Start: 15:13 Hours

Moderator: Cheryl Langdon Orr

Co-Moderator: Seth Reiss

SMEs: Roberto Gaetano, Rinalia Abdul Rahim

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Michele is brought in as special expert for constitutional and legal mechanisms; RAA in particular so we will lead off with that question.

CLO gives deliverable: *Informed opinion on where we agree/disagree on the subject*. Five questions posed to the group to focus thematic discussion:

1. Inclusion and Diversity

* Are there barriers to participation that hinder and limit based on cultureal, geopolitical, economical linguistic and gender or other differences

1. Equal Global MSM

* Are there stakeholders groups that are less represented, or have a lesser voice in the PDP?
* If so, do we put in place mechanisms to foster equal participation
* What are the mechanisms to ensure the PDP receives global input and addresses the need and expectations of all stakeholders?

1. Constitution and Legal Mechanisms

* Are the bye-laws drafted in compliance with Int’l law principles or are they oriented to a local, not global jurisdiction?
* Are contracts - with contracted parties compliant with int’l law and in any case not in contrast with legal systems other than the home jurisdiction of ICANN?

1. Accountability

* Are the accountability mechanisms globally fair
* Will all the different global stakeholder groups have the same power to enforce checks and balance on ICANN’s behaviour

1. Operational Matters

* Is communication privileging specific local communities
* Is ICANN’s footprint global, covering the global internet community on equal footing
* Are users worldwide given the same opportunities to contact ICANN and to provide their opinion, advice, comment or complaint?
* Is access to ICANN’s facilities equal to all stakeholders?
* Are ICANN’s operations sufficiently shielded from local jurisdiction i.e. can ICANN survive a change of the political attitude in one or more countries without disruption of its operations worldwide?

**Only Q3 handled to make use of the limited availability of a special SME/Guest Presenter; Michele.**

3:22p Handover to SME Rinalia Abdul Rahim

Tijani wanted to add questions, CLO disagreed but left it open for additions at the end

Rinalia went thru her presentation to highlight diversity issues; representation in WGs, Board, SO/ACs; ALAC is best balanced.

Public comments process; most agree it is OK

Languages; All UN + Portuguese now supported

Handed to Roberto at 3:37p

WRT geographical distribution of engagement models and responses, more subtle problems hinder participation and makes ICANN challenged to be global. Fadi spoke of Equal MSM: not just about the representation but fair weight to the representation. Attempt to spell out EMSM in the questions proposed.

Are there any barriers to participation for different groups? Translation has been ramped up but whether that is sufficient or not this is still in flux.

Equal Global MSM: mechanism need to ensure every stakeholder participates equally and has a chance to participate. More participation to the WG needed from At-Large

Legal and constitutional issues: Is the fact that ICANN is a California corporation an issue? What of contracts and conflicts with local law? Michele will address RAA specifically

Are there gaps in accountability? And to whom should ICANN be accountable? To global MS community? All groups do not have the same power. Culturally, accountability might mean different things in different parts of the wordl! So wrt accountability mechanism, are the fair?

Footprints: Offices all over the world. Is it fairly distributed? If there is a question to be raised, is this capability different depending on geographic location?

Final document should have a blueprint of proposal to say here are the issues, here’s what we suggest and this is how we think these could be implemented?

CLO: Any objection to image being posted to cyberspace? None noted.

3:45p Michele invited to speak. Introduced himself and contextualized Ireland and Irish law in the EU space. RAA is made of 2 things: 1) formal contract and one with Registrars. RAA contains consensus policies. 3 iterations of the RAA since; 2001, 2009, 2013. Contracts has a validity of # of years and until they expire, they don’t get naturally replaced. Issues such as privacy developed but LEAs and GAC weighed in without too much resulted.

ICANN the body corporate was pushed to 1) collect huge amount of information and 2) retain huge amounts as information. EU DP in principle says collect as little and hold as shortest time applicable. ICANN advised the RRA 2013 was incompatible with EU law. ICANN says no but came up with a process: Waivers. Took 9 mths to get a waiver; 9/2013 – 6/2014. Legal notices are handled in due course and with reason.

DP and DR impact both registrars and resigtries. You negotiate with ICANN Legal Counsel and Jones, Day. For registries, the situation came to head on .tel and .cat pertaining to WHOIS. In one stage it took 4 yrs (.tel) to get comfort from ICANN. What are the issues when registries – geo-type ones, example – are backed by governments? No functional process in ICANN to deal with these issues.

Muhammad Bashir: Requirements for registrars has impacted the number of African registrars. Global needs not considered. Procedures have also impacted. Lack of understanding of nuances in the global space. ICANN need to review its procedures and understand stakeholder requirements; one size does not fit all. Globalisation will be impacted

Michele: Submitted comments on ICANN Report to improve Registrar count in underserved regions of the worlds. They support in principle but wants a single die for registrars. Don’t want a situation where registrars jurisdiction shop. Same standard for all or it’s the lowest common denominator that gets the meat.

Kenyan (Paul Muchene): Waiver took 9 months is expensive. It would be relatively even more expensive for African registrars. Data collection requirements are problematic due to lack of DP and DR requirements may stymie growth of registrars in Africa.

Michele: 2013 RAA contains language detailing how contract may be modified for the first time. DP and Privacy is a serious issue because a lack of privacy policy. Nobody in place so no short term solution anticipated. Ask audience to submit comments on WHOIS Conflict in National Law.

Seth Reiss: Is there anything in the bye-laws that is causing the insensitivity to these national conflicts issue? And if that is the case, do we need something in the bye-laws to address that?

CLO: Nothing but not sure it is needed. Parties to contract should fix this and expectations in the negotiations must accommodate this.

Roberto Gaetano: Nothing in bye-laws to his knowledge. Not sure if having this in bye-laws would be reasonable?

Michele: Matters of national laws and sovereignty need not be in bye-law. No need to put “ ICANN staff may not murder community members”. That ICANN has not addressed privacy and data protection in law is the issue. You cannot ask someone to break the law of their own country.

Seth Reiss: Compliance with national law or national laws? Which will you choose?

Michele: We refused to sign RAA 2013 because we would not break Irish law.

Seth Reiss: You chose to not sign to comply with national law. ICANN needs to comply with the law of its jurisdiction? That is complex.

CLO: We will deal with Q1 tomorrow.

Frederick Douzet: DP and Privay; Snowden and EU revision of DP. How will that impact RAA 2013?

Michele: Article 29 and Commissioners have formally written to ICANN to outline the issues and incompatibility with the RAA with laws in 28 EU states. ICANN says you’re not authoritative.

Vittorio Bertola: EU Privacy and ICANN has been ongoing for 15 years but it was decided in November 2005 that ICANN would recognize EU privacy law. Internationalization/globalisation in 2001 was intended to address these issues! Population of staff in the regions tell the story; 1 person in LAC, probably on a PC. Maybe tits the operations that need to be distributed. And the cultural change must be gone.

Rinalia: No organization has a bye-law to say respect national law to her knowledge. We have to think of capacity in ICANN to address the matter. Confidence in ICANN is rising under Fadi.

Michele: WHOIS vs National Law. Policy and mechanism was introduced to deal with this years ago but not 1 registrar made use of it. You would have to be in breach of local law or in trouble BEFORE the mechanism could be invoked. ICANN is not a learning organisation.

Lance Hinds: What will be the yardstick that will measure impact of diversity and national laws etc.?

Neil Schwartzman: Global legal requirements that are in flux can at certain times deliver a lowest common denominator that is hard on businesses to implement. Canada’s PIPEDA congruent to EU DP laws. Redaction in WHOIS based on jurisdictional reqts.

Michele: WHOIS provokes irrational responses sometimes. Collection and display has variance; Thick WHOIS vs Thin WHOIS; CC registries have thick whois and available to all law enforcement. Tale of his mother. WHOIS may not be used as a proxy for all kinds of thing! Wordpress.com example.

Roberto: Task of SME is to intervene when we deviating from the theme. Issues related to globalisation is the matter for discussion. WHOIS is very peripheral and no intent to find solution to WHOIS issues in this TG.

Garth Bruen: Half the planet online, relatively few are domainers. Only domainers are required to have a WHOIS record. As the user count increase, the abuse and criminality will increase. They must have a way of addressing problems as consumers. WHOIS and WHOIS accuracy are tools to address these matters. Canada makes a distinction between personal and commercial domains.

CLO: Are the contracts drafted in compliance with International law or California law? Are there mechanisms in place to allow local parties to comply with local laws?

Neil Schwartzman: Globalisation brings with it some wonderful aspects like knowing people for decades and never talking to them and evil and dark side of people who literally want to take your money.

CLO: Pleased that Neil and others work to reduce but we must establish parity and equivalence to offline and online worlds; bad things happen to good people offline all the time. Any distinction in this aspect to online world must be balanced by this fact.

Resumed 4:10p (CLO): Questions and contributions have framed the question. Rinalia is out the room on other duties. Recorded thanks to Michele for his contribution and given good examples of how globalisation can become unhinged. Plans must be in place to minimize frustrations experienced by Michele and others in the Rs stakeholder group. So let’s look at the the questions:

Are the bye-laws drafted in compliance with Int’l law principles or drafted only in observance of national laws?

Are the contracts drafted to be in compliance with int’l law or are drafted …….?

Are there mechanisms to allow contracted parties to comply with local laws?

Jyry Suvilento: Use 2 colours post it notes to note position on the questions: (Green & Pink)

Are the bye-laws in compliance with Int’l law principles?

Yes, some but mechanisms must be anchored in national law to be responsive to some issues.

Tijani: Need bye-laws drafted in compliance with Int’l law. This is a requirement if ICANN must be global.

Garth: Observations at Int’l Product Safety Conference. They seem to find a way to harmonize with national laws. If they can, ICANN should be able.

Seth: Sounds like Garth responding to 3rd question.

Vittorio: First question is not well posed; bye-law can be Int’l but focused to national jurisdiction. Wary of posing the question in purely legal terms. Do you wish to push the agenda with values of people from a certain jurisdiction?

Neil Schwartzman: Nobody here can answer the question. Refers to the legal jurisdictions and do not believe it is in our place or competence to tell ICANN.

Alan Levin: From S. Africa. Question the inviolability of the law and notes laws can be changed. ICANN is a global organisation. He’s involved in ICANN to make the law that is independent of jurisdiction.

Roberto: Explained the context in which Michele was speaking. Are all stakeholders equal in front of ICANN? ICANN for a global organisation should not put registrars in any place at a disadvantage compared to others.

Alan Levin: ICANN don’t change rules for individuals. If they are in conflict with local laws vis-à-vis ICANN then you move!

Roberto: You don’t choose the country you’re born and you should be able to do business in the country to which you’re born. If there is disadvantage then it must be addressed.

Mohammed: ICANN must be globalized. ICANN must seek to review its bye-laws to make it more int’l. Case of int’l orgs in Geneva has reasons to those decisions. ICANN could have multiple legal instances. New reality requires new responses.

Garth Bruen: Used analogy of building [virtual] bridge; stairs on one side ramp on the other means somebody can be left off.

Vittorio Bertola: Is ICANN in the right jurisdiction to fulfil its mission? Binding byelaws is important to parties to contract. Whatever the country ICANN should not demand a party to contravene national law. We should not determine national systems of govt that is legitimate or illegitimate in the same way distinctions be made between good law and bad law. Parties to contract should be independent of country.

Jyry: ICANN should have multiple legal existence.

Seth: If there are 3 countries of incorporation, then would ICANN contracts required to be complaint with all 3?

Alan: Agree with Garth but concerned with questions. Bridge with one side a stair and the other side a ramp. Consider the Arab Spring. People on the stairs side had a problem so they changed it. Int’l law framework would be making a judgment on national laws. Why not make a model that is best for everyone? Don’t ask the question on globalisation because it is fact!

CLO: Housekeeping for tomorrow.

Sunday, June 22

Introductions; 14 attendees in room.

Seth: Is there a difference between internationalisation and globalisation?

Roberto: UseInt’lisation and it tends to make people think nation states and of the UN. Globalisation in popular perception tends to suggest ‘one-size-fits-all’. Rather it means giving value to local realities and making the world aware of them. It is not massification.

Tijani: **Global and not International to avoid the Intergovernmental meaning of “International”**

Vittoria: Multilateralism meaning between states, multistakeholder tends to mean individuals

Neil: Read the OED definition of globalisation; universal, total, all-embracing

SUMMARY (of Q3):

Bye-laws were neutral and not skewed.

Garth: The contract does not allow parties outside contract any space to engage so it appears to see an Internet as imposed and not participatory. Contract actually says contractee must obey local law.

Tony: The history of .cat negotiations with ICANN for WHOIS; too long and anti-business. Same thing with new gTLDs. Think globally!

Question 1: Inclusion & Diversity

Seth: Are there barriers to participation……?

Garth: An issue that was used for NARALO recruitment process. Actively account missing groups and those underrepresented; e.g. native communities, disabled community. VIBUG initiative at MIT [they use technology in innovative ways to access Internet] opened his eyes and demonstrated how unprepared and unknowing of the disabled community needs he was. Without their direct involvement in the process we cannot know what the needs are.

Vittorio: Barriers have existed and are still in place but slowly going away. Simple things like ICANNN websites were not fit to use of disabled persons. A wider set of needs associated with being disabled. Dearth of public comments from some areas of the world although there are participants from these areas. Why? Maybe because the PCs are useless in their context. Culture may impact participation in many ways and may also impact participation; public engagement in a public session is hard for some cultures. What is the effectiveness of all the instruments for participation?

Seth: Disability is globally neutral so interventions to address will have global impact. Participation in the PDP process is low from some areas. Why?

Neil: Problems with the process here. This gathering is not representative of the people having problems participating. Documents must be read and understood to participate. Can’t speak for disabled. Fix it by solicit input not from single individuals but study what issues are before we devise solutions!

Tijani: He agrees with disability but for participation, other problems. 1) Problem of language. Improvements but issues still exist in translation. What has emerged from translation is not good, examples in Arabic and Russian. We need human translators, **a verification from the community members could be necessary to avoid irrelevant translation in official documents** maybe from the community. 2) Geographic problem with visas. African ALS have visa problems for meetings in certain areas of the world. Solution is not to ask nations to ignore their visa procedure but be careful about **the selection of** meetings**’ venue**. And begin to work much earlier with them to facilitate. IGF practices seem to work better, maybe because it is intergovernmental.

Roberto: Improvements but organizational culture still needs work. Interpretation is going well but not utilized as much; language group need to make more use of this facility and speak in their own languages. Language translation has problems with documents first appearing in English then later in other languages. Need harmonisation of production output. Need to focus on policy development for effectiveness and global reach. Fair participation at meetings, despite issues of visa etc. WG participation needs work. Guidelines for WG chairs to be culturally-sensitive. WG schedules are an issue, English-only so interpretation may be necessary.

Garth: At-Large Accessibility WG Singapore meeting had deaf participants and it was wonderful. Get better insight by inviting a disabled person to meetings and have them demonstrate how they use technologies. Tried to continue this initiative for London meeting It was squashed for London meeting. Question of live transcription. It was said to be too expensive.

[Roberto: Transcript was important in listening to Paul Twomey; not just language but also about accents]

Lance: IN the Caribbean we’re dealing with technology access issues even before we get to ICANN participation. Europe & US ahead because those access and IT issues already addressed. Awareness and capacity-building is needed to enable participation.

Jyry: Agree with Tijani on 2 types of participation; ICANN meetings and between ICANN meetings. Agrees with Lance that the world not at the same level with access and capacity. Process ongoing so participation will emerge eventually. WG calls can be translated for a few WGs to start.

Neil: Emotes to Tijani’s translation error problem. Using the wrong translator seems irrational. Spend the money and use human translators! Document release from translation should be simultaneous. Simple policy change required. The major issue is gender.

Garth: Can we get a cost estimate for transcription?

Tijani: Gender barriers not an ICANN issue per se;

Paul Muchene: Awareness of ICANN low in developing countries. ICANN must be felt on the ground for people in developing economies to begin to know them.

Vittorio: Missing a few details. 1) Sub-regional diversity in reference to AP region; some parts of a region more represented than others. Maybe we need to expand ALAC membership to bring more diversity. Funding for volunteers was always an issue, is ongoing and improving. Creative solutions: ICANN could ask govts to subsidize civil society for meetings; even as the downsides are recognized.

Frederick: Compensation and gender are actually related; lack of compensation does affect women participation since time/task substitution could help. Government subsidy may be an answer. Culture and cultural codes; fluency, assertiveness etc. tend to have cultural markers. How do you adapt to accommodate the culturally-based disabilities?

Arnoldo Muller: He feels excluded but why? He doesn’t have a clear overview of what’s going on!Visuality is a universal way to explain ideas. Simply the language, use more visuals to assist communication of the ideas.

Tijani: Clarification of Frederick’s comment on compensation and gender?

Garth: In some countries such as Russia and Central Asian republics, national politics and intrigue depress participation in int’l organisations. National legislatures not always vigourous in debate.

Roberto: Blank spots in Central Asia for ALS. Big issue for ALAC wrt global representation.

Amr Hamdi: Promotion needed for more others to be included.

Yasushi: Telecommunications issues are central to reach. Most national infrastructure closely managed. Spoke of CAREN –academic research and education networks – and how capacity built here could be used for internet governance engagement.

**Resumed 10:25a**

Q4: Accountability

Milton Mueller: Identify accountability mechanism first and then see whether they are globally fair.

Roberto: Every stakeholder must have equal opportunity to access the mechanism, regardless of how derived. Example AoC only USG has access to that mechanism.

Milton: Identify them to see. IANA is the most important and is accessible only to the DoC. Not fair so that’s why we are in the IANA transition. Next is California law which has a geographic biased. AoC is the least biased but while not US-centric, it is still weak; fact-based policy development, must have HQ in the US; transparent budget processing; preserving stability and security, consumer confidence. Review team promoted to review and issue non-binding recommendations. Review team drawn from the community but what they can do. Independent Review Process; if ICANN is perceived to break its principle then it can be challenged (IRP); some access since .africa (and .xxx) made use of it.

Roberto: Is the ombudsman a part of the accountability mechanism

Garth: Document disclosure policy; ICANN may be requested to release documents that may not be public

Garth: domain hijacking case of Tamil-speaking website community group don’t know how to communicate and ICANN don’t know how to speak with them?

Seth: Is IANA transition helpful to accountability?

Milton: Yes, if done right it would be a huge step forward in accountability. What or who will ICANN be accountable to is the vexed question.

Alan: Accountability is tracked with responsibility and transparency. They work well together. USG was responsible for IANA up till now. For all of us to be responsible, then we must be transparent in how the IANA responsibility is managed. Default position should be open, included contract and contracting.

Seth: California law does not favour Californians. Anybody from anywhere can challenge. But there are aspects of the law that disallows ICANN from doing certain things.

Neil: No overall privacy law but a patchwork. Lawyers are needed to go to court and they must be qualified to practice in California and are expensive to engage. Ongoing int’l global activities don’t fit well in the US legal framework. Some consideration should be given to location; look at other **trade association** and find out why the decision to locate in Montreal, Brussels, or Geneva.

Seth: ICANN incorporated in several jurisdictions. If so, where would ICANN be sued, if necessary.

Vittoria: Challenged Seth on California law non-discriminatory stance. Yes, there is a matter of cost to challenge and that is universal. Accountability might flow in the wrong direction based on location.

Seth: Is there a future for the AoC?

Milton: They can be terminated in 120 days unilaterally by any party.

Garth: Based on developments in DoC and IANA transition, how is the AoC still relevant?

Roberto: Problem is not with AoC, its role was to establish an accountability mechanism. It was intended to give the USG comfort that its tie could be loosened. The relationship will change with IANA transition anyways.

Tijani: USG talked about IANA function only. Not clear about the AoC future.

Seth: How do we make sure the transition is globally fair?

Milton: AoC attempts what is usually done by int’l law. Once the IANA contract and the special relationship with USG gone you need new set of constraints. Who and what are the matters at issue. Some solutions talked about: Put AoC in bye-laws, reincorporating ICANN in Geneva,

Vittorio: Several ways to do it. Most direct is int’l treaty. A distributed accountability mechanism is the only way to avoid capture by a single group or govt.

Neil: California leaves ICANN open to spurious lawsuits and as a consequence, operations frozen!

Milton: Not sure it matters since in 15 years ICANN has had not one. California law says ICANN must have members. ICANN says it has none. So it shielded itself from the full effect of California legal framework.

Seth: ICANN has been sued a number of times; it is easier to sue in US, you must sue where the tareget resides; alleged California has a high standard of accountability; high cost of law.

Milton: In 2002 or 2003, ICANN was sued to release financial records, the lawsuit was successful.

Neil: if ICANN wants to act global they should consider operating in another jurisdiction

Adam: the focus should not be adhering to international law. It should be on building the mechanism

Carlton: it is important that the distinction is made between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the multstakholder organisation.

Adam: focus on Internet global governance. If ICANN has difficulty in delivering service to specific groups the mechanisms should built within ICANN to address

Neil: there is no clear distinction between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the stakeholder, spoke about the possibility of being shareholders in the ICANN Corporation.

Alan: does not believe in the at-large as it currently stands. Suggests the possibility of global elections to ensure accountability, transparency.

Roberto: in the Global Elections held participation varied based on geographic location.

**Resumed at 12:35**

Q5 Operational Matters

**Is ICANN’s footprints global Agreement that that is to some extent; this is still to be work to done**

**Suggestion that ICANN opens offices in the underrepresented geographic areas**

Alan: The opening of additional office is an expensive exercise.

Tijani: ICANN needs to closer to the stakeholders.

Mohammed: ICANN needs to open more engagement hubs around the world

Jordi: Suggestion to ICANN decentralized its functions to the ALS,

Roberto: Also support the need of additional offices, increases the chance of reaching ICANN for areas with limited connection. Need to define strategy for opening the offices since it would be impossible to open offices in every location. Express the concern that ICANN would get involved in the local political process.

Alan: His understanding that ALSs were the local representative for ICANN. If there is a need to open ICANN office in various locations it means therefore the AT-large process has failed.

Garth: ALS represents users, ALS do not work for ICANN, suggest creation of affiliates that can provide local support. These can be on contract.

Tijani: End users cannot provide ICANN functions. Need **(for example)** for registrars to interact with ICANN regional offices.

It was agreed the ALS was supposed to provide outreach services to users

Roberto: Supported the need to create the regional offices

***Summary:***

* ***General Agreement that ICANN’s Global Footprint does not cover the international community but there are weaknesses that need to be addressed.***
* ***General agreement ICANN needs to be closer to their stakeholders…suggestions included opening of regional offices or engagement hubs.***
* ***It was stressed that there needs to be defined strategy for opening offices since it would be impossible to open offices in every location.***
* ***There was a concern expressed that the local offices might get involved in the domestic political process.***
* ***There was a suggestion that ALS can provide the services on behalf of ICANN***
* ***This was a concern that is not ICANN roles***

**Resumed at 3: 25**

**Is Access to ICANN facilities equal to all stakeholders?**

Seth: Had found communicating physically with ICANN difficult

Alan: Not sure whether or when communication is ICANN is necessary.

There are always opportunities to meet with ICANN because of they travel around the world

Need to ascertain what of kind of communication is required

Garth: Highlight the fact that the website is unhelpful and does not facilitate user access

Mohammed: Translated documents are not available online, There is issues that require immediately response depend upon constituency. Need to take into consideration specific Geographic tendencies (i.e the need to speak with live operators)

Roberto: Problems with the language; You need to contact ICANN without language barriers and related difficulties.; A need to enlarge ICANN’s footprint but need to take into consideration the scarce resources.

Mona: ICANN is global and running the global infrastructure therefore it needs to enlarge it footprints; ICANN can look at existing models

Yasuichi Government is denying access to social networks such as Facebook; ICANN has to be sensitive that the channels that they are using as promotion may not reach the desired target.

Garth: ICANN should provide all services on its own site and not route users to third party sites.

Are ICANN’s operations sufficiently shielded from local jurisdiction?

Garth: Raised the concern that elements in the US legislatives framework are against the IANA transition.

Carlton: Support the concern but raised the question of business continuity planning but at this point or what the consequences would be if any nation objected

Vinay Suggestion ICANN look at the model of the Red Cross.

Carlton This model cannot apply because Red Cross is circumscribed by local law.

Seth: Mooted the point local office that operate like corporate branches

Carlton: May be applied best for failover operation

Jyry: Does not believe the corporate analogy is not best fit

Alan: Feels that this is not an At-Large discussion. At-Large should focus on more technical and policy matters.

Mohammed: Disagreed because as an example the US has embargoes against certain countries. This can affect the support that ICANN gives to potential

Victorio: Raising the point why Switzerland as a neutral location is potentially better suited.

Mohammed: Because of embargo related restrictions. Local agencies require exemptions which can be lengthy process

**Suggestions**

The need for ICANN to open regional offices but, with a clear strategy because ICANN cannot open in every location.

That the need for ICANN to possibly relocate to a more neutral location

That ALS take on some of the responsibilities of ICANN in local jurisdictions (some discussion about whether that this is truly a responsibility)

Need for ICANN to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones

That ICANN to be sensitive to the fact that social media is sometimes blocked by governments

That ICANN must ensure translations are made available in a timely manner

Recognise that there is a clear distinction between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the stakeholders

Suggest that ALS fulfill their mandate for outreach on behalf of ICANN.

Notes:

There is full consensus that ICANN must take steps to improve their globalization efforts.