Avri's participation. So if there are any comments or questions at this point, I'm hoping if there are no objections at this point I'd like to turn the floor over to Avri.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Evan. And so the floor is open for questions. No questions? Okay. The proposal itself appears to have support from everyone. I certainly don't see anyone putting their hand and saying "no, we don't want Avri". In which case, because it also has my full support as well, I think Avri would be perfect to run this and to take us through a process that might be very complex and with a lot of work. So welcome Avri who has

just joined us, Avri Doria. And perhaps I can give the floor over to Avri for her to speak to us a little bit. Thank you.

Avri Doria:

Thank you. And I apologize, I'll start out by apologizing by starting to do it as soon as Evan suggested it and jumping in as opposed to waiting a proper interval. So I apologize for that. I'm actually really quite pleased to be doing this having been sort of involved with the gTLD process from the beginning. So now, actually being able to come and work in this environment and look at these issues of its implementation of how JAS gets into it and to work with you all on that is really exciting.

Now we had basically, I think you've put as a chartering organization three things on the table for this group already that Evan mentioned – the being charged with developing a method to accept, filter and submit community based objections, which I think is a critically important things given ALAC's role with the GAC in terms of being able to provide an objection mechanism for those who cannot do it themselves. So I think that's important.

With the JAS report complete and winding down, getting that implemented and especially over the next couple of months trying to work with GAC and the staff and the Board in terms of making sure that that is implemented in time for it to be useful to people and to review that implementation as it's coming forward. And then just as the gTLD rollout starts to happen, being in a position to be able to comment, to ask questions, to probe; and then also

perhaps to contribute as they start thinking about a second round – what needs to be fixed before that.

I'm hoping that more people sort of join in on that. I'm hoping to start scheduling regular meetings. We'll look for a schedule. We'll do the whole process of working with the ALAC secretary and staff and others to figure out to schedule a meeting, how to make it work, plan to do some updating on the Wiki so that there's one place to find all the relevant information that might be useful to the people in that group. And I guess that's about it for now; certainly haven't done anything yet. But as I say, I'm really quite excited to be doing this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Avri and I was just reminded that for the time being I guess you will be sharing the chair with Evan throughout the week as we have a smooth transition. I know that the two of you get along with each other which certainly does help in a transition.

Avri Doria: Yeah we've done this chair thing before.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Since you have worked in the past and very well indeed. So excellent, right. So that's one group. There are several other working groups that are currently being also moving and changing – I wouldn't say changing hands, but certainly evolving. And

unfortunately, one of them being the At-Large Registrant – oh god this is the one which I can't say – the Registrants Rights and Responsibilities. Okay, got it. This one, unfortunately Beau Brendler is one of the co-chairs and beau is not available due to a intoxication of some sort, which doesn't – no not this way – intoxicate in French. Here we go; I'm starting to speak French. Due to a problem – a flu or something which hasn't been quite established, but has kept him in bed. He's in pretty poor shape.

Evan Leibovitch:

He's passed some information on. If you are planning to do any tourism at [Il Gove] avoid the restaurant.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

So I would have preferred to have a discussion on that because it is a very important subject, it's something that has been on the table for a while. It's also something that links up with some work that is being done with the consumer metrics with various initiatives that are there to provide more of an input or feedback I guess for registrants, for the customers, for people that register domain names.

I may also tell you that there is currently an initiative that is taking place between At-Large and the Registrars and Registries themselves. There are two pages on the Wiki which ask for input. The first on asking for input on future meetings that we would have with the registrars and registries. We do not have a meeting this time around because one, we had so many other things to deal

with, but at the same time page was not full enough for us to come with a full agenda. So we do have to fill this before our next meeting that will take place.

The second Wiki page is one which asks questions; questions that registrants would like to ask from registries or registrars. The questions being the Frequently Asked Questions effectively – what would a registrant want to know? An example of that would be, “how do I transfer from one registrar to another?” How do I transfer my domain names from one to the other? What happens if XYZ happens? This is something where we really wanted the community here to fill this page with the questions. And I know some of you already have, but we need more of those.

And what will then happen is we will be able to transmit all of these questions over to the registrars and they will be able to provide answers, which will be vendor neutral. Those answers will be of course put onto a website that will be independent. And I know that some people say well they should be dependent of ICANN, but this is just a matter of saying we’re not going to put it on the main ICANN website because if a registrant, a person who registers a domain name comes onto the ICANN website it’s going to confuse them even more. So it has to be some sort of website that is going to be geared towards the consumers.

At the same time, we know that ICANN is working to have such information also made available. ICANN staff is working on that. So I’m not too worried about the amount of time that this is taking

for us to come up with material for this, but certainly we will be working in parallel with ICANN staff on that.

So that's the other thing. And I don't know if Matt has put – have you managed to put the links to these pages or...? I know that we do remind RALOs during every RALO call we have the same call for it and some regions have been better than others at filling those pages, but we do need more material please. And of course, you can ask your At-Large structures; I'm sure there are questions. All you've ever wanted to ask from the registrars.

Okay, not quite sure about the other working groups. I think we've gone through sort of a quick run through. As we have heard from Cheryl and from Matt, there is still movement on that just to streamline them. Perhaps we can, when I see the At-Large IRT process and the sub-committee – that's one important one. So the IRT process has already passed. This I believe will be archived. But the Sub-committee on Finance and Budget is particularly important.

This is the sub-committee of the ALAC, the At-Large advisory committee, plus some members of the community. And what we would like to have would be at least I think a couple of people from each regional At-Large organization coming into that committee. And that's really important because this is the sub-committee that deals with preparing information that we will pass to ICANN when we want to obtain funds.

And good representation is very important because if your region doesn't have the representation, your region will probably be less likely to have funds. Not because we don't like you but because if you're not there how are you going to ask for it.

So we are asking for volunteers to join this group. I think it would be a bit of a short deadline if we say you've got two minutes to decide whether you want to go on it or not, but that's certainly a call that is open now. We will send out a call for volunteers on the list and there is already a list of people on there.

Some have actually moved on and are busy in other working groups and so on, so we need to fill it up. And certainly the Subcommittee on Finance and Budget is going to be busy with the new round of strategic plan going through and the new round of financial plan going through.

So, moving on, I think that we've pretty much covered all of the subject of At-Large Working Groups. Matt, do you have anything else to add on your side?

Matt Ashtiani: No, not at this time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Now, a little bit earlier we were speaking about the At-Large improvements and we mentioned a number of recommendations, many, many different recommendations that came from the 13 original recommendations. And Heidi just mentioned to me that

we might wish to mention a couple or a handful of the recommendations that were made that actually effect the forming of working groups. And I hope I'm not speaking to fast for the interpreters at the moment. Okay, the coffee must be wearing off or it must be the fizzy caffeine drink that I have there.

The first one is forming a working group to conduct a complete review of the ALAC's Rules of Procedure. That is an extremely important group. The first review of the ALAC's Rules of Procedures has been completed a while ago and that was conducted very well. And the Rules of Procedures, for those who don't know, are effectively the bylaws that we operate by.

And of course, because we keep on growing and there are more and more people involved and the ALAC itself and At-Large evolves and the internet evolves and everything changes, some of the Rules of Procedures that are currently in place are somehow not well aligned with the developments that have recently been reached.

So the suggestion as the queen of procedure, who has actually left us to go over to a ccNSO meeting I believe, the suggestion is for Cheryl Langdon-Orr to be chairing that working group. And the idea is, well the review would include a consideration of the role, selection process, and term length of the ALAC chair and vice chairs. And that is directly off the improvements, the ALAC improvements report.

Another working group is, a proposed working group is one to ensure that the At-Large information already available is organized properly and easily available by end users. And that of course ties in with what we've just been speaking about as far as the Wiki is concerned.

That will require some work and is particularly important because if we do not disseminate At-Large information well, it's already extremely confusing with all the acronyms and everything else, if we don't have something that can be easily navigated that information is effectively worth nothing. You have to be able to access it. So there will be a call for that working group and of course, that is something that we have to do; it's part of our DNA. And I'd like to, I hope that we will have a good response for people. I see a few people already nodding.

The next one is the establishing of a Technology Task Force of community members that would periodically review the appropriateness of available technology, help train the RALO's and At-Large structures – oh does someone have questions? I have two eyes but they have to point both in the same direction usually to read, so sorry Holly, I didn't see you. Holly Reich.

Holly Reich:

Just a question – is the working group you just referred to going to be developing some material as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Do you mean the previous working group we were speaking about? I think that part of it will be developing more material, but first, trying to get our own house in order with all the available information that is already there but that is simply inaccessible because it's just extremely far down the path. I must say I'm always so frustrated going through the Wiki pages and I'm sure you all are. I can't imagine how someone who doesn't even know what At-Large is about actually feels about this.

Holly Reich: Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I can see for the record that Sala is already saying she volunteers; so fantastic. The next one is – oh I was just on the previous one; the previous one which deals with technologies. Now, you might notice we've already got a Technology Working Group that is in our current standing working groups.

That's a working group that deals primarily with the technology of domain names and that includes IPv6, that includes addressing, that includes the more sort of technological side of, and issues of domain names and what ICANN deals with. The one that is here, the Technology Task Force, is more what kind of tools that At-Large can use.

There are constantly new tools out there and some really help in us being able to talk to each other. I know that a few years ago Skype

was not being used at all and now we are using this. In fact confluence is now a tool that is being used as standard. The Wiki's of course we had a social text system before, everything moves on. And the At-Large improvements have said that one of the things is that technology should work for us.

And certainly with everything coming out, including social networking, etc; there needs to be a group that looks out for these technologies and perhaps proposes that those be used in our everyday interactions. Certainly meeting three times a year is good, but having something that will help us work smarter is even better.

So the next one, and I'm sorry to be going through this long list, but I thought it would be important that we're all aware of everything that's already linked from the improvements report. The next one is the standing committee of the ALAC and At-Large Policy Review Committee responsible for advising the ALAC of actions needed regarding upcoming policy comment issues as well as policy issues not on the policy comment sheet but of At-Large interest.

Now, as you know, the current way that we look out for policy comments is to have one or two people, depending on who is available, to look at the open calls on the ICANN website and basically make a judgment call by speaking to a few people, make a judgment call as to whether At-Large should submit a statement or not. This is a responsibility that is becoming harder and harder as there are more and more calls out there; it's very difficult to

keep track of absolutely everything that is going on. And it's sometimes overwhelming, which means that there are times when we do waste time.

The call comes out of the first of the month. The first time the Executive Committee meets might be on the 15th of the month, so 15 days are already lost. And if we have a 30 day comment period, which is the standard at the moment, then we've only got 15 days left to go advertise and ask for input from the RALO's and from the At-Large structures. And effectively we end up with not a perfect way of having comments put into the ICANN process.

If we did have, however, a committee that was set up that would be able to work in a much faster way then the response rate would be maybe one, two, three days. As soon as a comment period comes out, a request for comments comes on the ICANN website, and in fact, hand in hand with the current improvement in the process we might even know in advance when we will be solicited for comments.

That committee could work together and propose immediately that the question be sent to the RALO's, to the At-Large structures and so we would be able to get input at a much earlier time, which certainly would put less pressure on everyone else to read the proposed statement and would give us more chance to be able to polish that statement so as to make it of a better quality.

That is something which was recognized by the improvements report and that of course needs processes, that needs procedures

and that I think will also act as a stabilizing factor in At-Large. Because when processes are in place that rely on a group of people, the process itself is not stuck when one person is ill if it just relied on that one person. So it really is a matter of resiliency, but also of being able to build ourselves up to the next generation and go from 130plus At-large structures to our 1000 At-Large structures that we've spoken about a little bit earlier.

I think that we've gone through all of the proposed working groups and this is all part of the improvements report. So we have a clock that is ticking for us to take action on that. So don't you think that after we finished our week, that said week, we can go to sleep, we've solved all the problems. It's just the beginning. But they're not all problems. I think they're all opportunities and that's really good. And it's exciting to see that we'll be able to tackle those.

Any questions or comments about any of what I've just been talking about? Edmon, were you first? Okay, Sala has asked in a very particular way, and I would like that to go on the record please because it's quite interesting. I've heard you ask questions in the past and usually it never is what you think it might be.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Just out of curiosity, I'm just wondering, I think I've asked a few people before, but I'd just like to ask again whether we have any economists in our group; particularly economists or something like that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Any economists? Do we have currently any economists in our group? Well, that's an interesting question. I'm not quite sure. Is anyone currently in a working group and considering themselves an economist? Please, yeah, if you could expand on that Sala.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Yes. I'd just be curious to know if we have any economists or if we don't then I suppose also if we have somebody who does modeling, simulations...?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. Certainly in At-Large we have a wide range of people from having all sorts of activities and we probably do. The thing is, it might be that we have not actually put our finger on who has what skills. And that is actually something that's actually very good that you've just touched on.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Perhaps if I could expand the rationale behind my question. In terms of policy I'm just thinking it would be good, yes we a few lawyers, yes we have techies and whatnot, it will be interesting also to have economists and people who do modeling in terms of a policy content; the substantive bits. Just a thought, Mr. Chair.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sala. However, things work slightly differently. Volunteers come up and join us and we might end up

with 22 lawyers and one mathematician when we need 22 mathematicians and one lawyer. But unfortunately we don't have the choice and certainly we would not say we are looking for At-Large structures that have mathematicians and no lawyers; that certainly wouldn't be the message we'd like to send out.

However one thing that I do think is a very valid point that you've raised, which is actually finding out people's skills because we have such a wide skill set, probably the widest skill set in all of ICANN, because the majority of ICANN is quite focused on specifics. And certainly being able to use that skill set is very interesting and very important, thus bringing synergy.

So I guess the finance and budget sub-committee that also deals with strategy would have some members who might have been strategists who might have worked for large consultancies who might have a background that is able to help so as to be able to speak on the same terms, or on the same level if you wish, playing field with ICANN finance. And that's certainly something which we would really be happy about. Yes Sala?

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Because I think we'll find, and this is just a thought, I think we'll find that if you area able to identify the different skill sets and whatnot and be able to draw we will perhaps work smarter and perhaps save time even.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And you're absolutely right. So, perhaps should we take it as an Action Item to identify the skill sets that we all have? In one way the working groups are such that people with specific skill sets will naturally fall into one or will naturally prefer to go into one working group or another. I see Eduardo would like to say a few words. Sorry, I really apologize. I think Edmon, I've zapped you in between. Oh it's a different topic? Then Eduardo please.

Eduardo Diaz: This is just a comment and probably a suggestion. I was talking to Ganesh about this, this thing we're talking about with skill sets. It would be, when I read these comments from some of the things I've written, when you look at who writes them there are three or four people that write them.

And I think that if we identify the skill sets, let's say I'm an expert in IPv6, other people are experts in policy, other people are experts in other things and you will task those people to answer when it's something we have to come back to, ask that group of people to write something because they are the experts on that area. And then everyone could comment on it. You do things with that and you will have other people involved in the work and people are experts in that specific area.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you Eduardo, that's a very valid point. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you chair. I don't mean to burst my friend Eduardo's bubble. Carlton, for the record. But there was a time when we tried exactly that and it didn't work. The thing that you find with volunteer organizations, and I've been doing this for a long time, I probably give 200 hours a month in volunteer efforts – you have to work with who shows up for work. That's the reality. That's the practical matter. And it's not because some of us want to have to hold the pen on these things all the time. It's because when we ask for help to just kick start it, it takes a while.

What we find works is that if we kick start it and then put it up, then it's a good opportunity for others to come in. And that's how we've managed to be a little bit productive in the At-Large. And the reason for the ex-com, believe it or not, was precisely to address this problem. That was the reason for it. So it is good that we all agree that we need more hands at the till; we all agree with that. But in the practical sense, you have work with those that show up. So you dance, as they say in Texas, you dance with them that bring you. Okay?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much Carlton. I do want to ask a question though – does anyone think that maybe having a survey of skills so as for us to know better what we all excel at or what we all wish to do..? I mean I understand I'm not asking for everyone to put their CV online and say well this is what I want to do and please give me a job. But effectively say this is what I'm particularly interested in so that for us, and I'm saying us as the Executive Committee team

being able to have a good idea or a better idea of what our skill sets are in the core group that travels or the group that is particularly involved. In any volunteer organization there's a group that has more time to devote and then there's a second level group that spends a little bit less time and the further you go the less time that is being spent. Although, it's important because sometimes people have a very specific interest and would be a real champion of that specific interest. Sandra?

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you. Sandra Hoferichter for the records. I would be in favor with this idea even if it works not out for the forming of working groups but I think it's quite interesting to find out what other people are interested in and maybe even if you have collaboration of a project besides ICANN you can try to find colleagues or project partners whatever. I would be in favor. And maybe we could even go a step further and use it for forming working groups and collaborate with the nom com and say listen we need people with more strategic background or more Board experience. Maybe not for ALAC, but something like this. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much Sandra. In fact, what is happening is, when the nom com comes to see us and they ask us what do you need in At-Large they actually look at what we have also independently. And I know from having been on the nom com that this is taken

into account. It's not just picking out of a hat and saying well that's somebody that's really smart, but it's also picking somebody who's really smart, who's really dedicated and who has also got some skill sets which the nom com thinks might be very helpful to the group. So maybe the nom com is ahead of us in knowing what we need.

I'm now going to ask Edmon, and thank you for waiting Edmon, I appreciate it.

Edmon Chang:

No worries. Since we're on this topic and I was clicking through and I realized that there's the IDN Working Group as well, I think we discussed about it and said we would keep it. I want to apologize; I haven't followed up on it. So I was wondering if it would be appropriate to try to put out an ad hoc call for anyone who is interested, to get this restarted, to meet briefly here in Dakar to get the group started again. If that's okay I'll send a note to the list and see if we can try to convene within the week and get it started again. Is that something that's okay?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well Edmon, just a correction. I don't think it's an ad hoc, I think it's a standing one.

Edmon Chang:

No, no, it is, but I'm suggesting an ad hoc meeting here so we can get the group started again.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, well you will have a few challenges in finding a time slot because I think Gisella and Heidi have worked extremely hard to try and fill our days to the max and they've succeeded ever so well. But if we can find some time then yes. And perhaps we can just touch on that on Tuesday, and between now and Tuesday can we discuss and perhaps check with Gisella and with Heidi as to where we could have something.

Thank you Edmon. Any other contributions or questions? I think we have to move on because I've been told that our staff has to run a little bit ahead of us due to the AFRALO Showcase that is taking place afterwards and which requires much work from them.

So, the next part of our agenda is the DSSA update and that's – I think – do we have the DSSA update slides on the screen please. The DSSA acronym stands for DNS Stability and Security Analysis Working Group and this actually stems from the following piece of history. And with us we have Bart Boswinkel, who is At-Large staff supporting the DSSA Working Group, and he is going to bring fantastic one pagers to all of you around the table.

For those of you that do not have the one pagers or, well I guess we'll all have the one pagers, but for those of you that do not have the muscles to take back huge stacks of paper, we've actually also got a copy of that specific diagram on the USB sticks I believe that you've all been issued with. So you can take that back home and

print it again if you wish to do so. The sticks I believe have been passed around but you're welcome if anybody doesn't have their USB stick with all of the documents that we resort to, the sticks are here. And they can also, the contents of the sticks can also be downloaded and perhaps – perfect, Matt will post that.

We've got beautiful planets on the right screen. Matt, do we have that presentation ready please? There's an error. Well, that's certainly a problem when you deal with DNS Stability. But maybe I will start then. We have several At-Large members that are members of this working group and I will just go quickly through the charter, the background of it, which is a subject effectively started at the ICANN meeting during the ICANN Brussels meeting, where the various supporting organizations and advisory committees of ICANN and also the number resource organizations, the NRO's acknowledged the need for a better understanding of the security and stability of the global domain name system.

That was not the thing I was looking for. We have a Power Point presentation. For the record, the presentation has crashed on a fruit based computer, which I shant mention due to litigation issues. So basically, there was a need for a better understanding of the security and stability of the global domain name system and this was considered to be a common interest for everyone; especially in light of the fact that a lot more new gTLDs are going to be added to the stack. I just wonder whether we might have another version of this. Bart, would you have a version of it on a USB stick or something please? The same fruit based computer? Okay.

Okay, so the goals for today, and I'm not sure whether we'll be able to achieve those if we don't have visuals, will be to update you on the progress of the working group; also, raise awareness and I think we can do that, and to solicit your input. The approach was actually quite interesting.

There are a number of co-chairs, I think we have four of them is that correct, five co-chairs; one from each one of the supporting organizations and advisory committees and also the NROs. And the approach was to use a piece of software called Mind Map, which is actually – no, not Mind Map, FreeMind I think is the piece of software – where we start with the launch and the first thing to do was to identify the threats and vulnerabilities. Then to move onto analyze the threats and vulnerabilities and of course to produce a report at the end.

So far, we have reached about 70% completion with the identification of threats and vulnerabilities. This set of meetings consist or two meeting per week; one being the co-chairs of the working group who meet early on in the week and then in the second part of the week the rest of the working group meets with the co-chairs being present. And usually each meeting is about an hour and a half long.

We work with a FreeMind Mind Map. That's a free software to create sort of a mapping system to organize your thoughts in the brainstorming. And so we have developed lists of vulnerabilities

and threats with definitions; by just clicking on the little box you can go further. I believe, is this document also on the USB key? That's fantastic. So if you actually click on the document, that is a living document, you can click on the little plus sign and it will actually go all the way down the tree, which is pretty interesting. And maybe we might think about using the same sort of system for some of our own work. That's of course something we'll look at in the future.

We're making preliminary choices about which threats are in and out of scope for analysis. And we've developed preliminary criteria and mechanisms for segregating sensitive information. Understandably some of the information that will be shared within that working group will be extremely sensitive. Operators of networks are not too happy about showing any vulnerability and definitely not sharing it with the actual public due to the actual threat of saying such a thing. So we have established some level of criteria. And of course, there's still work to be done in there.

The first one being, the soliciting of additional lists and definitions from experts and interested parties; and the group is able to bring experts. And the final amount of work in this first phase, the identifying threats phase is to arrive at a prioritized, a final prioritized list of threats and vulnerabilities. Unfortunately, because you don't have the visuals, you can't see this beautiful diagram which has been put together. So just move to the next one.

The scope of the threats and vulnerabilities is particularly important because you can either have a scope where you look at absolutely everything from the problems at the root level and at second level domain and third level and the whole stability of the internet itself, including the protocols, addresses, numbers and so on, but that of course is something which sometimes overlaps the work of other groups within the ICANN structure. And at the same time, we're not there to reinvent the wheel. So the scope is particularly important in being able to be focused and actually come up with recommendations within an amount of time that is manageable.

The DSSA Working Group, as the charter of the group says, should limit its activities to considering the issues at the root and the top level domains within the framework of ICANN's coordinating role. So we're not looking at every threat out there. We're just concerned with the DNS, with the threats to the system itself and the ones that are relevant to ICANN.

Just as an example in scope, system failures, hardware/software failures, governmental interventions, seizure blocking, physical events, natural disasters, fragmentation of the root with alternate roots, root scaling, etc. Out of scope – depletion of the IPv4 address pool; that's not a direct threat to the DNS itself. And the DNS itself is not a heavy consumer of IP addresses, so the depletion is unlikely to have any significant impact.

Under discussion at the moment is “business failure”. And now I open the floor for a quick question then – do you think that

business failure should be in or out of the threats to the underlying infrastructure? The floor is open. Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz for the record. Question – business failure means like going bankrupt or just disappearing?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's correct; both and maybe even more. But going back to the disappearing, will that affect the stability?

Eduardo Diaz: Well the thing is if that business is the one that owns the data then we lose it all. So I think it's a threat.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Carlton, would you please speak into the microphone?

Carlton Samuels: Thank you chair. Carlton Samuels for the record. To support my friend there, business failure, both bankruptcy and just failing because of operational – it is particularly acute if they are embedded in the digital infrastructure. For example, if they are people that provide names and numbers registrations and so on. There is some protection that is in the current setup through ICANN where you have to have data escrowed. But there are other operational facts that if the business fails could actually

negatively impact users. So I think business failure should be part of the scope.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, sorry about this. Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Question is, is that applied, the escrow of data, does that apply to ccTLDs or...?

Carlton Samuels: Those are some of the gaps.

Eduardo Diaz: Well then I agree with Carlton that it should be in the threat.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If you could say your names, and I know it's very...

Eduardo Diaz: I'm sorry. Eduardo Diaz for the record.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: In the transcript it doesn't mean anything anymore and certainly when it's translated or when it's interpreted it sounds very schizophrenic.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz for the record.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. So in/out, yes? I think that I see quite a few people nodding so that will be the answer that will be conveyed over to the group. Thank you. So, the next one is the threats of indirect attacks. To give you an idea, in scope would be email server hopping under IPv6 because that would cause collateral damage due to the load. Something out of scope would be registration abuse. Registration abuse from front running or from cybersquatting, or WHOIS abuse, harvesting WHOIS data for Spam or harvesting personal information or personal contact information from domain name registration records – those were determined by the working group as being out of scope.

The rationale for this is that these are at the second level so they're not a direct threat to the DNS. They might be a threat to the DNS records for not the actual records themselves but whatever is attached to the identification, but not a threat to the DNS itself. Move to the next page – we looked at vulnerabilities. Cooperational issues, registry failure and continuity, and this is something which we mentioned a little bit earlier, and also the managerial choices and issues. I will fly through those and hopefully we will be able to have the document itself in your folders. It is on the USB keys isn't it? Okay, thank you.

Moving on to the next – what's happened there? I think I've also had a problem in my presentation; that's interesting. So, direct

attacks – threats and direct attacks – and I think that I’ve jumped a page unfortunately, so we’re back to the page there. Direct attacks – again in scope, distributed denial of service, packet interception, recursive versus authoritative name server attacks, data poisoning attacks; all of these are direct attacks on the DNS system and these might make it crash if the system is not architected well enough or if the attack is massive enough so as to cause failure. Under discussion at the moment – IDN attacks, and also malicious or unintentional alteration of DNS configuration information.

So the IDN attacks being lookalike characters for standard exploitation techniques. Out of scope – foot printing, I’m not quite sure what that meant, but we’ll take it for what it is, authenticated denial of domain name, malicious or unintentional alteration of contact information, because these are not direct attacks on the DNS. The question I throw on the floor then is are IDN attacks, so lookalike characters for standard exploitation techniques, are these in scope for the DSSA Working Group? The floor is open. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels:

Can I make this proposition? If you, if anything arises that erodes confidence in the DNS system at whatever level, could that not be construed as a direct attack on the DNS system? Just user confidence in the system.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. Well, does that affect stability of the DNS? Is confidence stability?

Carlton Samuels: Well I'm extending the thought to the extent that it undermines confidence and therefore might detract users from the system, then that would impact stability of the system.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Open to question. Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz for the record. The question I have is when you say confidence, I've seen you explain it more confidence in using the system. But aren't we talking here about the technology under this?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Was that question aimed at me?

Eduardo Diaz: No, that was a question for somebody to answer. This is Eduardo Diaz; this is a question to be answered by whoever can answer it. I mean we're talking here about the underlying technology. If that's the case, the confidence doesn't apply, right?

Carlton Samuels: This is Carlton Samuels. Eduardo, to the extent... Well, I am thinking it's about more than technology, because I can have the best technology infrastructure. If I'm not using it for anything else what I have is a white elephant. And to the extent that I have a white elephant that nobody cares about, who cares? So it's about the users and what it is that they use it for and say. That's why I'm a technologist – it's to deliver a service that people can use to advance some idea, improve their lives or something.

So to me, the confidence cannot be just about the technology. There has to be that human aspect of it that is recognized as important to the continued operation of the technology.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Carlton. Eduardo and then Sala.

Eduardo Diaz: Hi, Eduardo Diaz. The thing is, is if people don't use the system that also makes the system unstable, just not being used.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fair point. First, Salanieta.

Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro: Thank you. Just riding off Eduardo's comments, Salanieta for the record, I can understand for the financial system – if a user doesn't have confidence that's a direct threat to the market and that sort of thing. But in relation to the DNS I'm struggling with trying

to understand the rationale. But I'm happy to be persuaded but I'm still not convinced.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sala. In the meantime, Matt has managed to put the presentation on the page – page 10, please. Is it 10? Sorry, 9: “Threats, Direct Attacks: Draft for discussion only.” That’s the one, thank you. Any more comments stemming from this?

It’s a little unfortunate that the presentation didn’t go down too well technically so we kind of missed some of the input on there because we couldn’t see it. I do like the dialog that has taken place here and I think we will have some material that we can work with. If you are interested in the subject itself there is a set of webpages that is available with an enormous amount of information, and I would urge all At-Large members to go and have a look at that set of webpages.

Let me just try and download the emails... Oh, it’s downloading at the moment because it’s got the actual location of those webpages. Certainly you will find the presentations; you will also find the working material. If you are interested in joining the DSSA Working Group, I don’t know if we have spaces at the moment. But if you can come to me afterwards we will have a chat and I will see whether there are any spaces.

We are quite a few people on the Working Group already because there are so many supporting organizations and also advisory

committees involved. There's also an issue of as we said confidentiality, etc.

Now, has my email loaded up... And it hasn't, right. So it's the end of the day and of course computers are giving up before humans are; or maybe most of us are already looking quite tired, especially those who have been here since 7:00 in the morning. And I see some of my African ALS friends... Or is it 6:00 AM for others? Well, you don't need sleep anyway, Matt, so that's fine.

Okay, well I thank everyone for this. The thing hasn't come out on my screen. What I will do then, and let's take this as an action item, Matt, is to send to the At-Large lists the actual details of the webpages that have the information about the DSSA and all of the working material that is on there that is publicly available. And I guess Eduardo and Carlton, you'll probably be the first people who will look through those and we look forward to your comments.

Obviously what's been discussed here and of course what Sala has also contributed is going to be fed back over the Working Group, so thank you very much. And thank you very much to Bart for having joined us, and having brought over the one-pagers; and certainly something which we might wish to also adopt – these kind of one-pagers – for our own future meetings. I thought it was maybe one of the very good ways of displaying information and I hope that we can do the same.

So thank you, and thank you, Bart.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And as we reach towards the end of the day, we just have a couple more things before we're going to die. And Matt also has to go; Heidi has gone, Gisella is gone. In fact, I'm quite surprised everyone else is still here but we have a couple more things. One is the assigning of reports of non-At-Large meetings and the other one is Chairs announcement.

So the first one is the assigning of reports of non-At-Large meetings. For those members who are here for the first time, what At-Large actually does is not only attend meetings around this table and in this room; we also go to all of the other meetings out there as much as we can and we try to report on those because of course, we also need to know what's going on everywhere else and it's extremely helpful for the community and for our community to be able to have a summary of what's been going on in the other sessions.

With the very full schedule that we already have it might be a bit of a challenge; however, there are several opportunities, especially the main sessions and some of the sessions where we're not doing things ourselves – specifically I think Wednesday and Thursday, and some parts of Monday.

So the problem that we have had is that people in the past have signed up and then we've only had a handful of reports. In fact, the shame is that we only had two reports out of Singapore. Now,

I remember a lot more people having said “Yes, I’ll write a report,” “Yes, I’ll write a report,” but only two reports out of a committee of fifteen members plus other members that are around is not a particularly good performance. And I hope that this time we will have more reports coming.

And they don’t need to be very large – they can just be four or five, six lines just saying “This is what was discussed, this is what the consensus was, and this is what was the sticky point.” And that’s it. It’s not something that will take you half an hour or even an hour to write. It’s something that can be written in about five, ten minutes.

One of the suggestions, actually, because we have an At-Large Skype chat that is on for all of us to be able to contribute to, is for us to actually write on the Skype chat what is going on at a specific time in the session itself, which helps because it is written whilst everything is happening so then we don’t forget half of what’s going on. And the second thing is it doesn’t take any additional amount of time. We’re already sitting in the session; we can immediately report on it, and that will then be formatted and can be put into our own storage I guess, or archival system.

Any comments or questions or suggestions on this, please? The floor is open. Sandra Hoferichter.

Sandra Hoferichter:

Thank you, Olivier. Sandra for the record. I don’t want to be unpolite or questioning the rule procedure, but in the past I was

one of those who signed up to go to a session, write a report and did not. The reason is the limited amount of time which is left besides all the ALAC activities, I just need to be flexible for my ALS activities – EuroDIG or [.latch] initiative, whatever – so that I’m not very reliable on writing a report. So I decided not to sign up for any session or report in advance, but I will be willing, if I attend a session and have the time to put something together.

I know we discussed this already, where this procedure came from, and I do understand perfectly the reasons for that. But please apologize if I don’t sign up.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Sandra. It’s a valid point – I guess we’re all very busy with a lot of things going on simultaneously. However, do you think that using the Skype as an instant way of reporting is something that would be helpful? I see some nods around the table. Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz. I have a question. Are you saying using Skype to report, but is that information that we put in the chat – we’re going to copy it and put it in somewhere else? Or how are you proposing this?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, the information that we put in the chat, of course if it’s formatted correctly and written in language that is comprehensible,

will be then cut and pasted. It does involve work but at least we will have something. And okay, it might take staff some time to take it but try and write it as legibly and of course as well as possible. Maybe Heidi wishes to add a couple words on this since it will be staff that will be doing the summary.

Heidi Ullrich:

I think this is an excellent idea and I think this will facilitate having more reports available. If I could ask just for convenience's sake, if you do place your paragraph for the meeting on the Dakar At-Large chat could you also please put it in an email to At-Large staff? And one of us then will see that and we'll put it onto the meeting form.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

And as I said, it's only four or five lines in some cases. Darlene has been waiting – is it just a response to Heidi or something else? Okay, then let's let Darlene ask her question and then we'll come back to you, Eduardo. Darlene?

Darlene Thompson:

Thank you, Darlene Thompson here. This reporting of the meetings is becoming a real pet peeve with me actually as I'm sure some of you have seen my emails. I have no problem, I actually think it's very important for us to report on these meetings. I think it also should be used as a performance indicator for those who get travel to here. However, for the last two years there's been about

two of us that have been doing reporting for these meetings and nobody else, and nobody in the ALAC. And I've been told by certain members of the ALAC that they're too busy and they shouldn't have to do this reporting.

So I really think that either it should be done and enforced or drop it. I actually think it should be done and enforced but it's getting very discouraging for the one or two of us, excuse me – two of us that actually do it when the rest of the ALAC does not.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Darlene, and well done for providing the reports. I think it's a really, really good thing. I hope everyone else follows your example. Back to Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Eduardo Diaz. You know, if we're going to format the four or five lines in the chat, I mean go to the Wiki and do it there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Eduardo, that's a good point. However, it doesn't work for some reason. So we're trying to take the barriers out, so the Wiki might be one barrier. So let's take that barrier out and try and make it even easier. I hope that we will not have to go as far as having people have a way of just pressing record on their computer for a minute and then we'll have sound bytes that will describe what's going on. I'm hoping we're not going to reach that level but somehow we're at the moment on this.

The other thing I'm hoping not to have is for people to do cut and paste from the transcript. That would not be helpful. We're looking at something that is a little bit more condensed and certainly that helps people who do not have the time to listen to a one-and-a-half hour discussion but who can just have a quick browse at what's going on, and see if there's something interesting. Mohamed?

Mohamed El Bashir: I think many of us here use Twitter, and we are tweeting, some of us tweeting the meetings live. So if Matt or someone could send us a hash tag so whatever we tweet, sorry most of it is descriptive of the meeting itself.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Mohamed El Bashir. That's a very interesting point, especially in light of the fact that we did speak about new technologies and tweeting well, makes the report even shorter I guess. But it's an interesting point and that might be something that we will also be looking at. Next is Yaovi Atohoun.

Yaovi Atohoun: Yaovi, I will be speaking French. (speaks French)

Darlene Thompson: I'm not hearing any translation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So it looks as though there is an interpretation problem. Is the equipment faulty?

Yaovi Atohoun: I wanted to speak in French because this will wake me up and everybody will follow better – that’s very good. I have the following remark. When people are volunteers to attend these meetings, in reality when the day comes do they really have the possibility to attend? That’s a factor. During certain meetings, when they ask “Who’s going?” people don’t see really, they say “Okay, maybe I will go,” the other ones say “Oh, I’ll go to that one,” but then they see that they don’t have the time afterwards.

So my proposal, I don’t know if today we could do it but before saying that we are going to attend, that we should be sure that we will be able to attend to do the report. Maybe people don’t really have the time to attend the meeting. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Well, I think this might happen in a number of cases. If five people sign up for a meeting and all five people are unable to make it, it really sounds though as either they’re very, very close friends and they all have the same alternative activity at the same time; or there’s a problem somehow. So the fact that somebody is attending a meeting doesn’t mean that you cannot sign up for that meeting.

All that we wish to do and to have is to have more than just two reports. We are more than 15 people in the room – surely we can produce more than two reports. I mean anything is going to be better than during the last meeting, and it's highly disappointing to see only two reports. I'm not sure how this reflects on our community, because yes, we are doing an enormous amount of work during our sessions but I would hope that we also go out there and see what's going on out there.

The main problem in my view with the amount of time that the new gTLD process has taken is that institutionally at ICANN, things happen in silos. And so you have a discussion that takes place in this room and the same discussion is happening in the room next door and the same in the room next door; and ultimately, what used to happen is the Board ended up with everybody's point of view and having to choose between five, six, seven points of view – and thinking “Why didn't these people talk to each other?”

The important thing with us is that we're able to look at anything and everything. We are actually the cross-community group that can go everywhere. I see Carlton has put his hand up, and then afterwards I'll have Darlene again and Evan as well. Carlton?

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you, Chair – for the record, Carlton Samuels. I'm emoting to what you said a little while ago because that's precisely why I tend to go to these other meetings outside. I know that we operate

in silos. I know that there are issues before us that I need to know more about or I need to sharpen my arguments or something I have about that issue. And so I tend to go to those meetings that either help me to sharpen my understanding of the issues or help me develop counter arguments against what I don't like.

That's why I go to those meetings, and I have to tell you, it is very, very straightforward. It helps me to provide what I consider to be a reputable representation of views that I think are worthwhile. And to the extent that I do that, I would always argue that the best way to develop a sense of what it is, is do what I do – read the transcripts, listen to them, make determinations of what is important to you and act accordingly.

I'm truly very sorry that this has not left me. This is why I spend a lot of time reading documents and talking to people and listening to what people have to say, because I want to develop a sense of my own as to what is important and what I might do to advance the agenda that I seek to support.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Carlton. Next on the speaking list is Darlene.

Darlene Thompson: Darlene Thompson. Just a comment on something you said, Olivier, about this getting noticed by others about the lack of reporting. This was noted the last meeting. One of the individual

members from the NARALO put it out on a very public list, how almost nobody had put in any reports; and publicly questioned whether any of the ALAC were actually going to other meetings and what was actually happening here, because that is the public perception. If these reports are not going in by such a majority of people it's going to look bad on everybody.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Darlene; that's a very fair point and I did see that. And of course what do you answer when you don't have the actual material? It's very hard to convince someone that you were there when you can't write a few lines about what happened there.

Certainly in addition to this, also during my Friday Chair's report that I give over to the community, I am always pointing to the fact that we have had our members go to all these meetings and there is also a pointer in that report to the area where we store this information. So it does look a little strange for the members, the people out there to go onto that webpage and to see that it's a little bit empty.

Next on the speaking list is Evan.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. I wanted to link together something that Darlene said earlier with something you've just said now, and in fact something we talked about earlier in terms of metrics. When we had this

whole discussion about sanctions and this whole thing about holding representatives accountable and things like that, one of the things that was mentioned as an alternative is making sure that RALOs and regions understand the performance of the people that they've sent and that they've elected.

Perhaps one of the metrics should be what reports did people send in? When they attended a meeting, did people submit reports? This should be the kind of thing that is reported back to the RALOs as part of "This is what your elected representatives did on your behalf when they attended the meetings."

So and I think that's sort of what Darlene was alluding to a little earlier when we were talking about holding people accountable. If only two reports are coming in then that gets listed just as if only two people voted on a motion or only two people participated in a working group or whatever. It should not in itself be a reason for sanction, to use the word from before, but should be the kind of thing that is brought back to the region, brought back to the Nominating Committee to indicate to them the performance of the people they have sent to ALAC.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan, and I'll have an action item for Heidi to include what we've just heard here into the ALAC metrics. I think that's a really interesting thing. Rinalia?

Rinalia Abdul Rahim: Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the record. Just a question: where exactly can we find the reports if they are filed? And is there a guideline in terms of where it's supposed to go?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'll let Heidi answer that.

Heidi Ullrich: Okay, thank you. It's a very good question and for the newcomers I'm happy to speak to you and show you how the At-Large Wiki is set up or at least in theory is set up. But actually I've just sent the link to past At-Large workspaces for ICANN meetings, so you'll see Singapore, you'll see San Francisco, Cartagena, all on down. And on each individual workspace there's an area that says "At-Large Reports," and then you click on that and you'll see day-by-day meetings.

Currently there's not anything there except as I think Darlene mentioned, one or two reports at least for San Francisco. There were I think just one or two reports so you won't really see anything. You'll see the meetings but they're all empty. So for example, click on the Singapore one – I've just sent the link. You'll see all of the meetings. Click on Singapore; go down the page a little bit. You'll see where it says "At-Large Meeting Reports," and you'll see there are spaces for the meetings that took place but no reports. And you can see how you can add – it'll say "Add your report here."

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Heidi. And so we have two ways or three ways actually – one, the Wiki; two, the email; three, the Skype chat. And as I said earlier, a report is not a twenty-page report; it can be a paragraph long.

We are running out of time in this discussion. We're not going to go through each one of the sessions and allocate people here with people putting their hands up. That takes an enormous amount of time and we certainly don't have the time to do that. However, there is a webpage which Heidi will send maybe both to the Confluence... It's already on there, is it? It's a Google Document to sign up, and if like Sandra you're not quite sure whether you can make it or not make it you can put your name up, or maybe not put your name up; and then if you do go to that session you can write a report without having your name on there.

But at least let's try, all of us at least put a couple of reports in so that at least that fills up. We're fifteen people – if each person does two reports, well that's thirty reports. That's a heck of a lot more than just two reports. So thank you.

And finally to close the day, and I realize that we have the AFRALO Showcase taking place in fifteen minutes so we have to be rather fast, but it's still a very important item on the agenda. It's the Chair's announcement, and the announcement is actually about someone who has not managed to join us today unfortunately for health reasons, but is an outgoing member of the

At-Large Advisory Committee. And I'm speaking about Gareth Shearman who I understand is with us remotely. Are we able to speak to him?

Gareth Shearman: I'm here. Can you hear me, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Can we put the telephone line up a little bit, please? We can hear you, you're just very faint.

Gareth Shearman: Okay, can you hear me better?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes we can, indeed. Yes. Well we could, but maybe we can't now. Can you hear us?

Gareth Shearman: Yes, I'm here. I'm here. I'm listening to you; have been for a while now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Perfect. Well Gareth, it's of course a very sad thing that you couldn't come down all the way here in Dakar. I hope that your health is stable or improves but I just wanted to ask whether you had any lessons learned. I don't know what one calls it after being

on the ALAC for such a while? “Parting shots” perhaps, says Evan.

Gareth Shearman:

No. I think I just would like to say that it’s been a fascinating and very informative time that I’ve spent with you all and I’ve certainly learned a lot. I understand the difficulties of being involved and the time it takes, but certainly I have tried to – although I haven’t had a lot that I’ve wanted to contribute directly, not being a policy wonk – I have tried to make sure that I attended all the meetings that I could and made sure... I think in the time I was there I only missed one vote, which I guess is something of a mark.

But other than that I wish you all well with the rest of the time in Dakar and I intend to keep involved as much as I can through NARALO.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well, Gareth, thank you, thank you for those, what Evan calls “parting shots.” I guess they’re not shots – they actually sound very praiseful, so I saw quite a few nodding heads around the table. And equally I think the community here has really appreciated all the time and all the input that you have had into the process, and so what I wanted to ask from everyone is to have a big, big round of thanks for you. And I’m not sure if the video works but I thought we would do it all standing up.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And for the record, I think the only people who did not stand up were the interpreters because the booths are a little bit small. But everyone was in the room and we were standing up, so Gareth, thank you so much.

Gareth Shearman: Thank you very much, everyone. I appreciate that enormously.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, and well I hope that you'll be able to still join us over the week remotely. Of course it's a little bit hard sometimes due to the time zones and the fact that the Earth is round, and that's one thing that At-Large is not going to be able to fix. But we've really appreciated your input and I'm not quite sure what to say. Is it "So long" or "See you soon," I guess?

Evan Leibovitch: We'll see you at tomorrow night's NARALO meeting.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, so I understand you will be there in Costa Rica.

Gareth Shearman: No, I don't think so, but we'll see how things go in the future.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Absolutely. Well, we'll see how it goes. Thanks so much and with this I now declare the meeting to be closed, but not before having done two things: the first one asking for everyone to go to the AFRALO Showcase. It's one of the exciting things that happens during an ICANN meeting and is certainly one of the things that I enjoy the most, because it's always great to know a lot more about the At-Large Structures that make up our organization.

We're not structures that are solely here to deal with ICANN issues. This is not only a volunteer job but it's a side job, and most of the organizations if not all of them, all of the At-Large Structures have actually got another activity on top of that. So it's always really heartwarming to see such an effort. The other thing of course, the AFRALO Showcase is going to be particularly exciting. They're always pioneers so they will no doubt sweep us off our feet.

And then last thing: I wanted to thank, a big round of applause for the interpreters today who have worked extremely hard since 7:00 in the morning.

[Applause]

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And who have had to contend with several of us having drunk several cups of coffee, thus making our speech barely intelligible. So thank you, and I now declare today's meeting closed.

[End of Transcript]

