BEIJING – At-Large New gTLD Working Group Outreach Evaluation Meeting
Tuesday, April 09, 2013 – 09:30 to 10:30
ICANN – Beijing, People's Republic of China

MALE:	Good morning. It is Tuesday April 9, 2013 at 9:47 in the morning in Function Room 6 of the International Beijing Hotel. This is the At-Large New gTLD Working Group Outreach Evaluation Meeting. Please go ahead and start.
AVRI DORIA:	Thank you this is Avri Doria. Thank you for your patience. I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about what we're about. And I know the rest of the team most of the rest of the group itself isn't here but they already know this. This actually gives me a comfortable point to begin.

The Working Group that we're part of is an At-Large Working Group looking at various issues to with the new gTLD roll out. Basically this group has several subparts in it. This group has several subprojects. This is the group that designed the process that was used for ALAC to file objections. This group has been tracking the Support Applicant Review Program, the SARP.

And one of our projects is this outreach evaluation and recommendation project. we will be having a full Working Group meeting that goes through all of our - and the other thing the group does is basically look at various issues that come up in the gTLD roll out where there may be issues worth discussion and then makes recommendations to ALAC as to whether there's a statement they would like to make or not. Those are the things this group does. |

And this group will have a full meeting later this week, tomorrow. I'm not sure where it is on the schedule but it is on the schedule. We'll go through the rest of these and we'll even go through this somewhat to report. The reason that we scheduled a specific meeting for this one is that one of our projects the Outreach Evaluation and Recommendation Project has pretty much fallen behind on its schedule.

Our full meeting will be on Wednesday at 4 o'clock -- 4 to 5:30 in Function 8-AB. That's when we'll actually be having that meeting. Basically we have this project where we're trying to evaluate what went wrong with evaluation and maybe that's jumping to conclusions. It's outreach evaluation. So perhaps nothing went wrong but I think almost all of us start from the assumption that something went wrong with outreach.

And by that we mean not only outreach for the SARP, not only outreach for the applications from developing areas but also has come up perhaps outreach to people who might want to file objections. There seems to be something missing in this. While the project started as how come there were so few applications from developing areas? How come there were so few IDN or IDN community applications? What went wrong?

And then after we figure out what went wrong, why did it go wrong? Once we know that we can make recommendations as to how it can be fixed or what can be done to remediate it, etc. and not presupposing anything even though there are various theories and suggestions already flying around. In terms of this project we started out with several questions.

We had an open discussion in Toronto and we asked in terms of outreach was this a - basically we started doing a theory formation and came up with some suggestions, lack of appropriate outreach, technical capacity, no interest, no

business case, timing, no buy in from local community, the cost of engaging a registry service provider, unnecessary duplication of ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs.

And this is basically a part of the project that Tijani has been leading and he wrote a draft paper on it. And we got to a point on it where we said all well and good. We have a draft paper that sort of lists this in more detail, more discussion.

That paper needs more work but we've put that into the background for now and this was a discussion we had at our last meeting we put that into the background for now saying the next step in this is to go back to the next part of this which was after the original theory formation.

And we have a basic set of possibilities was to create a general outreach which of course is one of those reflexive problems. Here we are talking about a problem with outreach and part of our process is going to be doing outreach. We may actually learn something about the problem while trying to understand the problem. To do a general outreach and we talked about doing a questionnaire.

It was a questionnaire that we had hoped to get out before this meeting and be able to discuss in this meeting. But as I said we got to the point where there really was too many other things going on at the same time and too many crises and such that were now at the point of talking about the questionnaire and how to put it out.

After this meeting and probably at the meeting on Wednesday we'll end up realigning the timing on this project to what I thought should happen in this meeting happening in Durban. But I'm not worried about that in this meeting at

the moment. We'll talk about that tomorrow. At the moment we've got a first bit on the questionnaire.

Yaovi has taken the lead on that particular part of the project. But I also remember asking people from the group who are coming in to perhaps do a little bit of homework and each come in with a question that they thought belonged in a questionnaire and wanted to basically do a little bit of blue skying, question generation with the group that came here.

First I'd like to turn things over to Yaovi to get an update from him. And I'd also like to ask you take the lead in this part of the conversation.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you Avri. As you said our expectation is to have a set of questions ready to be discussed during that meeting in Beijing. But as you see it is not the case. We are still working on a project and our expectation is to during this meeting to talk to all of you. And probably before the meeting tomorrow we have something we can present so you have an idea of what we are expecting.

Finally we had an idea and that idea is assumption but we think it is very important to hear from the diverse group of people why we have this result now. This is why we find this important to know the reason of this situation. At this stage we are still working on the questionnaire and then we hope that from after tomorrow's meeting we can have a clear idea of a timeline and what we can do at what time.

And especially we would like to get your contribution. What we will be doing we will be available on the Wiki page and then you are invited to contribute and send your idea. We will give a deadline for contribution so that we sent out this questionnaire as soon as possible and get enough information from everybody

from various groups so that we can really know the cause of this situation to find the appropriate solution. This is what I can say for now, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks and I'll probably be coming back to you shortly. If you notice what was up there, first of all when we were talking about questionnaires we were wondering what kind of questionnaire. I don't even know that that's fully decided. Is it open questions where we ask people to write an essay, to answer in words?

I tend to think it would be multiple questions I don't know, whether they were open questions that required some words of answer, whether it was multiple choice. I always hate those because they constrain my choices. So I like multiple choice as long as there is an essay option at the end. I have to admit as a teacher the only kind of tests I write are true and false.

But I'm not sure that's the right case for this but those are the only kinds of questions I like to write. Do we have any questions? I know what my first question is at the top of it and it's true/false question and it was "Did anybody contact you about the opportunity to apply for a community IDN domain?" And a second question after that. I was contacted. I decided not to. I was contacted about the support applicant program.

I was contacted about the SARP in enough time to come up with an application. Those are my type of basic questions when I think about what I wanted to put up there. I would have four or five true and false like that where it's just someone could say they were contacted, they decided not to. One of the things you see there is then follow-up on some of the questions.

If you look at a questionnaire and it says I was contacted. And you get the next question that says I decided not to, then you know that there is further information that you need. Why did you decide not to? There can be questions but that's also the kind of thing that says this is a good person to interview. They were contacted but they decided not to.

If you get an answer that says I was not contacted there's obviously no more question to ask them or perhaps there is in terms of a follow-up question like what kind of medium do you follow so that contact would've been possible? If somebody wanted to reach you, how would they reach you? That's why I look at - and I have a fairly simple way of thinking about it I think - is a true/false answer gives us stuff to ask people about.

I think in some ways we get more information in the follow-up interviews that the questionnaire becomes a method of keying in the second part of the conversation of knowing who to approach what way. the other thing I wanted to point out before we start looking for other questions - and fortunately we will have a transcript so the questions will all be captured even though nobody is necessarily writing them all down.

Don't think they are lost. How do we distribute this questionnaire to reach the most people? In terms of interviews when others are looking at this, we have to reach out to these regional groups, to the ALSs, to ISOC chapters who might not be ALSs, to the GAC delegations, to the ccTLDs, almost every country, almost every region has one, if they're local and then following up from the questionnaire.

I know that I asked the people in the group to try and come to this meeting with some questions in mind that would sort of help get the discussion going. Of course I invite anyone else who is not in the group but who is participating in

this meeting to introduce yourself, come to the table with a question and put them in the pile.

I very much hope especially from people who aren't in the group that your questions will come from whether you've heard of the outreach, whether you didn't. You'll know the right questions to ask about why were or weren't reached, why you did or didn't make a decision.

From the people in the group first because hopefully they have questions on the tips of their tongues. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Avri. I think that before asking were you contacted, the best is to ask have you heard about the program. Have you heard about the support program? Have you heard about the new gTLD program first and then have you heard about the support program. Because I am sure that a lot of people who would be able to apply hadn't heard about the program.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you Tijani. Yes Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: I completely agree with Tijani. We want to know if people were informed about the program. One key point is we are not only talking to people we are expecting to apply. This is very important. We are talking to everybody. We are thinking to ask the question to that we will know that people are informed. We can be in front of people [Inaudible 00:17:40].

We can also talk to other people who can be the applicant. That is very important. We are not going to talk only to people who are going to apply for the TLD, we have also users. One of the questions also we should put is to know if the current strings, if the people that are expecting that are applying for names only the [Inaudible 00:18:06] string that's after the final decision.

That is also one of the questions. This will give an idea to know that it is a useful program. We may have users or people that don't care at all either as new TLD or not. This will be also one question to measure the importance of this new program. First we want to know if people are informed. They are not business people. They are interested in applying for a TLD.

But they may be interested to know that there's an opportunity for their community to have a new string in the system. This is what I want to add for now, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, that's quite a good question in terms of what TLD would you like to have seen someone in your community apply for? What TLD have you always wished there was, if someone had a question like that would be questions I see as deriving from yours. Anyone else in the group have any questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The questions that I've heard are excellent. And you've got me thinking about the true/false thing. I haven't gone down that pathway. But I think framing those things could be very interesting. The reason I thought it was interesting other than the fact that obviously it's proven effective in the work you do, is I was concerned if we have questions that in themselves may be barriers to understanding, either linguistically or culturally.

I'm very aware in our region there may be a number of people we could effectively reach out to but there would be a discomfort in frank and fearless responses. And I was trying to think of a way of getting through that layer and perhaps that approach may help. But what I wanted to contribute was whether or not as part of this surveying we could also do a personal telecomm interaction.

Because I think there might be a number of communities which we will get deeper and more useful information from if we have a personal touch. And we have enough language skills I believe to do that. I really wanted to put that to the table as an option, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. I want to ask you a question on that. Now we had always planned on first a questionnaire, then a follow-up interview outreach. Are you suggesting that it would be something that would actually be in parallel?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm suggesting that we would miss capture of important information if we didn't include the option for personal interaction in the survey phase.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you, I just wanted to clarify. Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to make sure that Cheryl's words weren't misrepresented, I don't think she was saying interviews instead of the survey. You said interviews could follow

surveys, I still think they should but there may be people for whom a survey will not be a vehicle for the first interaction and we need to reach out to them.

AVRI DORIA: Okay that brings up another question for me, is this an interview to help somebody do the survey, talk somebody through the survey information so that we collect the survey but we collect the survey by talking to them so that we can explain it, so that we can put it in culturally correct context? Is that an idea? So that we get the survey but we've done verbal outreach to them so it's actually that - okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: It could well be that the ones that we get input from verbally that we do the equivalent of the survey and the follow-up interaction at the same time. But there are certain gaps because people are too busy, aren't culturally adapted to doing cold surveys like that or a language issue that the personal interaction is a prerequisite to getting contact at all.

AVRI DORIA: Okay thank you. And as I said part of what we're going to learn in doing our survey is sort of a pattern for how outreach should actually be done just while we're learning how to do an outreach about outreach. Yes, please?

ANDREW MACK: I think one of things we all came up against during this early outreach period was that there isn't one size that fits all. And in fact we want to use multiple media. I think some people both in terms of culture and in terms of practice

there are an awful lot of people who won't respond necessarily to a survey. Much more needs to be done face-to-face.

Also you're assuming if we're going to go with the survey in a more distant kind of thing we're more likely to get usual suspects. If one of our express goals is to get new people into this process that we would otherwise not be reaching the more direct approach, the face-to-face approach is probably one that would be more appropriate. I think that is one of our goals in the end to get additional people in.

AVRI DORIA: Yep, thank you, Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Avri.   In terms of distribution point for the survey I would suggest getting the IGF as one of the distribution point. Also consumer organizations because yesterday we had a panel that had consumer international on it on consumer protection related to new gTLDs and we should get that out through their network.

Another question and perhaps a suggestion is that one question that was asked is did you know about this program and if yes, and so on but also a question that says "Did you hear about it after it was launched? And did you have specific concerns and what are those concerns?" I think that would be valuable for us to get as feedback.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I have Tijani, Evan and Andrew.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: As I do think that the sequence that we spoke about which is do the survey and then the interview I think that we have to stick to this sequence. But at the level of the interview we will not limit our interview to the people who answered the survey. That's the way to solve the problem there is by Cheryl. I think that the survey will orient more or less will help us to do the interview in the best way, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Are you talking mainly about the content of the questions or who this is going to go out to?

AVRI DORIA: We've been talking primarily about the content but we're mixing it up and we can - I think all of it is good information and we'll pull it out of the transcript and put it in the right bucket when we need to.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My concern at this point is about the Rumsfeldian unknown unknowns in that we don't know who - part of the problem is the people that didn't apply are people who may never have known and how do we know to even contact them for a survey? I would try to suggest doing as much as we can to go outside the ICANN bubble.

The list of ALSs, ISOC chapters, GACs, ccTLDs, I'm actually curious why NCSG isn't in there. There's a lot of civil society participants who one would think are not part of At-Large or not part of the cc community but would also probably if not themselves be involved with applicants who might've benefitted might at least know the communities in which they reside. I'm very cognoscente right now of outreach to people that don't know ICANN exists let alone whether not decided whether or not they should be involved.

And in terms of things like both the objection process and as we know previously applicant support the turnout numbers really give an idea that people that were in a position or should've been a position to act on this were not even aware that any of this existed.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I don't know why when I was writing that it didn't occur to me to list NCSG. I must've blocked on it. I don't have enough to do with that group, it just slipped my mind. One question that came up when you were talking is perhaps one of the questions we need to include to get that next layer out is to ask people that we go to with a questionnaire who else should we be talking to?

Because the one - we got to the plus one and then that plus one gives us a plus two. We do start building a greater tree. Yes Andrew?

ANDREW MACK: Further to your excellent point Avri, I think that one of the big problems that we face with all of the outreach was the compressed timeframe. So that even as people started hearing about it it was already relatively late in the process. If we're trying to get good feedback I know that it seems a little counterintuitive

but it may be better to leave it open a little bit longer so we can get the value of these plus one and plus twos.

It's just a much better product. I think the shorter our timeframe the more likely we are to get the usual suspects who are very well wired and in the end we're not going to accomplish our goal that way.

AVRI DORIA: I think you make a really good point that on this project and we do have time. Nobody is going to start a remedial or next program until this one is gone so we do have a certain amount of time to get the work done. I think that's a good suggestion to make sure that we get the questionnaire started soon but that we don't have to end it soon. I have Alan next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I'm just reacting to what Tijani said of we have to keep to the order of the survey and then possibly face-to-face or verbal interactions. I think if we're not careful we're in danger of making the same mistake that ICANN does in outreach of presuming that electronic means are the way to communicate with people.

And as we're learning now very often shaking people's hands and going to visit them or something equivalent to that is the way to interact with certain people. I think we have to be flexible in this.

AVRI DORIA: Yes, for example many of us are going to be a various IGF and IGF related and there's whises and many other activities where a lot of people that're involved

in the internet throughout the world will be there who are not ICANN people. Yes Dev please?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. One of the things I always try to capture information on when I was for a presentation at the IGF was to try to capture information regarding targeting businesses and business organizations which I think needs to be also in the persons we should be targeting. And the reason how I was doing it was to say well okay and I also framed it in the context of if they had a domain name whether they use a ccTLD or gTLD which I think is useful to know.

I think the survey needs to talk about how organizations are using domain names now. If they heard about the gTLD program and if they did, did they hear about the support program? And did this influence your decision whether to apply or not?

AVRI DORIA: Thank you Azumi using the traditional flag placement method.

AZUMI ISAS: I am a little hesitant to bring this question but nevertheless I'm mindful of the time. First I really appreciate this initiative. It's very important. Having said that are we going to ask the question only pertinent to the outreach program or anything related to the gTLD introduction program itself? Because and I –

AVRI DORIA: Please explain I don't know what you mean.

AZUMI ISAS: Okay if the purpose of the survey is to evaluate why let's say as you started in the first place, it went wrong. If it's very successful you don't need this to some degree right? Assuming that we see very few applications from the developing countries, we see many applications from a few companies. And I see some imbalance. Some others may not feel like that.

But the factors that determine these numbers may not only be the outreach. Of course there are other elements like high interest barrier, too complex, there's no interest or there are different factors all combined. If you only single out the effectiveness of the ICANN outreach about this program, does it really produce the real result? I'm not too sure.

It's okay to focus on very specific things. And you get tangible results on the surface. But it's really deeply meaningful to improve the next round of the new gTLD program. That's my other question is that it depends on the target. If we go to [Inaudible 00:33:14], yes I do go IGF and throw this question out to general, every participant of IGF and they may be responding differently the real factor is like in Japan and elsewhere mostly the [Inaudible 00:33:29] registries and the consulting firms try to grab the client like companies or communities, hey there is something called new gTLD program.

Are you interested in doing this for this for the [Inaudible 00:33:42] industry or something like that? There is the in-between. And asking the questions to them, how they succeeded in getting the client or not getting the client could be other things, whether how many of these active players are there in East Europe or South Africa versus - but these questions to this industry sector could be very different from asking more of the policy makers or the civil society folks. If you just come up with one general questionnaire it may lose the focus.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. In response to Azumi's first point about the imbalance of the application, to my mind the actual people that we should be talking to about that is the group of applicants because by asking them "How did you know about the program? When did you decide to apply? Why did you decide to apply?"

And if they're willing to share "What resources did you have to expend before you engage officially in the process?" Then you'd have a good idea about what it is that barrier could be for the external folks, just a comment, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Sure go ahead.

AZUMI ISAS: I would also like to include those who considered but didn't apply. And it's highly difficult to. But at the same time some of the registries may cooperate with you because maybe they applied for 10 but they wanted to have 50. Why did they fail to get the other 40? These are the areas of the potential applicant that didn't come up.

AVRI DORIA: It does sound like a recommendation perhaps for a - and we did have one conversation where there may not be one questionnaire that fit all groupings. One other comment before I go to Andrew is it does sound like if you have the chance you may want to look at getting somewhat involved at some point in the theory formation paper that goes into some of these ideas.

Our specific goal is to understand why the outreach didn't work. If we get further information or outreach reached us but it cost too much, outreach

reached us but - those are information that we collect. But that's sort of a secondary outcome of the information gathering. It's not really the focus so much because we're looking at outreach for new gTLD, outreach for SARP application and now we're adding it think outreach for objection processing.

We're trying to focus on the problem of how do we make sure that we're reaching everybody that we've got to reach. In terms of the gTLD program I'm sure there's a lot of good information that collect that we can use toward other parts of this Working Group's overall goal which is an analysis of the rollout program and we may kick off other projects. But I don't want to complicate this one too much by gathering every bit of information possible. Yes Andrew?

ANDREW MACK: Thanks Avri. I like to jump on this idea of trying to get a clearer sense of the costs involved in participating. I think the unknown cost of time and money is actually a big detriment. If I can't tell you exactly how long it's going to take me and much money I need to raise or how much I need to have in my head as an idea that means that I probably won't participate either way.

I won't go into more detail. I won't even look into it. We now have some data. I also think that especially if one of our goals is to attract people from the global south where there may be a smaller number of people that have more demands for their ICANN time.

If they are our introducers, our vectors of finding new participants then we need to be fair to them by giving them some clear expectations about their time and about any resources that they would have to try to raise of help encourage their people to raise.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I want to ask - I've heard a lot from Working Group members. We've heard a little bit from usual suspects that aren't Working Group members, heard almost nothing from others. From what you've heard are there questions that we're not even getting close to? Are there approaches that you know we should be doing but no one has mentioned?

Now one thing no one has mentioned and I'd like to actually throw this in as an auxiliary question is how many languages do we need to do this in? Is it the three, the five, the six, is it the 21? Six is the norm is that what we're talking about. That's another piece of information we'd be looking for. Is there anyone especially those that haven't have we missed anything? What have we missed? Yes please?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: It's not maybe something you're missing but it's the question I have and I just kept thinking about it because I read about the rejection of some applicants who applied for the applicant support. And they were very frustrated. And those people read about the applicant support and everything but still they didn't make it, how come?

AVRI DORIA: They didn't make it to apply?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: No they applied.

AVRI DORIA: They applied but they didn't -

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: They didn't get it.

AVRI DORIA: I don't know that that is actually in our scope. I think it's a really good question but I don't - it might be a good question for the Working Group. But it's not part of this project. But I should record it as part of the Working Group.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: I would like to join within this comment. How come in the outreach program people don't know about this applicant support provision?

AVRI DORIA: In the original outreach about new gTLDs?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes.

AVRI DORIA: Okay I kinda know the answer to that one is we were still in the process. When they started the program we didn't have this yet. We spent two years.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: So that's something we should be thinking about?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, we should. And indeed that's one of the faults we know of from the start is that an applicant support program wasn't already designed at the same point as

the new gTLD program. It took us an extra year, year and a half to get that going which was insane.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Agreed.   So your aim is just to say what went wrong and not suggesting something to improve for the next step?

AVRI DORIA: Right I think there's two parts. At the moment in terms of this particular group that has several different projects. I think in this part of this project and that's why I'm trying to keep the project narrow and collect information. In terms of going forward that is indeed a task that the At-Large New gTLD Working Group can certainly take up in terms of how to do better in the future.

And what I think as a secondary effect of the outreach questions we'll start collecting the information that Azumi's looking for and that you're looking for and that we'll be able to use that to start making recommendations about other things and perhaps to start other subprojects in the group to say "Ah ha we have seen these answers how do we follow-up on this problem further?"

I think it's valuable but I also do want to keep the questionnaire in terms of outreach narrow because like the New gTLD Program we could end up trying to boil the ocean and not get anything done. But I agree there is a lot to discover. Other comments from those who haven't spoken? We've certain gotten a lot of questions.

I guess Yaovi, you and Cintra and Jacqueline I don't know how active the subgroup is and of course others part of all of this is is this is a Working Group. This is an ongoing Working Group, new participation in this Working Group is

invited, is encouraged. There are so many tasks for us to do in terms of evaluating this program whether it's this outreach.

And you can come to the meeting tomorrow to look at some of the other issues we're looking at. I want to encourage anyone that's here as a watcher that this is definitely an opportunity for jumping into something that's got all kinds of good questions to talk about and all kinds of important results to achieve in terms of we know that there will be future rounds.

We want those future rounds to fix whatever we discover from this round. Yes Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Avri. You asked Yaovi how the group he is leading is active. I can tell you that the group I am leading is not active at all, zero. And it is a big problem for me because since I had hard times last month nothing had been done. Even if what I produced is on the Wiki since long, no comment, no contribution, thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And Yaovi I have a feeling that you have been working pretty much alone too. Yes?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yes I think this is important for us to call for participation. All I can say is that we should just continue. And I hope that people will join the group and we will have more contribution for the work. I just want to take the opportunity to say that from what people said the next idea something special should be done there because of the diversity of participants.

It's like too late because I think there is something should be planned so that we get information from the various participants at IGF. If it's not too late we can think about what can be done or think about opportunity of the people that will be there to get something done from this project.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I want to encourage what they're saying in terms of more people getting involved. At-Large, ALAC has the same problem that so much of ICANN has, 100s of people participate but three or four people are really the ones that jump in and get hands dirty. And you see the same people over and over again doing the work.

I'm one of those that are constantly attacking senior staff and board and those about you know you're not being bottom up enough. But then again if we at the bottom aren't doing anything one can hardly criticize them for not following through with our work. Yes Jean Jacques?

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'd offer a general remark. It's not only about the application system or about IDNs it's a much more general remark. The experience I gained setting up and chairing the Public Participation Committee of the Board, gave me a clear sense of what the issue was about. It's about engaging people to participate very actively.

But one must recognize and accept that there are all degrees of participation from people who arrive for the first time in an ICANN meeting and just want to know what it's all about. It takes a few hours for the clever ones to know all the acronyms and understand them. It took in my case, two years to understand

half of them. That's part of the problem. But I want to inject here a statement that there is no obligation either way.

It's really about volunteer work. So you shouldn't give the impression Avri that you are disappointed in the way that the level of active participation is so low. It's quite a natural phenomenon. And for instance the degree of engagement you give and many of us give is the upper most echelon. But we have to provide, that's our duty, it's to provide the possibility simply for the whole range of participation from simply listening in to being very active in all the committees.

I say this addressing myself to you Avri but of course you're not my main target. My main target is the people in the room, some of whom have come here for the first time. So don't be distressed or discouraged by this. This is the early learning stage of a long process.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you for the normatus statement. I actually reject it. I believe that sure everyone has the right to participate to the extent that they wish to and being an observer is perfectly fine and not doing any further is perfectly within everyone's rights. And I wouldn't.

However, I also believe it is totally appropriate for those us that are very engaged to try and encourage others to participate, to tell them "Hey this is an easy group to get involved in, to start participating in, to throw in question, and to throw in whatever." I sort of - I don't condemn anyone for just listening and observing. I welcome people for the first time.

But I do believe it is the responsibility of those of us that are very active and see reasons for being very active to push them. To push them into supporting the

bottom up notion and getting involved and getting their hands dirty with the rest of us. I understand what you're saying. I don't think anyone will walk away saying "Oh my I feel guilty that I didn't volunteer for anyone."

But if anyone did feel guilty about not volunteering I'd hope they volunteer to get over it.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: I see no contradiction between the position I stated and your reminder. I mean it's just two ends of the same chain.

AVRI DORIA: Anyhow I encourage you all to get involved. I encourage you all to come to our next meeting where I'll probably try to harass you into participating again. And at that meeting we'll cover this subject briefly, just to report on where we're at. And then look at some of the other work that's being done by the group. Anything I've forgotten about?

I've started out at the beginning saying it; it is the At-Large New gTLD Working Group of which this is a subproject. It is tomorrow. It's is in Room 8 I believe and it is at 1600 or 4 o'clock for those that don't do 24. With that does anyone else wish to add anything else? I thank you all and this meeting is closed, thank you.

[End of Transcript]