

And hope we have a full, frank and fearless discussion particularly from the regional leaders. We have the questions that you've all had for some time. Section 9.1 from the AAC (inaudible 02:26) , you know what the public common questions are and we want to hear from you what you've brought to this meeting from your Rankin file members which is close to 121 and rising.

Brian Cute:

Thank you Cheryl. My name is Brian Cute. I am the Chair of the Accountability and Transparency Review team. Thank you all very much, not only for meeting with us but also providing lunch. Very much appreciate it. I would like to introduce the members of the Review Team or have them introduce themselves if we could go around. Thank you all and welcome again. We have up on the screen the questions that were provided to you in advance of the meeting.

Cheryl's indicated that at least from the regional groupings there may be some specific feedback. What we would like to do with the next 50 minutes that we have is to have as open, comfortable and frank a discussion as possible to hear from you in response to the questions that we put in the letter to you, but specifically if there are examples of ICANN decisions or ICANN processes that you think merit specific attention.

The review team has to deliver some recommendations at the end December for improvements mapping to all of the 5 areas in paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments. So this is an open discussion and I'm going to open the floor now and look forward to hearing from you. Does anyone have something they'd like to respond to?

Evan Liebovic:

I guess I'll start off with something that I guess has stuck in the craw with a number of ALS (inaudible 10:20). I have been involved with. And it has to do with the perception of ICANN as an industry organization as opposed to multi stakeholder body. You asked for specific examples and I'll give you one that has stuck in the craw that is the fact that ICANN holds secret meetings. It holds them with its registrars. There was one in Toronto, there was one in Rome.

There were actually members of the public that were denied access. And I had a very lively discussion with ICANN staff in Nairobi on this issue. And apparently it seems like either ICANN staff and/or the Registrars believe they have the right to have an ICANN funded meeting that is

closed to the public. This goes against every principle of transparency that you're here to talk about.

The answers that were given back to me were well these aren't policy decisions they're organizational issues, they're operational issues and I think there's people in At-Large that are intelligent enough to make the distinction and understand that these meetings are not about policy. But by keeping them closed you maintain the impression that number one ICANN is serving as an industry body as opposed to a multi-stakeholder group and you allow for conspiracy theories and things like that to happen simply because there is no outside access.

Things like we'll publish the minutes when we're done simply does not cut it. Anyway, I'll end there. You wanted specific examples and there's one right off the bat.

Brian Cute: Thank you Evan, others, Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I have some formal comments but I'll reserve them for other people to have a chance because I already had a chance earlier. I'll add one further comment to what Evan said. We did have a meeting with ICANN in Nairobi about it. The answers changed a little bit and it ended up being that the Registrars don't feel comfortable talking in front of other people and I appreciate that but I'm not sure that's a reason to close things.

Brian Cute: Thank you and I should note that when we sent these questions to the various constituent groups or bodies of an ICANN meeting in Brussels there was a complete understanding that there wasn't sufficient time for written answers. But we hope you'll take the time to provide answers to the questions that we provided as well as written summaries of the things that we're discussing today. So this is not a one shot interaction with the Review Team. Any other examples?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not so much an example but something I wanted the Review Team to know. This is not our first opportunity or sojourn to work on this as a group. Many of the people in this room were a small part of the members of the At-Large community who gathered in Mexico. And as a result of the At-Large Summit in Mexico, very specific statements were made, and passed on to ICANN Board, about a whole lot of things not the least of which was the production of about 6-8 months as well as the in-house work we did at the summit on Accountability and Transparency.

Now, we did actually get a recognition that we did hand over the documentation. That was a nice thing, it's a rare thing in the world of At-Large but it's a nice thing. We then went so far as to take those statements and ratify them as At-Large Advisory Committee Advice. And therefore that is advice to the Board. Now there is no requirement for them to do anything, including (Inaudible 14:26). But, what is important is our community and its' that community out there, please take a moment to have a look, it is the world.

It is Rank and File end users with an interest in perhaps communications, perhaps consumer issues that are willing to put time, energy, and hopefully have influence on ICANN policies and policy development processes. (Inaudible 15:03) gets fed up through the regions and comes to the 15 member ALAC. When something says it is ALAC advice it has gone through that full spectrum.

It is consensus agreed community view and if there is divergence we record it. So we actually have had on the record for some time some very specific recommendations and I can assure you that that's been prepared to come to us as a piece of formal documentation. But some of the regions may also have particular issues. And I'm looking to Andreas or Carlos or Sylvia. I listen to your meetings, I know your problems. Come on, share them.

Adam Peake: Three issues really. One is you'll be going to the summit and you of course have been involved in ICANN longer than many of us. But some of you may be new. And one of the most important inputs we have into ICANN is the public forum and it's a very important part of transparency and also accessibility to the decision making bodies.

So we'll have 4 or 5 hours of people standing at microphones giving comments to the Board and the Board will often give an instant response but there is very little indication that there's anything other than the instant response given to those often quite carefully considered questions. What happens? What does the Board do? Does it consider them, how does it consider them, and could we see how that consideration is presented.

I've submitted comments into that process and I have absolutely no clue whether they looked at it and gone, ha silly. Or if it is silly I'd like to know as embarrassing though that may be. That's one thing. Further about

the Board what we have seen, probably a couple of years ago, is a development where the Board minutes have started to show a detail of what the discussion was. Not necessarily that member X name said something but at least you saw a development of the discussion reflected in the minutes.

That has disappeared and we now seem to be back to whereas phrases, well other than being boring to read they're not very informative, you just don't know what happened during those long meetings. I think we should see what happens during the Board meetings and some descriptive text of how the meeting developed would be a good idea. And the last thing if we submit comments into a process, how were considered and for what reason were they rejected. It is perfectly ok to reject comments, you don't have to accept everything but we'd like to know how were my comments considered into the process.

And there is a well known US process for doing this and I think if you look at the green papers and the white papers the established (inaudible 17:53) you can see how those ideas were taken into consideration in the response and then the policy came later. So let's see how our comments are taken into consideration is important and we have a model already there so it shouldn't be too hard. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you for that and that is as you know an explicit element of paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments, (inaudible 18:19).

Evan Liebovic: Just as a follow up is it not possible for the ICANN Board to treat advice from ALAC they way it treats advice from the GAC (inaudible 18:28). Just as a matter of saying you have an advisory council, there is already a procedure in place on how to treat things coming from that other advisory council, why not just apply the same thing to ALAC? Doesn't mean that everything ALAC submits has to be agreed on, but if it's not there ought to at least be a reason given.

Not just with this, I mean with issues Cheryl identified came out of the summit. Someone characterized that you toss ideas over the wall and maybe every now and then something gets tossed back. It's a general feeling that came out of things like the summit where a lot of good ideas came out of the summit. (Inaudible 19:30) I just meant to follow up on what Alan was saying. If there already is a precedent why not just apply that to ALAC.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So noted. You might be interested to know we've just come from the meeting with the joint Board and GAC work group. Because there are changes and review mechanisms that they're looking at and mechanisms that maybe some of that might permeate into a more culturally wide thing. So it's not light at the end of the tunnel. It's not an oncoming train but it's on many agendas.

Sebastian Bachollet: Thank you in French. I will complete what my colleagues have said underlining something more specific. ALAC produces comments on issues and topics that are included on the agenda. For example we have produced a comment on the program of the plan of the three coming years. We have suggested a project that would be to have an objective in the 3 years to come to have an ALS in 80% of the countries of the world.

We decided it wasn't in the strategic plan of the icon. We are going to send you the summary of the comments they told us and we are here in the plan and we are doing the work and the work is disappearing from the situation. It seems to us that even if the Board doesn't agree we can start discussions and debates and we are not having a feedback. And every year we have to come back to the same points.

For an organization that is bottom up we have a lot of things to say again on the procedure of the production of the documents especially the strategy, the comments are made, how are they analyzed and how do we have replies to them and how all these are translated at this strategic level. Thank you Sebastian.

Andreas Piezza: I will speak in Spanish (inaudible 23:24). I agree but we can be polite and strong in our ideas at the same time. It is related to what Evan said when he first spoke about the meetings and the perception of the transparency in the regions and the possibility of the conspiracy as well to see how things are done, and also eventually the possibility of this lack of transparency.

If we add to this something which happened in our region linked to meetings which were supported by ICANN, which were advertised as outreach meetings. I don't know if they were totally financed by ICANN. I think there were also companies co-hosting those meetings. There was one in Sao Paulo in December, on is Buenos Aires in November. These meetings who aim is outreach, sometimes the main point in the agenda there was no special direction to link it to this At-Large concept.

When one says At-Large in our region probably it is auto-reference not linked to a structural idea but to the main concept of At-Large. Probably not as important of being a closed meeting, compared to what Evan said. What Evan said is more important. In a way I think we have an opportunity to talk about that now. I think the agenda of these outreach meetings could be best profited by ICANN, (inaudible 26:10).

Second point was linked to translation and interpreting. For those who represent regions in which English is not the native language that's transparency for us, Translation and interpreting means transparency. Since (inaudible 27:01) were created, they increased in terms of translations and interpreting really improved. Honestly speaking the situation is much better at least compared with 2006 was my first meeting now I see the level has improved. This is something we have to represent as a very important effort, but there are things like the budget allocated to translation is probably broader not only transparency.

We believe there are lots of things to do in terms of translation and interpreting. And going ahead allocating budget could be positive bearing in mind that the impact produced with \$100,000 with translation and interpreting compared with the same amount spent in a meeting with outreach, the impact is less. And I'm just speaking randomly about this budget, I don't have the exact budget but I have a feeling that this is money well spent and really needed.

And it is something I wanted to point out because we should be happy about this policy of translation and interpreting, but it's kind of slowing the rhythm of this reduction of budgets for the next term. It's worrying us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to be clear. You were saying that the money is better spent, that there is value for money in translation and interpretation as opposed to same dollar value going into an outreach meeting? Is that correct?

Andreas Piezza: (Inaudible 29:11) outreach meeting.

Brian Cute: Let's ask a follow up question Andreas on the outreach meetings just to understand if there is a disconnect in expectations or something else. From your perspective what do you think an outreach meeting should be? What I heard was disappointment in the agenda. I'll admit that I'm not very familiar with the outreach meeting's process.

One could envision outreach where ICANN is attempting to inform the globe about the work that it's doing and therefore establish an agenda to that end. An outreach meeting could be one where ICANN is coming to your home town and allowing you to interact with ICANN and form the agenda. Can you give me a sense of what the expectations are on both sides of the fence?

Andreas Piezza: At the end of the day if ICANN organizes the agenda they wish to communicate it is fine. If the targeting is defined that this is the subject new GTLD (inaudible 30:39) and it is the targeting for new potential registries in the community. If they come to Sao Paulo or Buenos Aires I guess they are not looking for (inaudible 30:53). These projects probably come from other countries. But if you come to our regions the targeting should probably be more specific.

If we're talking about outreach, the future of the internet, then the agenda could include (inaudible 31:23) invitation of these meetings were civil society but it was not really implemented in the agenda. It is not about personal participation because that is not the point. What I really think would be a topic to be treated without the specific person participation with the topic of which gives you the opportunity to talk about civil society this would be fine from this point of view.

It is not necessary that all people are invited then you can understand, I mean that if I present it that way it is not the idea we have. If we define that the target is to get new applicants then I wouldn't object but if the target is to present the activities by ICANN and we invite academies and civil society then we are talking about something else and the agenda should (inaudible 32:26)

Brian Cute: I think when we talk about accountability and transparency it is sometimes very difficult to explain to our communities, to our ALS's. Let me just give one example because for me this is mostly a question of how people perceive contradictions and then easily something very important is at stake and that's called credibility, just one example. It was (inaudible 33:20). Then we do everything since that time to attract as many as possible to apply and to get certified At-Large structures.

Now at the Brussels meeting we have a showcase for European Regional At-Large organizations. Unfortunately we had to tell our members sorry

we made a showcase (inaudible 34:00) but we are not in a position to invite you because we have no funding for you. Then some of our members asked me, oh we have heard that there was recently (inaudible 34:17) that costed a little fortune, but for your At-Large organizations you have no money to invite them to a meeting in Brussels. I think this is quite an obvious contradiction and as long as we have example like this there is always a piece of credibility at ICANN at stake.

Alan Greenberg: One of the questions that you ask is to what extent does ICANN address the needs of the public interest in its decisions. And my summary answer, and I will try to give specifics, is not very well. I think the reason for that is in general ICANN responds to its stake-holders and that predominantly means the people who come to meetings, the people who participate very actively, and those are largely people who have a financial stake in the game whether it ranges from Domainers, to Registrars, to registries, to companies that are investing large amounts of money.

And I think the question is closely linked to another one that is being discussed, not in this meeting but in the GNSO (inaudible 35:52) one, that there's a burn out and there's too much work to be done and how can we possibly limit what we do. And I think that's the wrong tactic. I don't think we're trying to do too much work; I think we have far too few people doing it. I sit on a whole bunch of working groups and the same people, if not the same people the same companies, are represented throughout it.

The companies who have a big stake make contributions. ICANN does not do a very good job of demonstrating the return on value of why individuals and why small companies should participate. I've got close to 40 years of experience dealing with volunteer organizations and some are far more successful than others in getting volunteers from small organizations or individuals to participate. ICANN has not made the value case of why, and as a result does not have the participation of many of its corporate organizations and certainly not of individuals because there's just no perceived value.

And telling At-Large, or the GNSO, go beat the bushes for your community and get them to contribute, it's very hard to come up with the rationale for why, because we're not given a lot of material for how they're going to benefit from giving huge investments of their time often with not only no return but very often with no acknowledgement. As



Cheryl implied it is now delightful that when we send advices to the Board we get an acknowledgement from somebody saying it was received. We don't have a clue if anyone reads it, but at least we know it didn't get lost in the mail. We need to do better.

Eric Gidearte: I will speak in Spanish. Thank you. First I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak in Spanish. This is very interesting. This doesn't happen very often. Secondly I would like to remind you in general all who are following this meeting that on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, the application of comments was launched. If you have selected the application of comments in the website of ICANN there are no comments registered. This is just a calling for you to go to your organizations and disseminate that I think that I like and prepare a formal response.

I think that the organizations should participate because this is the only way we have to interact (inaudible 39:01) now; this is a question because I would like to have a better input. How do you think from your organizations you could contribute and help to make things more transparent and to better control not only the (inaudible 39:27) but also the decision making process. You have already talked about that because it is very difficult to do that if there is no feedback, it's impossible. So what would be the alternative way if this doesn't work? How is the way to influence, make a difference with other people so they take active part and then cultural diversity.

That's different from linguistic diversity. Linguistic diversity can be helped through improving translation interpreting services. But now cultural diversity how are you dealing with that? How do you think from your organizations? How are you dealing with this topic cultural diversity? Thank you very much before hand for your answers because that will be useful in our report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a slight out of ordering because Carlton has a response specifically for your question.

Carlton Samuels: Thank you. I quite agree with Eric that it would be best if individuals make comments directly to the issues. If you look at the public comment list on the website, you'll see a list of activities and issues that are open to public comment. The underlying premise from this is that people understand the issues that are laid out there. To understand those issues you have to engage earlier rather than later. And sometimes some of the

infrastructural tools that are required to understand the issues are not present or apparent.

For example, some of these issues are highly technical and require translated documents, require summaries of the issues, and so on for ordinary people to understand them. Those are not present. People respond to issues when they have an interest. The people who tend to respond to specific issues are going to be the usual suspects. You're never going to break out of that small group unless you make it possible for others to be able to understand what's happening. And that to me is the basic problem with all of this. It takes time, it takes interest and it takes some tools and they are not always together.

Analise Mayin: (Inaudible 42:55) yes, what I want to say is along those similar lines. This is my first meeting as a representative of RALO so I try to imagine myself going back to my ALS and trying to pull in information and responses to the public comment questions and that type of thing. But in order to do that it is such a huge job, such as what this gentleman was saying, bringing them up to speed on what these issues are and why it's actually important to them.

I was wondering if there was a possibility of arming us as regional RALO's or ALS's with a kit of tools and it would sort of start very basic in a graphic form of how I can make decisions on categories. So what we can do is take issues and break them up into categories of policy making or development and which body of ICANN is involved in that process and actually have a graphic chart. So that if a user has an issue they can quickly at a glance look I need to take this through my ALS or RALO to ALAC and they will speak to ICANN on my issue. The rest of this stuff is really interesting but it's not really my area.

I think if I could present that to our ALS members they would feel a self value that they actually have something to offer because everybody is an expert in something or some area and they can see how it's relevant to what ICANN does. Other than that when you go to that ICANN website it tells you how ICANN is responsible for a coordination of names and numbers but that is a huge leap to how is that going to benefit my life using the internet. I'm very into the graphic idea of presenting policy development through which channels to the internet user so that his voice can be heard and valued.

Adam Peake: I like that. I guess you probably hear a lot of criticism as you go around. I think it is worth noting that ICANN is incredibly transparent and accountable at the same time. We just set particularly high standards for it. (Inaudible 45:58) so I think ICANN is setting very high standards for itself. And a lot of it is really about organizing the information that is there and if we could spend more time on how it's presented and making sure that people have organizational information. That could be translation it could be just how documents are presented generally.

A lot of stuff is available you just have no clue on how to find it on that website, back to a specific criticism since that's what we're here for. Recently ALAC and the non commercial stake-holders group issued a statement on transparency of staff documents. (Inaudible 46:46) essentially, it's saying that staff is briefing the Board on a lot of issues, we're not entirely sure because we can't see them. How they brief. How we wish them to brief. And this document was saying that all briefing documents should be made publicly accessible. So that we do know how the Board is receiving information from the staff because it may not be in line, it may not be summarizing fairly, it may be summarizing perfectly accurately. But we'd like to know.

Carlos Aguirre: Okay, the point you have made about zero participation you could say. I just remembered that this morning we were talking about this issue of commenting and in particular this is very familiar because I am the Chair of Commitment Engagement and Participation in ICANN and when we issued a call for participants the response was very poor: there were only two contributions. And as Carlton and Andreas were saying this has something to do with the fact that people don't know the language the lack of transcripts of documents or interpreting of translations. People who don't know about something they can't take part and if they can't take part in activities they can't make commitments. This is logical.

So I think we could rethink this outreach to do it in a more effective way. The question is how. You were talking about cultural diversity. This is a very important issue in our ALS in Latin America and we are working in different countries in the region. Because in Latin America there are indigenous communities and different ethnic groups, particular ethnic groups with specific needs and we have to provide for it and we have to understand this and this is also transparency that is to try to reach, to understand different cultures, and different people and different languages of course.

There are many examples as Analise has just said when in ALS someone can know how they can really participate in ICANN. Here is someone who has been asking me for 1 year how we can organize and settle or set up an ALS and this is not easy. They have only been able to apply one month ago. Is this transparency or is this someone else? How do we reach the individual user? Do we need simple communication or more concrete communication so that the individual user can participate so that they can engage and they can be committed to the work carried out by ICANN?

I think that is a very important issue. Then the last issue as Alan was saying, we are working on different topics. In my country, Argentina, 10 years ago it was said that when there are many acts that means corruption. Of course I am not talking about that here. I'm just trying to make a comparison of relations. So when there is a lot of work sometimes we cannot finish everything with little people. So that is the relation that I wanted to make. Don't get me wrong sometimes if there is a lot of work with less people, then the work will not get carried out. Thank you.

[Farud]: (Inaudible 52:33) I come into ICANN from a very interesting background. And that is being part of a process called the (inaudible 52:39) which ran since 2003. For the first time governments were compelled with this question: How could interim government processes be open up to include others? How could inclusiveness happen? How could participation be nondiscriminatory? In order to get to that stage testing began. Models were being explored by participation.

(Inaudible 53:10) furthermore, 80 years down the road, what does that mean? That means that (inaudible 53:30). It's a big word it can be thrown everywhere. And when its thrown people like me get agitated because we fight for it every day in other countries. (Inaudible 53:49) to let go the great closed governments and open up to such a level of openness and inclusiveness that all that happens in the process becomes common conversations. Conversations like the one we're having at the moment.

Brian Cute: Thank you very much and I have to apologize but we do have to go. Analise and Alan since you had a chance to speak please take my apologies. Thank you for your time. As I've said before we'll welcome written responses to the questions provided today. We would welcome any inputs that any of you would have individually. We will look at our

section website to make sure you have proper vehicles there for you to provide us input. We will pay quick attention to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Since the very moment you had a member of the At-Large in the ATRT, or as soon as we knew one was going to be there, we've had a public commons Wiki space. That's anybody's opinion at any time going up there. We're collecting case studies for us now. Thank you and please ALS members out there keep that information coming, get those case studies in, and bring in those pieces of information. Thank you one and all.

Male Voice: Thank you for participating ATRT members. We value your work because it is important for us as At-Large and ICANN in general. You have a very tough job. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Welcome to the thrill packed wonderful world of the At-Large regional leaders and ALAC room, this is where what we like think a lot of good policy decision making input comes from and I'd like as a member of the At-Large Advisory Committee to welcome all the ATRT members here today. You will be given one of these. We work in three languages; we have simultaneous real translation going on into French and to Spanish from English.

If you have any tri-lingual skills and you can do French, Spanish and English you may not need one of these hanging around your neck, unless you're good in three languages I suggest you do get one of these to hang around your neck, so if the ATRT do not have these around their neck they might want to put up their hand so that they can be given one. The other thing that you will need to know is that English is on channel 1, channel 2 is French, channel 3 is there for Spanish.

To start them you separate the ear pieces and it will suddenly start, you press the centre button to get 1, 2, or 3 to choose your language channel and then you've got the slide around to do your volume, and Louis is already working it out, so he can hear me in quadruple which is a scary thing. You're all eating and that's good because what we want is to have a fairly relaxed but nevertheless interactive and productive conversation going on here today.

So we've got the chairman of the ATRT, I think I've done my housekeeping excepting, thank you Heidi, each member of the ATRT should receive a small thumb drive or USB stick. Can I please make sure each of the ATRT members have one of those, if not, Heidi in the pink

jacket will provide you with one, that gives you an awful lot of background material that you might want to look at later.

That said, Brian you've got a microphone to push in front of you, so I'm going to take my role back into ATRT, stop being the chair of the ALAC for the rest of the day again and hope we have a full frank and fearless discussion, particularly from the regional leaders. We have the questions you've all had for some time, section 9.1 from the AOC, you know what the public comment questions are, and we want to hear from you and what you've brought to this meeting from your rank and file members, which is what? Are we close to 130? Matthias, what's our total number of listeners now?

Matthias Langenegger: 121.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 121 and rising, thank you go ahead.

Brian Cute: Thank you Cheryl, my name is Brian Cute I am the Chair of The Accountability and Transparency Review Team and thank you all very much, not only for meeting with us but providing us lunch, very much appreciated. I'd like to introduce the members of the review team, or have them introduce themselves if you wouldn't mind. Warren?

Warren Adelman: May I suggest we go around like that and present themselves. Dev you can start and then we go...

Brian Cute: Each person introduce themselves in the room if you would, starting at the end.

Dev Sundahl: Dev Sundahl, President of the internet society, ISOS Mauritius nom com appointed to ALAC I'm a member of the -- com.

Warren Adelman: Warren Adelman I'm the President of Godaddy.com and a member of the ATRT review team.

Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels and I'm a member from the University of the West Indies and Jamaica and a nom com appointed to ALAC.

Michel Chunow: Michel Chunow, Regional Coordinator of the Capta NGO Consortium for the promotion of documents of Africa.

- Olivia Muron: My name is Olivia Muron, I work at France Telecom in Paris and I am a member of ATRT.
- Carlos Agira: I'm Carlos Agira; I am member of ALAC for the region of Latin American Caribbean.
- Andreas Piataza: Andreas Piatza, President of LARALO in Latin American and Caribbean.
- Sylvia Leite: Sylvia Leite, member of ALAC for Latin America and Caribbean region.
- Daryl Sherman: Daryl Sherman, ALAC, North America.
- Evan Liebovic: Evan Liebovic, Chair North American region.
- Louie Lee: Louis Lee, Senior Network Architect at Equinox, member of the San Francisco Bay ISOC Chapter.
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Our youngest member, yay.
- Louie Lee: I am serving as the Chair of the ASO Address Council, a member of the ATRT.
- Larry Strickland: Hello, Larry Strickland, I'm a member of the Review Team from the US Department of Commerce.
- Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa of (inaudible 5.58)
- Aziza Laley: Aziza Laley, the President of ISOS, Morocco.
- Willie Curry: Willie Curry from the Association for Progressive Communications.
- Manella Smile: Manella Smile, Egypt Bank Representative and the Vice Chair of the RT.
- Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg Non Com Representative from North America.
- Sebastian Bachollet: And Vice-Chair of ALAC and -- Liaison, it's for him. Sebastian Bachollet, member of ISOC France, former President of ISOC France and Vice-President of ALAC, I represent European users.
- David Kissondoyal: David Kissondoyal, Secretary from the Latin American, Cook Caribbean Region.

- Kieran McCarthy: Kieran McCarthy, an ILS member.
- Fiona Alexander: Fiona Alexander, US Department of Commerce.
- Fabio Calasanti: Fabio Calasanti, member of the ATRT until recently with the European Commission.
- Adam Peake: Adam Peake, nom com appointee to the ALAC.
- Patrick Fanoual: Patrick Fanoual, from the ISOC of Luxembourg ELS and also a member of the ALAC and STECH.
- Emily Serojay: Emily Serojay, Vice-Chair of the San Francisco ISOC, so ALS member for NORALO.
- Fawat Bajawhar: Fawat Bajawhar from Pakistan and I'm the Vice-Chair of the Asia Pacific (inaudible 8.01).
- Male: I'm (inaudible 7.58), professor of law and representing ALAC Asia Pacific region from India.
- Hamil Bashir: My name is Hamil Bashir. I'm from Sudan, a member of ALAC from Afal.
- Wolf Ludwig: My name is Wolf Ludwig; I'm chair of European regional At-Large organization.
- Eric Illiat: My name is Eric Illiat I am the area manager of (inaudible 8.29) the association of Latin American Caribbean also a member of the ATRT and was one of the founders of the ILAC in the past and (inaudible 8.40) thanks.
- Rudi Vanstnick: Rudi Vanstnick from ISOC Belgium, chair of ISOC Belgium and (inaudible 8.49) liaison in ALAC.
- Uri Alansaporo: Uri Alansaporo from ISOC Finland.
- Brian Cute: Thank you all and welcome again. We have up on the screen the questions that were provided to you in advance of the meeting. Cheryl has indicated that at least from the regional groupings there may be some



specific feedback. What we'd like to do with the next 15 minutes that we have is have as open, comfortable and frank a discussion as possible to hear from you in response to the questions that we put in the letter to you, but specifically if there are examples of ICANN decisions or ICANN processes that you think merit specific attention.

The review has to deliver some recommendations at the end of December for improvements mapping to all of the five areas in paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments, so this is an open discussion, I'm going to open the floor now and look forward to hearing from you. Does anyone have something they would like to respond to?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Evan.

Evan Liebovic: Hi there, this Evan Liebovic chair North American region, I guess I'll start off with something that I guess has stuck in the craw with a number of AOS's that I've been involved with and it has to do with a perception of ICANN as an industry organization as opposed to multi stakeholder body. You asked for a couple of specific examples so I'll give you one that for whatever reason, it just seems to stick in the craw of people and that is the fact that ICANN holds secret meetings.

It holds them with its registrars, there was one in Toronto, there was one in Rome, there were actually members of the public that were denied access and I had a very lively discussion with ICANN staff in Nairobi on this issue and apparently it seems like ICANN staff and/or the registrars believe that they have a right to have an ICANN funded meeting that is closed to the public. This goes against every principle of transparency that you are here to talk about. The answers that were given back to me as well these aren't policy decisions, these are organizational issues, they are operational issues and I think there are people in At-Large that are intelligent enough to be able to make the distinction.

And understand that these meetings aren't there to discuss policy, but by keeping them closed you maintain the impression that number one, ICANN is serving as an industry body as opposed to a multi stakeholder group and you allow for conspiracy theories and like that to happen simply because there is no outside access. Things like, well we'll publish the minutes after it's done, doesn't quite cut it, and anyway I'll end there, but you wanted specific examples and there's one right off the bat.

Brian Cute                    Thank you Evan, others, Alan?

Alan Greenberg:            I have some formal comments but I'll reserve them until other people have had a chance because I already had a chance earlier today in the GSO meeting. I'll add one further comment to what Evan said, we did have a meeting with ICANN in Nairobi about it and the answers changed a little bit and it ended up being well the registrars just don't feel comfortable talking in front of other people and I appreciate that but I'm not sure that's a reason to close things.

Brian Cute                    And I should note that when we sent these questions to the various constituents groups or bodies within ICANN we were meeting in Brussels there was a complete understanding that there wasn't sufficient time for written answers, but we do hope that you will take the time to provide written answers to the questions we have provided as well as written summaries of the things we are discussing today, so this not a one shot interaction with the review team. Any other examples?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:       Not so much an example but something that I wanted to let the review team know. This is not our first opportunity or sojourn to work on this as a group. Many of the people in this room were a small part of the members of the At-Large community who gathered in Mexico and as a result of the At-Large summit in Mexico very specific statements were made and passed on to ICANN Board about a whole lot of things, not the least of which was the production of about six to eight months as well as the in-house work we did at the summit on accountability and transparency.

Now we did actually get recognition that we'd handed over the documentation, that's a nice thing, it's a rare thing in the world of At-Large but it is a nice thing. We then went so far as to take those statements and ratify them as At-Large Advisory Committee Advice and therefore that is advice to the Board. Now there is no requirement for them to do anything including apparently give us a read receipt up until recently that they received things like that.

But what is important is our community, and it's that community out there, please take a moment to have a look, it is the world, it is rank and file end users with an interest in perhaps communications, perhaps consumer issues, but are willing to put time, energy and hopefully have influence on ICANN policies and policy development process. If the --

gets fed up through the regions and then comes to the 15 member ALAC when something says it is ALAC Advice it has gone through that full spectrum, it is consensus agreed community view and if there is divergence we record it.

So we actually have had on the record for some time some very specific recommendations and I can assure you that that's being prepared to come to us as a piece of formal documentation, but some of the regions may also have particular issues and I am looking towards Andreas or Carlos or Sylvia, I listen to all your meetings, I know your problems come on share them.

Adam Peake:

Hello, I'm Adam Peake. I have three issues really. One is you will be going to the summit you have of course been involved in ICANN longer than many of us, but for some of you this may be new and one of the most important inputs we have as a community into ICANN is the public forum and it's a very important part of transparency and also accessibility to the decision making bodies. So we will have four or five hours of people standing at microphones giving comments to the Board and the Board will often give an instant response, but there is very little indication that there's anything other than the instant response given to those often quite carefully considered questions.

What happens? What does the Board do? Does it consider them? How does it consider them and could we see how that consideration is presented? I've submitted comments into that process and I have absolutely no clue whether they have just looked at it and gone hah, silly or if it is silly I'd like to know, embarrassing though that maybe. That's one thing, further about the Board, what we have seen probably a couple of years ago was a development where the Board minutes started to show a certain amount of detail of what the discussion was, not necessarily that member X's name said something but at least you saw a development of the discussion reflected in the minutes.

That has disappeared and we now seem to be back to whereas phrases when other than being boring to read they are not very informative, you just don't what happened during those long meetings. I think we should see what happens during the Board meetings and some descriptive text of how the meeting developed would be a good idea; and the last thing, and this is something that the ALAC has said in the formal comments that Cheryl mentioned, is we would very much like to see, if we submit

comments into a process, how are they considered and for what reason were they rejected?

It's absolutely perfectly okay to reject comments, you don't have to accept everything but we would like to know, how were my comments considered into a process and I know that there's a well known US process for doing this and I think if you look at the Green Paper and the White Papers that established ICANN you can see how those ideas were taken into consideration and the response and then the policy came later. So let's see how our comments are taken into consideration is important I think and we have a model there already so it shouldn't be too hard thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you for that Adam, and that is as you know an explicit element of paragraph 9.1 of the affirmation of commitments, others.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There was Evan and then Sebastian and then Andreas.

Brian Cute: Evan.

Evan Liebovic: Just as a follow up is it not possible for the ICANN Board to treat advice from ALAC the way it treats advice from the GAC? I believe there is already [background laughter] I mean just as a matter of saying you have an advisory council there is already procedure in place on how to treat things coming from that other advisory council why not just apply the same thing to ALAC. It doesn't mean that everything that ALAC submits has to be agreed on, but if not there...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'd like to start by saying thank you. When we left there were about six people who could not get into the spaces. And since we had that break I'm happy to report we had our IT support very specifically go through and all of those 5 or 6 names, all of those people who have asked have been given a new access. If you have additional problems please let me know. I have one more to check for you and I will do it shortly. That is the first order of business that we can have everyone do that. The second order of business with Wiki is we're going to have Emma kind of go over a few more Wiki capabilities to be make sure we highlighted those.

The third order of business is in order to make the At-Large Wiki the best it can be for all of you, we thought we would talk about some things we should be working on as we get through to migrating it onto the

(inaudible1:08:51) Wiki site. For example I think that there should be a list of templates people should see and have access to on the site. My suggestion for things like that whether it's templates or how you want to configure the tree on the left hand side I think it would be worth it to have a conversation and say submit those ideas to Heidi and the staff and then we can collect them all and come back with a proposal.

And the third is, and it's another piece of that puzzle, we will be sending out some guidelines that we would recommend that you do like how to save a document like the year the month the day and then how to tag it. Just as recommendations to make the counseling Wiki the most affective by having some guidelines that people can use as guidelines that we've experienced for ourselves and thought you could find useful. Having said that, I'm going to pass this back to Emma.

Emma Rush: I'm just locating the community Wiki that we're using as a starting point for this. So the login button in the top right hand corner and your log in should be the beginning part of your email address and the password is "mangochutney!" And then log in. What I did want to bring your attention to is in finding Carol's space there are two documents available. What I wanted to do was give them basic information to get information and add content to the pages.

There are key areas of conference and the dashboard landing page. (Inaudible 01:13:10), I just wanted to show you the way that they structured the space. This is the Global Partnership space but they are not randomly throwing the information in as I'm sure you will not randomly throw in information. They've got these top level pages and underneath there these are the parent pages and these are the children pages. So the idea is to consider how you're going to add that content, (inaudible 01:15:59).

So, if I go back to the dashboard. The dashboard is the landing point for the entire Wiki and you can go and find the specific spaces you are involved in and have access to. As I said before there will have access to some spaces and some you won't have access to based on your permissions.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I would like to add at this point that if you were to go to the At-Large Wiki demo site you would realize you cannot add documents at this point. This is a read only site.

Emma Rush: Often you use tables to present you content or make it look neater. You can use tables for example to list the names of the people attending a meeting.

Brian Cute: A lot of Wiki's tend to have their own markup language for people who are faster doing this kind of thing. Can somebody if they wanted to write html or similar mark up if they wanted something that's faster to type but not the same markup as this.

Emma Rush: Yes you can use Wiki Markup and it's the same Wiki Markup and it's the same markup that you would use in Wikipedia and also in social text. And its access, I'm afraid it's gotten much smaller now. You go from Wiki markup, rich text to Wiki markup. Yes you can search the word documents, add the word documents, and save it to the page. Tables at the moment are a little bit restricted in that you can't split, you can't have multiple cells.

But in a few months they will introduce the ability to do that. And you also asked me about html they announced at the recent seminar that they had. They are going to introduce xhtml editing facility. So that the whole thing will change you'll have xhtml, Wiki mark-up and rich text. That's going to be happening soon. So if you have a complex table you really have to consider how to simplify it

Brian Cute: Can we have a group of user; so for example, we can have a group of users named ALAC

Emma Rush: Can you have a group of users? You would create a space and all of the users would be a member of that space. So generally it would be a project you are working on, maybe a working group and all the members would create the space.

Brian Cute: I just want to expand on that a bit. Let's say the group has an executive that you want to be able to add permissions to. Let's say I have 5 people who have admin privileges and 50 people who can edit.

Emma Rush: Yes, you can do that. You can set the permissions as a space by space basis. You have to get the admins to set up permission groups and then you as the space administrator would be able to deal with who can access the space. I can show you how that's all done afterwards it's advanced

administration stuff. To create a permissions group you would have to talk with one of the IT guys.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The way it's worked in the past is we would go to Heidi and ask who she wants to give administrative rights to on your team. And then you could go forward and give permissions to who you want to. This goes back to a little bit about what I said about guidelines. I think it is important to have a set of guidelines that you all use to know how to access the Wiki and rules that you want to use as a group that you think best maximizes the space so you're consistent about it. And so one of the guidelines may include those sections if that's the feedback we get and then we would put that out and get your review and then say here is a set of guidelines for your team going forward.

Evan Liebovic: I love idea, I love what you say but I want to challenge you. Maybe it's the right answer but maybe it's not. Because we are elected and I don't know why staff that is supposed to support us will have to give us permissions. It is not the way I think we should run our work it is not this way. Now it could be at the end of discussion that it is that way for practical reasons but I don't want you to assume that that's the right answer.

I would like that we discuss that before we make decision about how we discuss that. Because I see the question is so important that if Heidi has to create all the groups, yeah that's great but then some of the elected people will have to look after if it's correct and say yes that is the right people. If not then we are in a closed situation but we should discuss it.

Emma Rush: Can I show one more thing? That is how you add an attachment to the page. So you can add word documents or excel or any kind of attachment. If the page has something that you need to refer to then you can add the attachment. You browse for the attachment. In some cases you can drop the file to attach here.

You can browse and then upload or you can drag and drop to upload. As you can see that's much easier and much faster. You can also attach more files if you have more to attach at one time. And you can see the guidelines. If you see the versions, version 1, version 2, version 3, I think I've run out of time.

Heidi Ulrich: Thank you very much [Emma]. I agree that there could be a different way. One way would be to have the At-Large staff work with the RALO

leaders. But Sebastian mentioned that this might be a good topic for the Secretarial Meeting later in the week.

Brian Cute: Before lunch you mentioned version control. Is there any way that with different versions we could have time stamp and (inaudible 1:35:28) One single document which is being edited by different users, I want to see who did what at one time.

Emma Rush: You will be able to see who did what at what time on the one document. But you would all need access to that page where the document is being edited.

Male Voice: Now we have to move on to the survey. We have 15 minutes to go on that. Who will present this subject for your group?

Female Voice: This is the first good news of the day, no of course not.

Male Voice The following is our preliminary analysis of our survey conducted in early 2010, just a quick review of the goals of the 2010 ALS survey. To have current contact information for At-Large structures and ICANN reps. To learn more about ALS's and ICANN policies that interest them, to learn more about the communication tools that ALS has used to better engage with At-Large and vice versa. So here is a quick summary of the timeline of the history of the survey.

In March the decision to conduct the ALS survey was taken by (inaudible 1:44:09). On April 22 the first draft of the ALS survey question were published for comments. April 29<sup>th</sup> ALAC approved the second draft questions for the survey. May 6<sup>th</sup> the first call of volunteers for the ALS Survey Analysis team. May 7<sup>th</sup> the survey was e-mailed to all management at the 22 At-Large structures in the three working languages English, French, and Spanish. What I'll try to show you is the response to the survey.

By the original deadline of May 18<sup>th</sup>, only 34 of the ALS's had responded. The survey was then extended to May 22 and it was through the efforts of the regional reps to get the people to respond that we got a final response of 72 ALS's which is a 59% of all ALS's. So soon after the end of the



survey the ALS survey team had its first of conferences starting May 27<sup>th</sup>. (Inaudible 1:45:45) an adapted Google spreadsheet of the results.

The Google spreadsheet was produced by the ALS survey team to better analyze the results of the survey and the adapted spreadsheet is removing the contact details and so forth. And also on that page is the summary of results of the aforementioned Google spreadsheet. So it was decided by the survey team that the regional results of the survey would be presented by the regional reps, followed by the Global results.

French Interpreter: Okay, I will speak English as (inaudible 1:47:18), so the participation of (inaudible 1:47:42) which represents 59% of the total number. As far as the website is concerned 62% had a website address. This is the number of ALS that declared they had a website, the level of representation. So most of the African ALS's are represented at a national level but I'd like here to make a remark.

But the regional level was understood as being regional within the country instead of being understood in the global sense, regional over several countries, because this is the way the order was described: national, regional, local, state. So this was the way it was understood. Whereas it should have been presented that ALS could be regional both at the regional global sense and the international sense. So in the future I suggest we change the order to local, state, national, regional, and international

Female Voice: And more than half of them use other communication means such as fax and so on. Do regular ALS hold meetings? 85% said yes. Most of them meet every 2-3 months. What type of meeting? Usually face to face meeting but you also have web conferences and teleconferences and other types. As far as working languages are concerned you have 62% of French 31% of English and 31% of Arabic. In order for ALS's to join At-Large working groups, (inaudible 1:50:54) but I do have a remark.

You will see that according to the regions you have percentage varies because they have different interests which makes sense. For example in Asian Pacific Region are the (inaudible 1:51:32). So African ALS's wanted to be a part of working groups no matter whether they're permanent or groups. What matters is the issue that's being dealt with and how long it takes. So is At-Large integrated into ICANN policy structure?

Nearly half said it was well integrated, 15 % decided it was very well integrated but 15% said at large wasn't integrated well at all in the ICANN structure.

So is ALS integrated in the ALAC RALO policy structure? 31% said it is very well integrated. 23% said well integrated and 23% said very poorly integrated. What limits the ALS participation to the At-Large work? Most of the ALS's said that the documents were too technical and required a long time to read. Others said that they had other things to do. A lot of them blamed the connectivity. This is Africa of course and northern areas are a different matter. So how can we increase the ALS participation in ICANN?

Well recommendation 4 about ALS education and awareness rising seems to be the top recommendation in terms of participation improvement. So which recommendation do ALS want in order to assist ALAC in implementing recommendation 4. Well, 54% want to help ALAC in implementing recommendation 4 for the information and awareness rising of ALS's. So it concludes with a situation description.

The participation rates of the African region was good, but only 62% gave a secondary contact to ALS representative which of course for me is an issue. I think all ALS's should have 2 contacts and more than 38% didn't give a website address which is a bad index for organizations that boast about representing internet users. Some of our ALS's still use a fax as a communication tool. However, most African ALS we French as a working language. Most of ALS feel that the excess of the technical nature and length of the published documents presents the most limitation for their participation.

Male Voice:

Next is the Asian Pacific Region. There are 18 ALS in the pacific region and nearly 60% of them took the survey which amounts to 10. From the first question the level of ALS in the region something is worth noting that there is less collaboration of synergies but that at the same time there is an opportunity for the countries to collaborate with each other through the ALS. There is a potential point that if we are able to build these opportunities this year and next there may be an opportunity to increase ALS's. (Inaudible 01:58:25) these are the communication tools used by the ALS. Mailing lists prove to be the most used option for communication (inaudible 02:01:00).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you have any trilingual skills and you can do French, Spanish and English, you may not need one of these things hanging around your neck. Unless you're good in three languages I suggest you do get one of these to hang around your neck. So if the ATRT do not have these around their neck they might want to put up their hands so they can be given one.

The other thing that you will need to know is that English is on channel one; channel two is French; channel three is therefore Spanish. To start them you separate the earpieces and it will suddenly start. You press the center button to get one, two or three to choose your language channel, and then you've got the slide around to do your volume. And [Louie]'s already working it out, so he can hear me in quadruple, which is a scary thing.

You're all eating and that's good because what we want is to have a fairly relaxed but nevertheless interactive and productive conversation going on here today. We've got the chairman of the ATRT, I think I've done my housekeeping, accepting— thank you, Heidi. Each member of the ATRT should receive a small thumb drive or USB stick. Can I please make sure each of the ATRT members have one of those?

If not, Heidi, in the pink jacket will provide you with one. That gives you an awful lot of background material that you might want to look at later. That said, Brian you've got a microphone to push in front of you so I'm going to take my role back into ATRT, stop being chair of the ALAC for the rest of the day again, and hope we have a full, frank and fearless discussion, particularly for the regional leaders. We have the questions you've all had for some time, section 9.1 from the AOC; we know what the public comment questions are, we want to hear from you and what you've brought to this meeting from your rank and file members, which is what? Are we close to 130, Matthias? What's our total number of ALSs now?

Matthias Langenegger: 121.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: 121 and rising. Thank you. Go ahead.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Cheryl. My name is Brian Cute; I am the chair of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team. Thank you all very much, not only for meeting with us but for providing us lunch; very much

appreciated. I'd like to introduce the members of the review team, or have them introduce themselves, if you wouldn't mind. Warren?

- Man: May I suggest that we go around like that. Dave, you can start, and then we go.
- Brian Cute: Each person introduce themselves in the room, if you would, starting at the end.
- Dave Kissondoyal: Dave Kissondoyal, President of the ISOC (inaudible 03:27), non-com appointee to ALAC, a member of the Excom.
- Warren Adelman: Warren Adelman, I'm the president of GoDaddy.com and a member of the ATRT Review Team.
- Carlton Samuels: Carlton Samuels, I'm an AL member from the University of West Indies, Jamaica, and a non-com appointee to ALAC.
- Michel Troneau: Michel Troneau, regional coordinator of the CPDA NGO, Consortium for the Promotion of Documents of Africa.
- Olivia Newhall: My name is Olivia Newhall, I work at France Telecom in Paris, and I am a member of ATRT.
- Carlos Agira: I'm Carlos Agira; I am member of ALAC for the region of Latin American/Caribbean.
- Andreas Piezza: Andreas Piezza, president of LACRALO in Latin American and Caribe.
- Sylvia Leite: Sylvia Leite, member of ALAC for Latin America and Caribe region.
- Gareth Sherman: Gareth Sherman, ALAC North America.
- Evan Liebovic: Evan Liebovic, Chair, North American region.
- Louie Lee: Louie Lee, Senior Network Architect at Equinox, member of the San Francisco Bay ISOC Chapter, and-
- Woman: ALS member, yay!
- Louie Lee: I'm serving as the chair of the ASL Address Council, member of the RT.

- Larry Strickland: Hi, Larry Strickland, I'm a member of the review team from the US Department of Commerce.
- Tijani Ben Jemaa: Tijani Ben Jemaa, AFRALO.
- Azizi Lehib: Azizi Lehib, I'm the president of ISCO, Morocco.
- Willie Curry: Willie Curry from the Association for Progressive Communications.
- Analise Mayin: Analise Mayin, Egypt LAC representative and vice chair of the RT.
- Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg, non-com representative from North America.
- Sebastian Bachollet: And vice chair of ALAC and GNSO liaison, for him. Sebastian Bachollet, member of ISOC France, former president of ISOC France, and vice president of ALAC. I represent European users.
- Man: (Inaudible 06:18), Brussels.
- David Antelepsing: David Antelepsing, Secretary from the Latin American/Caribbean region.
- Ciaran McCarthy: Ciaran McCarthy, an ALS member.
- Fiona Alexander: Fiona Alexander, US Department of Commerce.
- Fabio Calasanti: Fabio Calasanti, member of the ATRT, until recently with the European Commission.
- Adam Peake: Adam Peake, non-com reportee to the ALAC.
- PatrickVanderwal: PatrickVanderwal, from the ISOC Luxembourg ALS and also a member of the ALAC and SA.
- Emily Sirogee: Emily Sirogee, vice chair of San Francisco ISOC, so ALS member for NARALO.
- Fawat Bijor: Fawat Bijor, from Pakistan. I'm the vice chair of the Asian/Pacific At-Large.

- 
- Vivek Andan: I am Vivek Andan, professor of law, and representing ALAC Asia/Pacific region from India.
- Hamed Bashir: My name is Hamed Bashir, I'm from Sudan, member of ALAC (inaudible7:33).
- Wolf Ludwig: My name is Wolf Ludwig; I'm chair of the European At-Large region and At-Large organization.
- Eric Gidearte: My name is Eric Gidearte, I am the (inaudible7:51) of Latin American/Caribbean, also a member of the ATRT, whilst one of the founders of the ALAC in the past on LACRALO. Thanks.
- Ricky Vansnick: Ricky Vansnick from ISOC Belgium, chair of ISOC Belgium, and CCNSO as well in ALAC.
- Yurio Lansing: Yurio Lansing, ISOC Finland.
- Brian Cute: Thank you all, and welcome again. We have up on the screen the questions that were provided to you in advance of the meeting. Cheryl has indicated that at least from the regional groupings there may be some specific feedback. What we'd like to do with the next 50 minutes that we have is have as open, comfortable and frank a discussion as possible; to hear from you in response to the questions that we put in the letter to you.
- But specifically, if there are examples of ICANN decisions or ICANN processes that you think merit specific attention, the Review Team has to deliver some recommendations at the end of December for improvements mapping to all of the five areas in paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitments. So this is an open discussion; I'm going to open the floor now, and look forward to hearing from you. Does anyone have something they'd like to respond to?
- Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead, Evan.
- Evan Liebovic: Hi there, this is Evan Liebovic, chair of North American region. I guess I'll start off with something that I guess has stuck in the craw with a number of ALSs that I've been involved with, and it has to do with the perception of ICANN as an industry organization as opposed to multi-stakeholder body. You asked for a couple of specific examples so I'll give you one that for whatever reason just seems to stick in the craw of people,
-

and that is the fact that ICANN holds secret meetings. It holds them with its registrars; there was one in Toronto; there was one in Rome; there were actually members of the public that were denied access.

I had a very lively discussion with ICANN staff in Nairobi on this issue, and apparently it seems like either ICANN staff and/or the registrars believe that they have a right to have an ICANN-funded meeting that is closed to the public. This goes against every principle of transparency that you're here to talk about. The answers that were given back to me was, well these aren't policy decisions, these are organizational issues, they're operational issues, and I think there's people in At-Large that are intelligent enough to be able to make the distinction and understand that these meetings aren't there to discuss policy.

But by keeping them closed you maintain the impression that number one: ICANN is serving as an industry body as opposed to a multi-stakeholder group, and you allow for conspiracy theories and things like that to happen simply because there is no outside access. Things like, "Well, we'll publish the minutes after it's done," doesn't quite cut it. Anyway, I'll end there, but you wanted specific examples and there's one right off the bat.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Evan. Others? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I have some formal comments but I'll reserve them until other people have had a chance because I already had a chance earlier today in the GNSO meeting. I'll add one further comment to what Evan said: we did have a meeting with ICANN in Nairobi about it and the answers changed a little bit and it ended up being, "Well the registrars just don't feel comfortable talking in front of other people." And I appreciate that, but I'm not sure that's a reason to close things.

Brian Cute: Thank you. And I should note that when we sent these questions to the various constituent groups or bodies within ICANN that were meeting in Brussels there was a complete understanding that there was insufficient time for written answers, but we do hope that you will take the time to provide written answers to the questions we provided, as well as written summaries of the things we're discussing today. So this is not a one-shot interaction with the Review Team. Any other examples?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not so much an example but something that I wanted to let the Review Team know: this is not our first opportunity or sojourn to work on this as a

group. Many of the people in this room were a small part of the members of the At-Large community who gathered in Mexico, and as a result of the At-Large summit in Mexico very specific statements were made and passed on to ICANN Board about a whole lot of things.

Not the least of which was the production of about six to eight months, as well as the in-house work we did at the summit, on accountability and transparency. Now we did actually get a recognition that we'd handed over the documentation; that's a nice thing; it's a rare thing in the world of At-Large, but it's a nice thing. We then went so far as to take those statements and ratify them as At-Large Advisory Committee Advice, and therefore that is advice to the Board.

Now there is no requirement for them to do anything, including apparently give us a read receipt up until recently that they received things like that. But what is important is our community – and it's that community out there, please take a moment to have a look – it is the world, it is rank and file, end users with an interest in perhaps communications, perhaps consumer issues, but are willing to put time, energy, and hopefully have influence on ICANN policies and policy-development processes.

If the (inaudible 14:23) gets fed up through the regions and then comes to the 15-member ALAC, when something says it is ALAC advice it has gone through that full spectrum; it is consensus-agreed community view and if there is divergence we record it. So we actually have had on the record for some times some very specific recommendations and I can assure you that that's being prepared to come to us as a piece of formal documentation. But some of the regions may also have particular issues and are looking towards Andreas or Carlos or Sylvia. I listen to your meetings, I know you're problems; come on, share them.

Brian Cute: Please.

Adam Peake: Hi, Adam Peake with three issues really. One is, some of you of course have been involved in ICANN longer than many of us, but some of you, and this may be new. One of the most important inputs we have as a community into ICANN is the public forum and it's a very important part of transparency and also accessibility to decision-making bodies. So we'll have four or five hours of people standing at microphones giving comments to the Board and the Board will often give an instant response,



but there's very little indication that there's anything other than the instant response given to those often quite carefully considered questions.

What happens? What does the Board do? Does it consider them? How does it consider them? And could we see how that consideration is presented? I've submitted comments into that process and I have absolutely no cue whether they've just looked at it and gone, "Ha, silly," or if it is silly I'd like to know, embarrassing though that may be. That's one thing. Further about the Board, what we have seen probably a couple of years ago was a development where the Board minutes started to show a certain amount of what the discussion was. Not necessarily that Member X named said something, but at least you saw a development of the discussion reflected in the minutes.

That has disappeared and we now seem to be back to "Whereas," phrases when, other than being boring to read, they're not very informative; you just don't know what happened during those long meetings. I think we should see what happens during the Board meetings and some descriptive text of how the meeting developed would be a good idea. And the last thing – and this is something that the ALAC has said in the formal comments that Cheryl mentioned – is we would very much like to see, if we submit comments into a process, how are they considered and for what reason were they rejected?

It's absolutely perfectly okay to reject comments; you don't have to accept everything, but we'd like to know. How were my comments considered into a process? And I know there's a well-known US process for doing this, and I think if you look at the green paper and the white papers that established ICANN, you can see how those ideas were taken into consideration in the response, and then the policy came later. So let's see how our comments are taken into consideration; it's important I think, and we have a model there already so it shouldn't be too hard. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, for that, Adam, and that is, as you know, an explicit element of paragraph 9.1 of the Affirmation of Commitment. Others?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There was Evan and the Sebastian and then Andreas.

Brian Cute: Evan.

Evan Liebovic: Just as a follow-up, is it not possible for the ICANN Board to treat advice from ALAC the way it treats advice from the GAC? I believe there's already – I mean, just as a matter of saying you have an advisory council, there's already a procedure in place on how to treat things coming from that other advisory council, why not just apply the same thing to ALAC. It doesn't mean that everything that ALAC submits has to be agreed on, but if no there ought to at least be a reason given. Not just with this, with issues that Cheryl identified came out of the summit.

I forget who it was but somebody kind of characterized things as, well you toss ideas over the wall and maybe every now and then something gets tossed back. It's a general feeling that came out of things like the summit where a lot of ideas were brought back in. anyway, I just meant to follow up on what Adam was saying; if there already is a precedent, why not just apply that to ALAC?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So noted. And you might be interested to know, we've just come from the meeting with joint Board and GAC workgroup because there are changes and review mechanisms they're looking at, and maybe some of that might permeate into more culturally wide thing. So it's not light at the end of the tunnel; it's not an oncoming train, but it is on many agendas. Sebastian?

Man: Just to explain, Evan, why people started laughing when you said that: here is currently an ongoing discussion that the Board does not treat the communiqués from the GAC as advice from the GAC, and therefore can ignore them completely, which may explain why there was a bit of humor in the audience at that point – a new discussion going on.

Brian Cute: Sebastian?

Sebastian Bachollet: Thank you. I will complete what my colleagues have said, underlining something more specific. ALAC produces comments on the issues or the topics that are included in the agenda to make comments. For example, we have produced a comment on the plan of the three coming years; we have suggested a project that would be to have an objective for the three years to come to have an ALS in 80% of the countries of the world.

We have set it; it was in the strategic plan of the ICANN. We are going to send you the summary of the comments. They told us that we are here in a plan when we are doing the work and the work is disappearing from the situation. It seems to us that even if we do not agree, if the Board doesn't

agree, we could start discussions and debates and we are not having feedback, and every year we have to come back to the same points.

For an organization that is bottom-up, we have a lot of things to say again on the procedure of the production of the documents, especially regarding the strategy, the comments that are made, how are they analyzed, do we have replies to them, and how all these are translated at the strategic level?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Andreas.

Brian Cute: Andreas, thank you.

Andreas Piezza: Thanks. I will speak in Spanish. Some of my statement has to do with translation and language, so it's a purpose to speak in Spanish. I'm sorry that many of you have to use these translation devices.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely no apology required. We need to facilitate global outreach and global conversation, and if in our room we can't do it right, then I doubt ICANN ever will. Go ahead, Andreas.

Andreas Piezza: Yeah, I agree, but we can be polite and be strong in our ideas at the same time. It's related to what Evan said at the first time he spoke, about the meetings and the perception – probably not the real transparency, but the perception of this transparency in the regions, and the possibility of the conspirations probably as well to see how meetings are done, and also the possibility of this lack of transparency.

If we add to this something which happened in our region linked to meetings supported by ICANN, which were advertised as outreach meetings – I don't know if they were totally financed by ICANN, I think there were also companies co-hosting those meetings. There was one in Sao Paulo in December, another one in Buenos Aires in November. These meetings, whose aim is outreach, sometimes the main point in the agenda are not – there was no special direction linked in this At-Large concept.

When one says, "At-Large," in our region, probably it's auto-reference, not linked to a structural idea, but to the main concept of At-Large. Probably it's not that important as doing a closed meeting compared to what Evan said; what Evan said was more serious and more important. Anyway, I think we have the opportunity to talk about that now. I think

the agenda of these outreach meetings could be best profited by ICANN. Are you receiving the English translation?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. (Inaudible 25:31) notes and as you were talking about the way that we are accountable and transparent, I want to find out that we get transcripts of everything said, so he could listen and not worry about writing his notes because all the transcripts will be available.

Andreas Piezza: Second point was linked to translation and interpreting. For those who represent regions in which English is not the native language, that's transparency for us. Translation and interpreting means transparency. Since RALOs were created, in terms of translation and interpreting really improved. Honestly speaking, the situation is much better, at least compared with 2006, was my first meeting; now I see the level really improved and this is something we have to appreciate, a very important effort. But there are things like the budget allocated to translation, probably it broader, not only transparency, and we believe that there are lots of things to do in terms of translation and interpreting.

Going ahead, allocating budget could be positive, bearing in mind that the impact produced with \$1000 in translation and interpreting compared with the same amount spent in a meeting of outreach, the impact is less. And I'm just speaking randomly about this budget; I don't know exactly the exact budget, but I have a feeling that it's money really well spent and really needed, and it's something I wanted to point out because we should be happy about this policy of translation and interpreting, but it's slowing the rhythm. This reduction of budget for the next term is worrying us. Thank you, very much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just to be clear – because remember I only listened to the translation – you were saying that the money is better spent, there is value for money, in the translation and interpretation as opposed to the same dollar value going into an outreach meeting. Is that correct?

Andreas Piezza: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you.

Man: I'd like to ask a follow-up question, Andreas. On the outreach meetings, just to understand if there's a disconnect in expectations or something else, from your perspective, what do you think an outreach meeting should be?

What I heard was disappointment in the agenda – and I’ll admit that I’m not very familiar with the outreach meetings process, but one could envision outreach where ICANN is attempting to inform the globe on the work that it’s doing and therefore might establish an agenda to that end. An outreach meeting could be one where ICANN is coming to your hometown and allowing you to interact with ICANN and form an agenda. Can you give me a sense on what the expectations are on both sides of the fence?

Andreas Piezza: Yes. At the end of the day, ICANN organizes the agenda. They wish to communicate, it’s fine; if the targeting is defined that new GTLD is the subject and it’s the targeting for new potential registries in the community – because if they come to Sao Paolo or Buenos Aires, I guess they are not looking for .sport or .green; these projects probably come from other countries.

But if you come to our regions, the targeting should be probably more specific. If we are talking about outreach, the future of the internet, then the agenda could include – and I insist the invitation of these meetings was social, civil society, but it was not really implemented in the agenda and I really want to – it’s not about personal participation because it is not the point; what I really think would be a topic to be treated without specific person participation with the topic which gives the opportunity to talk about civil society, this would be fine from this point of view.

It’s not necessary that all people is invited because then you can’t understand. If I present it that way, it’s not the idea I have. If we define that the target is to get new applicants then I wouldn’t object, but if the target is to present the activities by ICANN and we invite academies and civil society, then we are talking about something else and then the agenda should incorporate that.

Brian Cute: Thank you. I have three people in the queue, gentlemen here first. You had raised your hand, yes.

Man: Thanks. I think when we talk about accountability and transparency it is sometimes very difficult to explain to our communities, to our ALSs. Let me just give one example because this is mostly a question of how people perceive contradictions and then easily something very important is at stake and that’s called credibility.

Just one example: it was nice when ICANN decided in 2006 they want to have Regional At-Large Organizations, and At-Large structures. Then we do everything since that time to attract as many as possible to apply and to get certified At-Large Structures. Now, at the Brussels meeting, we had a showcase of the European Regional At-Large Organization. Unfortunately, we had to tell our members, "Sorry, we made the showcase on EURALO, but we are not in a position to invite you because we have no funding for you."

Then some of our members asked me, "We have heard that there was recently a new office created of ICANN that cost a little fortune, but for your At-Large organizations, you have no money to invite them to Brussels." I think this is quite an obvious contradiction, and as long as we have examples like this there's always a piece of credibility of ICANN at stake.

Brian Cute: Thank you, very much. I've got Alan, then Eric.

Alan Greenberg: One of the questions that you ask is to what extent does ICANN address needs of the public interest in its decisions. My summary answer – and I will try to give specifics – is not very well. I think the reason for that is, in general ICANN responds to its stakeholders, and that predominantly means the people who come to meetings, the people who participate very actively, and those are largely people who have a financial stake in the game, whether it ranges from domainers to registrars to registries to companies that are investing large amounts of money.

I think the question is very closely linked to another one that's being discussed, not at this meeting but in the GNSO one, that is of burn-out and there's too much work to be done and how can we possibly limit what we do? And I think that's the wrong tactic. I don't think we're trying to do too much work, I think we have far too few people doing it. I sit on a whole bunch of working groups, and the same people – and if not the same people, the same companies – are represented throughout it. The companies who have a big stake make contributions. ICANN does not do a very good job of demonstrating the return on value; why individuals and why small companies should participate.

I've got close to 40 years of experience dealing with volunteer organizations, and some were far more successful than others in getting volunteers from small organizations or individuals to participate. ICANN

has not made the value case of why, and as a result does not have the participation of many of its corporate organizations, and certainly not of individuals, because there's just no perceived value. And telling At-Large or the GNSO, "Go beat the bushes for your community and get them to contribute," it's very hard for us to come up with the rationale for why because we're not given a lot of material for how they're actually going to benefit from making huge investments of their time, often with not only no return, but very often not even any acknowledgement.

Cheryl implied, it's now a delight when we send advice to the Board ; we get an acknowledgement back from a secretary or from somebody, a staff member, saying it was received. We don't have a clue if anyone reads it, but at least we know it didn't get lost in the mail. We need to do better.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Alan. Eric?

Eric Gidearte: I will be speaking in Spanish. Thank you. First I would like to thank the opportunity to me able to speak in Spanish in a meeting in ICANN. This is very interesting because this doesn't happen very often. Secondly, I would like to remind you in general, all who are following this meeting, that on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, this comments application was launched. Up to now there are no comments registered and if you have a link to the application of comments in the website of ICANN, there are no comments.

This is just calling for you to go to your organizations and disseminate that. I think that ALAC is preparing a formal response, but I think that the organization should participate because this is the only way we have to interact and I think this is very important because we have seen it over the last 10 years. Now, I would like to know – this is a question because I would like to have a better input, and you can read it here in the questions I've already made – how do you think that from your organizations you could contribute and help to make things more transparent and to better control not only the budget – that's very important of course – but also the decision-making process?

You have already talked about that, because it's very difficult to do that if there are no comments, if there's not feedback; it's impossible. So what would be the alternative way, if this doesn't work? How is the way to influence other people so they take active part? And then, cultural diversity: that's different from linguistic diversity. Linguistic diversity, this can be helped through improving translation/interpreter services, but

now cultural diversity: how are you dealing with that? How do you think from your organizations, how are you dealing with this topic; the cultural diversity? Thank you, very much, beforehand, for your answers, because that will be very useful for our final report.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just a slight out-of-ordering, because Carlton has a response specifically to your question, and then we go to Analise to Adam to Carlos and (inaudible 40:02).

Carlton Samuels: Thank you, Cheryl. I quite agree with Eric that it would be best if individuals made comments directly to the issues. If you look at the public comment list on ICANN, just on the website, you'll see a list of activities, a list of issues that are open for public comment. The underlying premise of this is that people understand the issues that are laid out there. To understand those issues you have to engage earlier, rather than later. And sometimes some of the infrastructure tools that are required to understand the issues are not present or apparent.

For example, some of these issues are highly technical and require translator documents, require summaries of the issues, and so on, for ordinary people to understand them. Those are not present. Oftentimes you find a discussion on an issue – let's say this: people respond to issues when they have an interest, and the people who tend to respond to specific issues are going to be the usual suspects. You are never going to break out of that small group unless you make it possible for others to understand what's happening. That, to me, is a basic problem with all of this. It takes time, it takes interest, and it takes some tools, and they are not always together.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Just to note, we have between 10 and 15 minutes left, so we have four people in the queue. Analise, please.

Analise Mayin: Yes, what I want to say actually is along similar lines. This is my first meeting as a representative of NARALO, so I try to imagine myself going back to my ALS and trying to pull in information and responses to the public comment questions, that type of thing. But in order to do that it's such a huge job, kind of like what this gentleman was saying about bringing the people up to speed on what these issues are and why it's actually important to them.



So I was wondering if there would be a possibility of sort of arming us as regional RALOs or even ALSs with a kit or tools. It would sort of start very basic in kind of a graphic form, of how ICANN makes decisions on categories. So what we could do is we could take issues, break them up into categories or policy-making or development, and which body of ICANN is involved in that process, and actually have a graphic chart so that if the user has an issue, they can quickly, at a glance, look, "Oh, I need to take this through my ALS to NARALO, ALAC, and then ALAC is going to speak specifically to that part of ICANN on this issue.

The rest of the stuff is really interesting, but it's not really my area, so now I don't have to be overwhelmed by all of that to get my comment in." and I think if I could propose or present that to our ALS members, they would feel a self-value that they actually have something to offer. Everybody's an expert in something or some area, and they could see how it's relevant to what ICANN does.

But other than that, when you go to the ICANN website, it tells you how ICANN is responsible for coordination of names and numbers, and that's a huge leap to go from there to, "How is this going to better my life using the internet?" So I'm really into the graphic idea of presenting policy development, through which channels, down to the internet user so he thinks his voice could be heard and valued.

Brian Cute: Thank you. Adam.

Adam Peake: I guess you're going to probably hear a lot of criticism going around, but I think it's worth noting that ICANN is incredibly transparent and accountable at the same time, we just set particularly high standards for it. My day job is I look at telecommunication and broadband policy and stuff like that, and the organizations that I try and get information from are nowhere near as accountable and transparent international organizations.

So I think ICANN is setting very high standards for itself and that's one thing. And a lot of it is really about organizing the information that's there, and if we could just spend some more time thinking about how to present it and making sure that people have, I suppose it's just organization of information. That could be translation; it could be just how documents are presented generally. A lot of stuff is available; it's just that there's no clue how to get to it on that website. But anyway, back to a specific criticism, because that's what we're here for, kind of criticism.

Recently ALAC and the non-commercial stakeholders group issued a statement on transparency of staff documents. I don't know if you've seen it, but if you've not I'm sure we can get you a copy. Essentially it's saying that of course staff is briefing the Board particularly on a lot of issues – we're not entirely sure because we don't see them, but are they briefing how we wish them to brief? And the statement was essentially saying that all briefing documents should be made publically accessible so that we do know how the Board is receiving information from the staff, because it may not be in line, it may not be summarizing fairly, it may be summarizing perfectly accurately, but we'd like to know.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Adam. Carlos?

Carlos Agirre: Thank you, Chair. I speak Spanish. The comment, just the point you have made about participation, serial participation, we could say: I just remember that this morning, early, we were talking about this issue in this committee. In particular, this is very familiar because I am the Chair of Commitment, Engagement and Participation in ICANN, and when we issued our call for participants the response was very poor. There were only two contributions.

And as Carlton was saying, and Andreas was saying, this has something to do with the fact that people don't know the language; the lack of transcripts of documents; interpreting or translation. People who don't know anything about something don't take part in this, and if they don't take part in these activities they can't make commitments. This is something logical. So I think that the outreach we were just talking about, we could rethink this outreach to do it in a more effective way. How?

That's the question: how? When you were talking about cultural diversity, this is a very important issue in our ALS in Latin America. We are working in different countries in the region because in Latin America there are many indigenous communities and different ethnic groups, very particular ethnic groups, with very particular and specific needs, and we have to provide for it; we have to understand this. And this is also transparency; to try to reach, to try to understand different cultures and different peoples and different languages, of course.

There are many examples. As Analise has just said, when an ALS, someone can know how they can really participate in ICANN. Here

there's someone, but he has been asking me for one year how we can organize or set up an ALS, and this is not easy and they have just managed to apply one month ago. Is this transparency or is this something else, how we can reach the end user; the individual user? Do we need simple communication or a more concrete communication, so the individual user can participate, so that they can engage and they can be committed to the work carried out by ICANN?

I think that's a very important issue. And then the last point, as Alan was saying, we are working on different topics. In my country, in Argentina, 10 years ago it was said that when there are many laws, many acts, that means corruption. Of course, I'm not talking about that here; I'm just trying to make a comparison of relation. So when there is a lot of work, sometimes we cannot finish everything with little people. So that's the relation I want to make. Of course, don't get me wrong, sometimes if there is a lot of work with less people that means that the work won't be carried out. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, Carlos, and I would encourage you, particularly with the example of it taking a year to set up the organization, if there were specific barriers, if you could put that into writing and supply it to the review team that would be helpful. I'm going to have to make this the last – I think Fawat you're the last person in the line and this will be it unless there's someone else.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Analise and Adam did want to have a very quick final word.

Brian Cute: Okay, if we could. Thank you.

Fawat Bijor: I come into ICANN with a very interesting background, and that is being part of a process which is called the World Summit on Information Society, which ran since 2003. For the first time, governments and organizations and various government structures worldwide were compelled with this question that how can internal government processes be opened up to include others? How could inclusiveness happen? How could participation be non-discriminatory?

In order to get to that stage, testing began; models were being explored by participation. Forums or halls in the UN were opened up to people who used to sit in the galleries and observe sections. When you come and sit with governments and then you have the (inaudible 52:41) sitting with,

you have the (inaudible 52:42) society, the academia; almost everyone. And furthermore, eight years down the road, what does that mean?

That means that the word multi-stakeholder comes with a huge amount of commitment. It's a big word; it can be thrown anywhere, and when it's thrown publically people like me from developing countries really get intimidated because we fight for it every day in our countries.

So multi-stakeholderism is a very big word and a greater commitment that requires a great ability to let go the grip on closed governance and open up to such a level of openness and inclusiveness that all that happens within the process becomes common conversations, like the conversation we're having at the moment, that impact the issues at hand with open, inclusive, and non-discriminatory participation and sharing.

When we talk about ALAC, we're the public face of ICANN. When we talk about multi-stakeholderism, we're the ones to put it out there. This is what you can call the border, and I'm at the bottom; I'm not with any huge organization or so forth, we're voluntary, but we're shaping Pakistan's technology and internet telecom policies. We've existed as communities of hundreds and thousands and so forth, but how did we manage it.

A government person can feel free to come and discuss things and we will not mention him. The same thing goes up to something called the IGF. In the IGF you have open days and everyone is over there, and then you do have some closed meetings. But one thing to notice: whatever you say in the closed meetings is published without your name, which is a general principle which is called (inaudible 54:32) house rule. And I'm part of the (inaudible 54:34) of the IGF and I participate openly in the open consultations.

My group behind me can have full confidence in me that I am representing their interests in their organization, but at the same time there is some possible accumulation of their thoughts and their requests in the process going on. What's happening over here – this is my third meeting. In the last one in Nairobi, I took the floor on a very important issue, which I had discussions with the Board.

I may have a certain edge to me, but not all the people in my region or Asia or the Asian Pacific Islands, or Australasia may have that capability. And that is what I was mentioning earlier with the Director of

Communications; we have to own some things instead of giving them out to London School of Economics to analyze or MIT to analyze or consultants to analyze.

We have to do that ourselves, which is – for example, online communication strategy; that should be ours, why? Because if ALAC is going to reach out to a region, ALAC has to define from the experiences of these ALSs how outreach and participation happens. And as we go up the ladder, anything that is closed in ICANN, that is a conflict of interest with the word multi-stakeholderism. Closed has to have (inaudible 55:57); if you don't want to, leave out the (inaudible 56:00). And the final thought was the finance issues; literally when you go to a region, culture changes every country, and when you talk about continents it changes totally.

I'm an alien in Europe, and if I want to express myself here it's a whole different way. If ICANN comes from the US and wants to express itself indigenously, as the grass roots where it wants to start the bottom-up process, it have to localize and it has to commit to that localization. How does it has to commit?

It has to accept that there are different budgetary requirements on the ground inclusion, inclusiveness, or increasing participation from the ground. It has to realize that Australia will have a different requirement for budgeting than Pakistan. Pakistan would have a totally different requirement for budgeting than England.

Every region is a different region; it's culturally different; the way to participate, the way to convince people to come to ICANN is totally different. It may have to be done through (inaudible 57:02); it might have to be done through meetings; it might actually have to be done through such a multi-stakeholder process that you have all the ISPs, all the registries, registrars, everyone together, even the government committing to it. But then that takes a level of budgetary support.

So ICANN (inaudible 57:18) for ALAC, but ALAC itself is such a stakeholder and is so diverse that it needs a change in the way its budgets are being allocated. This word usual or normal, I don't accept that. Everything is unusual; on the ground, everything is unusual. Disasters happen, things happen, temperatures change, things crash, got knows what. I come from Pakistan so you can imagine. It's a different situation in any given situation. Thank you.

Brian Cute: Thank you, very much. And I have to apologize, we do have to go and Analise and Adam, since you've had a chance to speak would you take my apologies? Thank you, very much for your time. As I've said before, we would welcome written responses to the questions we've provided to the group. We would welcome any inputs that any of you have individually. We're going to be looking at our section of the website to make sure that there are proper vehicles there for you to provide us input, so that's already been raised and we will pay quick attention to that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And if I can just draw the ATRT's attention: since the very moment you had a member of the At-Large in the ATRT – or in fact, as soon as we knew one was going to be there – we've had a public commons Wiki space. That's anybody's opinion, at any time, going up there. We're collecting case studies for us now. But thank you, and please, ALS members out there, keep that information coming. Get those case studies in. Bring in those pieces of information. Thank you, one and all.

Man: Thank you, for participating, RT members. We value your work because it's very important for us as At-Large, but for the ICANN in general. You have a very tough job; thank you for fulfilling it. Thank you.

Sebastian Bachollet: I have a very tough job. Thank you for (inaudible 0:02). Thank you.

Male: Three two, two, two, hey, he, two, two. Are we online? Do you want to bring the call in to me? Yep, bring the call in to me, two, two, hey, hey, hey, hey, hey, hey. I'm still hearing a little bit. Two, two, hey, hey, hello operator, can you hear me?

Brian Cute: Sorry, say that again operator. Do you hear me loud and clear? Faint, Okay. Two, two, hey, hey, one, two, three, four. Is that any better there operator? I shouldn't be hearing myself back. OK, can I just have one of you ladies just (inaudible 2:35) please? And you ladies are both on a handheld device, or are you on a headset device?

Female: Handheld.

Brian Cute: Handhelds? Okay.

Darlene Thompson: Handheld.