BRIEFING REGARDING OPEN BUDGET ITEMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005-06

The ICANN Board adopted the fiscal year 2005-06 budget at the Luxembourg meeting (see, http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-15jul05.htm#p3). The adoption provided that:

> the community consultation process has also made it clear that there are categories of expenditures that remain under discussion within the ICANN community, particularly support for the creation of a new non-profit organization to facilitate DNSSEC deployment; spending from segregated funds (with the exception of funding for the Technical Standing Panel, and initiatives on IDN and registry failover); and the establishment of new regional offices,

and

> the Board Finance Committee is requested to itemize the expenditures in the expense categories still under discussion, including those in Resolution (05.[C]) above in order to ensure that such expenditures will continue only at the run rate from fiscal year 2004-2005 while community discussions continue.

The purpose of this memo is to provide a description in detail of the budget line items frozen at current run rates and, where appropriate, a report on community input regarding those items so that the Board can decide whether to adopt these line items along with the previously adopted budget. This memo recommends approval of those items.

As a result of the Board action on the budget, staff has performed three sets of analyses:

1) The burn rates during the last fiscal year. Monthly spending was analyzed to ensure that last year's activity rates can be funded and sustained.

2) Detail explanation for each line item amount under consideration.

3) In the cases of planned expenditures for the two line items for translation and establishment of regional presences, examination of public comment for each line item including meeting transcripts in Luxembourg and Mar del Plata in order to provide an overview of which portions of the community supported or objected to these items. (See Appendices "A" and "B" respectively.)

The line items in the current budget (see, http://www.icann.org/financials/adopted-budget-12aug05.html#EXPENSEREVENUEPROJECTION), currently held to "run rates" by the board vote are spending on: (1) DNSSEC; (2) Translation, (3) At-Large and Community Projects; (4) Regional meetings participation; and (5) Establishing regional presences.

These materials were presented to the Board Finance Committee and discussed in the Committee meeting held 28 September 2005. Committee recommendations follow discussion of each line item.

A. DNSSEC

Description
ICANN, along with other contributors, intend to fund a not-for-profit concern that will work to promote, and then implement DNSSEC. Disbursement of funds to a different entity is contingent upon the presentation of the new concern's operating plan and approval by the ICANN board.

Line item amount: $300k

Run rate: $0

Task Description and Status
This line item falls under the funding for "Stability and Security Projects" in the adopted budget. It falls directly under ICANN's mandate to ensure the ongoing security and stability of the DNS. The formation of this entity has not taken place. Steve Crocker, SSAC Chair, has been providing advice regarding the project, taking advice from others regarding entity formation and precise role. It is expected that the entity will receive sources of funding from others besides ICANN.

Discussions with Steve and others indicate the full implementation of DNSSEC will require considerable funding. Regardless of the timing of this planned entity or whether it is determined by staff and Board that this proposed entity is the appropriate mechanism for the deployment of DNNSSEC, this funding is required so that ICANN can take a visibly supportive role in this area.

It is important to recognize that DNSSEC efforts are moving ahead, regardless of ICANN's decision to participate. The Sweden TLD has deployed a version of DNSSEC, other groups have formed task forces to study and ultimately implement it. The proposed ICANN contribution in the 2005-06 budget is "the price of admission" to keep ICANN in the visibly supportive role that is required if ICANN is to continue to be recognized as effective.

If the Board approves this line item, there are two additional controls in place to ensure reasoned and consensus-based investments are made:

- if it is determined that all or much of this $300,000 should be invested in a single effort, the bylaws require that the Board approve that expenditure even after the line item in the budget is approved by the board; and

- ICANN staff will consult with Vint, Steve and other technical liaisons to the Board prior to making any investment in this area.

<u>Recommendation</u>
It is recommended that the Board approve this line item. It is recommended that the
Board consult with the Chair, the CEO and the Technical Liaisons in order to gain a full
understanding of DNSSEC related issues and ICANN's role. The Finance Committee
asked that in approving this line item, the board request a detailed spending plan for
additional approval prior to making major expenditures (exceeding $50,000 per ICANN
controls policy) and that staff provide periodic reports to the Committee regarding the
efficacy of spending after it has been made.

B. Translation

<u>Description</u>
This line item falls under "Developing Country Internet Community Projects" in the
adopted budget. The ICANN brochure and other materials are now translated into 17
languages. An increased comprehensive translation program has been budgeted for the
fiscal year 2005-06 to assist with those stakeholder groups who do not operate in English
as their first language. Included will be facilitation of participation at ICANN meetings in
multiple languages.

Run rate: $75K annually. [$0 was spent in the first quarter of last fiscal year as
expenditures were tailored to match the slower than planned revenue increases. $52K was
spent during the last three quarters after revenue flow was ascertained, a $75K run rate.]

Line item amount: $300K

> Detailed spending (approximation):
> - $100,000 – Outsourced translation services to provide accurate, syntactical
>   translations of ICANN literature;
>
> - $50,000 – Outsourced translation services to broadcast real-time translations
>   in the primary regional languages of the key events at ICANN's meetings;
>
> - $100,000 – Outsource translation services to provide accurate, syntactical
>   translations of key elements of ICANN's website;
>
> - $50,000 – Outsourced translation services to support ICANN efforts with
>   regional media, and with editing, archiving and posting recordings for access
>   by key Internet communities.

The MoU with the U.S. Government calls for ICANN to "develop and implement an appropriate and effective strategy for multi-lingual communications."

The translation budget of $300,000 will be used to target a variety of Internet stakeholders in each region using some or all of the following mechanisms:

– Regional media – providing ICANN information, press briefings, interviews, public service announcements and video news releases in multiple languages to numerous, regionally-based, multi-lingual publications and media outlets;

– ICANN literature – including hard copy, CD, and online distribution, in each region in multiple languages, describing ICANN's mission, structure, how to get involved, recent activities and regionally-specific developments, and information of interest to specific constituency groups;

– ICANN website – translating principle documents into nine different languages;

– Regional ICANN meetings – broadcasting real-time translations in the primary regional languages of ICANN's public forum, Board meetings and other key events, distributing multi-lingual literature to attendees, and conducting multi-lingual interviews for regional press;

– Audio/video archives – maintaining visual and/or audio recordings of various international meetings, seminars and speeches that will be accessible to the international community in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and other languages;

– Editing, archiving and posting donated translation services from members of the Internet community to reduce costs and improve utility of materials for key Internet communities.

Comments from the community
During both the Luxembourg and Mar del Plata ICANN meetings, translation was addressed in multiple public discussions. In the public forums and during public discussions of ICANN's strategic plan, statements by members of the ICANN community supported increased translation efforts as a critical component to international participation in ICANN. This position was encapsulated in a statement by ICANN consultant, Patrick Sharry, who identified internationalization/translation as the most important issue consistently raised by participants in the strategic planning small group discussions he conducted in Luxembourg:

> ...Internationalization...came up in a number of ways in a number of those forums. Internationalization in the sense that people wanted ways of working that wasn't in English... That's also to do with the way that business processes are conducted in ICANN, and that's meetings and the documents and translations that might be useful for that.... So I think that that would be the number one issue.

A full listing of community commentary regarding translation can be found in Appendix A.

<u>Recommendation</u>
Performing translations where economical and meaningful enjoys wide community support. ICANN's first translation efforts of the past fiscal year have indicated that the increased amount planned is reasonable for the effort defined. ICANN has also learned lessons and received offers regarding economical methods to obtain translations. It is recommended that the Board approve this line item.

C. At Large and Community Projects

<u>General Description</u>
This line item falls under "Developing Country Internet Community Projects" in the adopted budget. At-Large activities include expenses to improve upon the significant progress that has been made on the creation and involvement of ICANN At-Large. As ICANN attempts Regional At-Large Organisations, additional start-up funds are needed. To increase the likelihood of establishing the At-Large framework envisioned in the bylaws, additional ICANN support is required for At-Large organizing/outreach, including staff support to secure the involvement of a significant number of At-Large Structures in each region in ICANN policy activities, and face-to-face interactions at ICANN meetings of At-Large community leaders.

Line item amount: $381K

Run rate: $188K [The run rate varies from month to month. Higher levels of expenditures are made during the ICANN meetings due to travel expenses. During this period, ALAC will hold activity levels and meeting travel at rates consistent with last year.]

<u>Detailed spending:</u>

− $133,500 – Development and distribution of informational materials, support for RALO organizing meetings, secretariat support for RALO formation efforts, and in-region staff/consultant services to support At-Large organizing and outreach objectives;

− $235,000 – Travel for ALAC members and key At-Large leaders to ICANN meetings to conduct ALAC policy development and outreach activities, and travel for ALAC members and/or At-Large leaders to attend 2 key outreach events in each region;

− $12,500 – Administration expenses to support At-Large efforts, including regular conference call meetings.

<u>Task description</u>
The At-Large and Community Projects budget of $381,000 will be used to build upon the significant progress that has been made in the creation of a global framework of "At-Large" user groups and their involvement in ICANN, including the work of the At-Large Advisory Committee. To increase the likelihood of fully establishing the At-Large framework envisioned in the bylaws, these funds will support:

- At-Large organizing and outreach, including staff support to inform and educate the global At-Large community and secure the involvement of a significant number of individual Internet user groups (At-Large Structures) in each region in ICANN;

- Community efforts to create Regional At-Large Organizations (RALOs) (as called for in the bylaws), including support for RALO planning and formation meetings, efforts to develop RALO MoUs and supporting documents, support for At-Large representatives' participation in meetings and events to advance RALO formation and involvement in ICANN issues;

- At-Large Advisory Committee policy development and communication efforts, including resources to help the ALAC coordinate with At-Large Structures globally and communicate their activities to the At-Large community, and to support the ALAC's efforts to develop policy advice that promotes individual user community interests.

<u>Recommendation</u>
ALAC enjoys broad community support. Additional funding is required in order to provide the resources necessary to finalise the formation of RALOs. It is recommended that the Board approve this line item.

D. Regional Meetings

<u>General Description</u>
This line item falls under "Developing Country Internet Community Projects" in the adopted budget. ICANN will sponsor attendance at regional meeting for the world's least developed countries. Meetings will include seminars describing IANA services, DNS structure and operations and opportunities available through widespread connectivity and an interoperable Internet.

Line item amount: $450K

Current run rate: $0

<u>Task description and costing</u>
This line item falls under "Developing Country Internet Community Projects" in the adopted budget. One of ICANN's four key priorities, as reflected in the strategic plan, is to ensure global stakeholder participation. ICANN's work to date in relation to developing country participation has focused on outreach and developing partnerships in

respective regions. This work has been well received and will be built upon. This new line item in no way seeks to replace this. However, ICANN's current work has been limited because ICANN has not been able to help sponsor regional meetings and participation therein, nor focus resources to improve the ability for developing countries to participate in ICANN. All efforts to date rely on the resources of others.

The budget item proposed is in response to the growing need for ICANN to improve (and increase) developing country awareness the organization and its areas of responsibility, increase participation, and improve ICANN's responsiveness to developing country needs.

ICANN is undertaking much work in outreach and building partnerships in different regions. However, ICANN's current work needs to be enhanced with a mechanism to help sponsor and support the world's developing countries participate in regional meetings, and ICANN, within areas of ICANN's mandate. It is not appropriate for ICANN to solely rely on other international organizations (governmental or not) for this. If ICANN fails to continue to improve its developing country outreach and participation work, it will put at risk its own structure and ability to say with credibility that it is working to ensure participation of all stakeholders, from all regions, in particular developing countries.

ICANN has not been able in the past to help sponsor regional meetings within the areas of its responsibilities for the world's least developed countries. Nor has it been able to provide resources to help participants from developing countries partake in ICANN.

The importance of ensuring participation from all regions, in particular developing countries, is not new. It is reflected, in part, in the MoU between ICANN and the US Department of Commerce (14)(e), where it states that ICANN should "develop a collaborative program with private and intergovernmental parties to conduct outreach to governments and local Internet communities in targeted regions, including key constituencies". Additionally, in discussions on Internet governance, the World Summit on Information Society, and in particular the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), have noted that participation from developing countries is often limited and expensive. [WGIG report, para 19].

The WGIG report specifically noted that there were "two overarching prerequisites to enhance the legitimacy of Internet governance processes," those being:

- The effective and meaningful participation of all stakeholders, especially from developing countries.

- The building of sufficient capacity in developing countries, in terms of knowledge and of human, financial and technical resources." [Para. 74]

The WGIG report furthermore identified a number of priority recommendations, which include in paragraph 82:

> "Meaningful participation in global policy development:
>
> - International organizations, including intergovernmental organizations where relevant, should ensure that all stakeholders, particularly from developing countries, have the opportunity to participate in the determination of policy decisions that affect them, and promote and support such participation.
>
> - Specific efforts should be made to address the lack of funds of the different stakeholders of developing countries, which impedes them from actively and consistently participating in international Internet governance processes."

ICANN proposes to use the funds to improve developing country participation in two ways:

(a) To support, where appropriate in partnership with other organizations, the participation on a rotational basis of developing country participants (government, private sector, technical community, civil society) in ICANN meetings.

- Total of approximately US$ 250,000 for 50 developing country participants @ US $5,000 each (the U.N. rate), to attend one of three ICANN meetings. This equates to supporting approximately 16 participants to attend one ICANN meeting (a cost of approximately US$ 83,000 for each meeting).

- If possible to do in partnership with other organizations, this could contribute to additional support for participants from developing countries, in particular least developed countries.

(b) To regularly hold, where appropriate in partnership with regional governmental and non-governmental organizations, workshops on specific areas of ICANN's responsibility and emerging issue areas. The purpose of these workshops is to:

- To better provide information to developing country participants on issues of interest as they relate to ICANN's mandate;

- To better understand specific needs of respective developing country regions on their needs from ICANN so ICANN can better ensure full global participation in ICANN's processes and deliverance to all regions of ICANN's work.

    – Total of approximately US$ 200,000.

    – Proposing 2 meetings per region @ $20,000 each. For developed country regions, the focus should be on the least developed areas (e.g. North

America/Caribbean, focus in Caribbean; for Europe focus is former Eastern Europe).

- The regional meetings will focus on IANA/ccTLD issues, DNS and other ICANN related issues, of particular interest/concern to the specific region.

- The meetings will occur where possible in partnership with other regional events to ensure improved attendance. Funds would go in part to support travel for participants from the developing country, and in part to support the local event.

With work in any region it is important to not just 'parachute in', but rather to build partnerships and help build capacity and knowledge that remains in the region. This program aims to do exactly that – focusing on specific regional needs, building local awareness, and delivering to local needs. Also noted is the importance of understanding how things work in respective regions, as well as reaching out to constituencies and partners not yet involved in ICANN.

Recommendation
For the reasons stated above and the sense of urgency ICANN must bring to this situation, it is recommended that the Board approve this line item. The Finance Committee asked that in approving this line item that staff provide periodic reports to the Committee regarding the efficacy of spending after it has been made.

E. Regional Presences

Regarding the establishment of regional presence, there is $40,000 in seed money per location for each of four global regions (Asia-Pacific, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East) to conduct appropriate study in to order to determine the most effective manner in which to effectuate regional presences. The operational study and plan may result in the establishment of an office, the use of existing presence by another entity, periodic meetings or some other form of presence.

Line item amount: $200K

Current burn rate: $0K

Description
This expense line item is contained ICANN's Global Partnerships budget and is within the capital expense line item in the published budget. This effort will be supported primarily by the Regional Liaisons and the Global Partnerships General Manger. The budget for regional presences is beyond that of the liaisons; the liaison positions were also included in the prior year's budget. Recruiting for these positions is nearly completed. The original publication of the operational plan indicated that concrete steps were to be taken to establish regional offices in specific locations. After consultation with

the community, this objective was modified to use the funds to determine the most effective way to conduct outreach.

The original objective:

> Establish regional presences, to implement ICANN's outreach to the local Internet community. Retain regional liaisons and in cooperation with outside entities that contribute staff, infra-structure and logistics to establish offices in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. Establish regional presences in cooperation with outside entities that provide logistical, staffing or infrastructure support. These presences should provide:
>
> - Education in a manner consistent with other objectives,
> - ICANN operational support so that local stakeholders have a contact point in the same time zone.

Was modified to:

> Establish regional presences through the hiring of regional liaisons to implement ICANN's outreach to the local Internet community. These presences should enable local personnel (not ICANN staff) to work with regional populations to bring:
>
> - Education in a manner consistent with other objectives,
> - ICANN operational support so that local stakeholders have a contact point in the same time zone.

As a result of these changes, there was positive feedback from the community. In particular, in the meeting in Luxembourg the follows comments were made in public meetings:

> "I love how this particular item has been rewritten. As you know, my constituency and myself in particular have been very suspicious of this particular item that sits in the strategic plan. And I think that the input that ICANN, the board and the staff, got for this particular item that appears in the strategic plan has been redrafted and reoriented in a very positive way. I like a lot of the way that things have

> been reworded here in terms of the liaisons and the way
> that the emphasis is on presence, the presence in those
> places."

and

> "I want to express my appreciation for the changes that I
> see reflected in the overview that's presented here based on
> the input that you all have received both in Mar del Plata
> and since then. And I think that we all really ought to say
> thank you for that and how much we appreciate that."

In previous writings and discussions with the community regarding the establishment of regional presences, ICANN has described offers-in-kind to assist in the establishment of offices or presences. These offers have been described in public fora and writings without providing detail. Some of those offers include:

Latin America:

- Offers of support have been received from organizations in Uruguay and Brazil.

Asia Pacific (including Middle East):

– Offers of support have been received from organizations in Japan, Singapore, Thailand, India, Egypt, Jordan and the United Arab Emirates.

Africa:

– Offers of support have been received from organizations in Ghana, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Mauritius

In addition, one country, requesting that it remain confidential, has offered office space, infrastructure, etc. Other countries and organizations have offered aid.

Regional presences are also important for all the reasons stated in the section describing Regional Meetings, *supra*. One of ICANN's four key priorities, as reflected in the strategic plan, is to ensure global stakeholder participation. The regional presence proposal is in response to the growing need for ICANN to improve (and increase) developing country awareness the organization and its areas of responsibility, increase participation, and improve ICANN's responsiveness to developing country needs.

The MoU between ICANN and the US Department of Commerce states that ICANN should:

> develop a collaborative program with private and
> intergovernmental parties to conduct outreach to
> governments and local Internet communities in targeted
> regions, including key constituencies.

Additionally, in discussions on Internet governance, the World Summit on Information Society, and in particular the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), have noted that participation from developing countries is often limited.

Success in both the U.S. Government MoU and in WSIS/WGIG requires outreach in the form of regional presences. The Internet community has told ICANN that before opening offices in any area, ICANN should undertake the study necessary to and enable local entities determine the most efficacious way in which to conduct that outreach. This is what this funding is intended to do.

Community feedback
There has been substantial discussion in ICANN meetings and in discussion for a posted on the ICANN site. There have been expressions both for and against the establishment of regional offices. There were expressions of appreciation when ICANN altered its objective in this area to use the funding to enable local entities to accomplish outreach. As stated above, several members of the community have made offers of financial or other support to establish regional presence in their area. This is a very strong indication that many who would be directly affected by ICANN regional participation support it.

A full listing of community commentary regarding regional presences can be found in Appendix B.

Recommendation
Nearly every corner of the ICANN community has provided commentary in this area. ICANN has conducted substantial community consultation regarding the implementation of outreach. ICANN has substantially changed its objective regarding regional presences in response to this commentary. The current plan is a conservative approach that engages the outreach "recipient" in the process in order to ensure the outreach is delivered an effective form. It is recommended that the Board approve this line item. The Finance Committee asked that in approving this line item that staff provide periodic reports to the Committee regarding the efficacy of spending after it has been made.

F. Conclusion

In this analysis, ICANN has set out to provide insight into the thought, planning and detail that went into the budget formulation in these specific instances. Also described is the consultation and feedback ICANN has received from the community on some of these issues.

It is recommended that the Board approve these budget line items. In each case the funds will enable required efforts to support ICANN efforts regarding the MoU, WSIS and, most importantly, performing our core mission.

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY COMMENTS REGARDING TRANSLATION

Meetings in Mar del Plata

Raul Echeberria: I think we have heard the idea translation is very expensive, and as you know, I have a very different opinion…In LACNIC, we spend a very minor percentage of our budget to keep updated in all the information that we offer to the community in three language. …In ICANN's case, it would be more expensive because, first of all, we should identify which language -- to which language should we translate all the information. But if we select six or seven languages, then surely it will be more expensive than in the case of LACNIC, but I still think that it should not be very expensive and it is perfectly affordable and it should be one of the priorities for the next year to have the whole ICANN web site translated to good set of language. I don't know exactly which number.

Marilyn Cade: I support the idea that in doing translation of legal documents that we do need to use professional services. I would say, however, that even the U.N. was able to agree on six languages… I think that the idea that ICANN could afford or should afford to translate into dozens of languages is a burden that I'm not sure the community is prepared for. But my point about that really addresses a different point, and that is that in the redo of the web site and in the translations of documents, today we are merely translating documents that are a bit uncomprehensible to those who seek to understand them. Even for someone who spends a good deal of time at ICANN, with ICANN, and around ICANN, I have difficulty finding the easy-to-understand, easy-to-distribute to my community or to my constituency information about what ICANN does, what its policies are, what its policy topics are, how to participate, those kinds of things.

Sebastian Bellagamba: I would like to address tomorrow the issue about translation, too, because, it's more part of the strategic plan than today. But i would like to say that i think the issues of (inaudible) are not. If we expect us to be a broad organization, we have to translate, we have to communicate to the world.

Amadeu Abril i Abril: Regarding translations, I will not turn down the importance of translations, but sometimes I would like that we collectively, and especially ICANN, tries to translate its documents to a new language: internet userage. If someone has problems with its domain name or something, it's a regular user, and tries to discover climbing up to the top, what's the redemption grace period or how a transfer works, this is for experts. This is not even for the whole ICANN community; this is for a subset of the ICANN community. And i think we should make an evident -- I think whois is a little bit better, there's some good explanations between Internic and ICANN.

Roberto Gaetano: …I would like to add that we need to see this thing about the regional offices, or, for that extent, also the translation in foreign languages, from two different points of view. One is strategic; and the other one is cost-effectiveness … The perception

that the world has by and large of ICANN as being a U.S. type of thing … is a problem that has to be countered with a strategic move.

So in order to remove at least the perception of this, we need to have a global presence of ICANN. And the global presence can be enforced by having regional offices and by having translation of the material in national languages. That will bring ICANN closer to people. And will be only strategically beneficial.

Vittorio Bertola: My final point is multilingualism. And i was, of course, very happy to see that in the plan. Yet i want to point out that multilingualism is not just translating leaflets or the web site. So it's not just a matter of communication. If you read the plan, it's mostly mentioned in the communication part. Well, it's really a matter of making all internal processes multilingual. So it is a huge effort, of course. It is a cost. But i think it's part of the game. You cannot have a meeting of an international organization without rooms and you cannot have them without translations. So, i mean, it's really something that needs to be addressed promptly to make this a truly international organization viable for people from different parts of the world.

Erick Iriarte: How is possible if we want to involve people, if i understood correctly the spirit of this point, if only have the document in English? I make the same comment three months ago, and never translate the document to another language, possible to try to keep together to have multilingualism concept to have multistakeholder concept when we only can discuss in English now here in Latin America, we don't have now translation. But if -- what happens if i don't understand English? I can't participate?

Philip Sheppard: …I support the aspiration of multilingualism, certainly, as a professional communicator, but I have a couple of comments that are really a watch-out, … the majority of the administrative budget of the European union is dedicated towards translations and interpretation. This may not be the direction we wish to go at ICANN. We heard also yesterday about the difficulties of some technical translations. I think in that case, the .eu was mentioned. Certainly I always remember that most of my Finnish friends in said they almost never read a .eu document in Finnish because the translation is so bad they almost always use the English or another language because of again the complexities of some of the languages there. Again, there are many successful and alter organizations which survive on one or two official languages. So let us not necessarily think that the U.N. model or any other model is a vital one. We may need to find one that is a better match and fit for the nature of ICANN. I understand that there was rather good work underway within ICANN itself in terms of a voip and text-based conferencing facility. This, I think, actually goes a long way in helping certainly the working groups of ICANN do their conferencing work better where people can see text during a conference and that's highly valuable and may be something useful seeing spelled out in perhaps the operational plan rather than strategic. The warning, I think I see a phrase, while multilingual staff can assist with translations they cannot dedicate all their time to the translation of materials and communications.

I find that phrase highly alarming because as the manager of multilingual staff the last thing I want them to do is waste their expertise and time in doing translations. They may

use multilingualism in terms of direct communication and talking, but where translations are needed I think you need professional technical translators.

And finally as I said to end on a positive suggestion, it may be what we need to think about is the translation into appropriate sets of languages of final documents so that the reference material is there, but in terms of multilingualism for the process getting towards that, I think you'll find there the budget size would necessarily be rather prohibitive.

Vittorio Bertolla: Multilingualism is also a key issue in enhancing possibilities for public participation. While we recognize the efforts that ICANN has been making to this existent, the vision of multilingualism as only affecting institutional communication between ICANN and the public ask reductive and, in our opinion, wrong. It is the internal cultural and operating practices of ICANN that have to become multilingual, not just its leaflets and web site. Real-time translation of meetings and advance preparation of printed translated documents for discussion should become regular practice and cover at least some major languages; core documents, such as the strategic plans and the policies should be made available in as many languages as possible. While the costs of these practices would be significant, we think that they are necessary to grant legitimacy to ICANN's role. They are an integral part of its mandate.

Strategic Planning Session in Luxembourg

Q: How should ICANN facilitate participation from the global community of Internet stakeholders to ensure that policy development incorporates all relevant perspectives and stakeholder values?

Selected Answers Relating to Translation:

multilingual participation / Translation

substantial automatic translations

Translation of all policy documents in a timely manner.

translation of documents and meetings

regional development

promote language diversity

Taking serious the multilingual problem !

language - translation of all material that affects a Board decision; real tijme translation of meetings; strategic plan in many languages; core documents in many languages, working documents in UN languages

7x24x365x multilingual

publicacion de documentos en varios idiomas.

aceptacion de comentarios publicos en varios idiomas

Generando documentos en varios idiomas que puedan ser comprendidos por todos Tener el strategic plan en varios idiomas, entre ellos español y portugues seria un avance

Los documentos mas importantes deberian estar disponibles en varios idiomas

Des documents de base dans différentes langues pour les nouveaux venus

Même si la « séléction par la langue » peut être choquante, la discussions « entre français » a été extrémement profitable et chaleureuse. Dans l'avenir, peut-être pourrions nous organiser en tout début de meeting ces séances de « brainstorm » et publier, lors de l'Open Mike, une déclaration commune, en français et en anglais pour donner à ceux qui ont du mal à s'exprimer dans cette langue, une vraie chance d'être entendus ?

Traduction et interprétariat ne sont pas utiles, trop coûteux pour la valeur ajoutée. Posons clairement la question : le multilinguisme est-il la seule chose qui empêche d'autres francophones de rejoindre les meetings ICANN aux 4 coins du monde ?

ICANN On-line forum

Koki Higashida: JPRS generally supports ICANN's multilingual communications strategy, provided that ICANN releases such information in a timely manner and takes proper balance between prompt delivery and multilingual translation. In other words, we believe the prompt communication should not be undermined by translation process.

Erick Iriarte Ahon : ¿Quisiera saber si existe la intención de una política multilingue activa que empiece, al menos, con el documento del Plan Estrategico.?

No es entendible que se diga en dicho Plan: "ICANN believes strongly in this principle of self-governance in Internet policy development, and has embedded it in the structure of its organisation and ICANN?s policy development processes. Complementary to it is ICANN?s principle to seek and support broad, informed participation that reflects the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.(...)" (Pagina 33), y no exista una acción directa, una demostración que no estamos ante una organización de mero discurso sin actos concretos.

El multilinguismo no es solo traducir documentos (que es parte importante), es permitirle a las personas expresarse en su propia lengua, porque el interlocutor hara los esfuerzos por entenderle, porque comprendemos que la limitante de hablar en un idioma distinto al materno, impedira que las personas expresen correctamente sus ideas y propuestas.

Entonces renuevo mi pregunta: ¿Quisiera saber si existe la intención de una política multilingue activa que empiece, al menos, con el documento del Plan Estrategico.?

Adriana Rivero: Is there a different language version of the Strategic Plan document, other than the English version?

Sebastian Bellagamba: Furthermore, considering that the Plan is intended to convey a large amount of information in different languages, and to offer the translation of ICANN's web site (Has anybody ever visited the Spanish version of ICANN's site? It is only one page long...) why not begin by having this document translated?

Likewise, ICANN should provide for the simultaneous interpretation of public events into the source language of the country organizing the events, either at its own expenses or under sponsorship. Thus, participation by the local community would increase and the multiple language environment would be encouraged.

This language issue is directly associated with the first content comment on the Plan: If ICANN expects to become a global organization, it should globalize. Apparently, ICANN is aware of this, as the Plan expressly states the objective of operating at an international level. However, this internationalization should not be understood as merely opening offices in different time zones in order to assist already existing domain registrants more adequately. On the contrary, we should particularly seek to assist regions in the world where Internet has not yet developed much, as ICANN's globalization goal will be truly achieved when all of them, are better assisted. The Plan seems to show that ICANN is too "U.S.-centered" (or too "first world-centered"), and it seems to have set the true example of internationalization aside. At least, this is what is happening with the RIRs.

APPENDIX B

COMMUNITY COMMENTS REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL PRESENCES

<u>Meetings in Mar del Plata</u>

Marilyn Cade: … When we think about outreach, I have a strong concern that before we go physically into regions too far, and until we create new mechanisms, that we stop and focus on, first of all, making sure we have materials that are usable, that support the work that is being done already, and that advances understanding. We had a brief conversation today with -- between the business constituency -- between the cross-constituency and the alac about our common need for that kind of information, and I find it in the work I'm doing in the WSIS and other settings… but I'm going to say something now about how we advance participation, not whether we advance participation. It is, in fact, critical that we advance participation very broadly. However, I, at this point, don't yet understand how much ICANN staff has been able to do by reaching out to the regional ccTLD organizations, by talking to the RIRs, by meeting with the cc's themselves by talking to other organizations that are building capacity in these regions, and whether we have yet had a chance to think about capacity building with others. When you hire staff to do capacity building with others, it's a different set of skills than when you hire staff to do things themselves.

Izumi Aizu: I was a bit surprised and wanted to clarify…when I heard most of the ICANN constituencies are not really in favor of having the regional offices. I don't want to limit this discussion just about the regional office. We have to think about the globalization or internationalization and perhaps some redistribution of the resources of icann related activities to regions or local areas. I usually am a good fan, supporter of bottom-up transparency and open process, but I'd like to remind that there may be some danger about bottom-up. If the bottom means all those who are already inside ICANN as constituencies, then if you listen to only these people, then you lose the opportunity to explore the new constituencies, new partners. That's where we need to outreach.
I was a bit surprised that [it was] said that the -- you know, not member of TLD folks. Are you saying all the TLD are against this idea? I don't think so. I know some of them are. I didn't really think the ASOs are against. They are based on the regional basis of the operation. I think if it's matter of, say, conditions or how do you handle that, I can fully agree to that. I do understand that the GNSO may not have that much concern because gnso are not really operating on the regional basis. There's no quota or balance of the regional bodies in the gnso council. So they are different bodies. So I think we have to be very careful about these issues. So sometimes bottom-up is okay, but it depends on who -- which bottom you're talking about. So I'd like to really clarify these issues before making a very simple easy statement.

Yumi Ohashi: As for the openings of the regional offices, I respect opinions from some regions that there are an advantage to open up these offices, such as same language or same time zone or things like that. However, for Asia-Pacific, people use various languages and various time zones. So -- and I myself have difficulty in communicating for the outreach in this region, in Asia-Pacific region. So my point is, whether to open regional office should be considered case-by-case basis. And the APTLD as well as .jp is ready to discuss and investigate the possibility of this issue closely with ICANN.

Roberto Gaetano: Originally when I queued up for speaking at the mike, I just wanted to say one simple thing. Remove the perception that we might have…about almost all the constituencies in ICANN being against or not strongly supportive about regional offices. Since I have participated in the process before ICANN was founded, I was supporting in the body -- I am one of the people who sees the regional offices like a strategic move. And, in fact, the At-Large is strongly in favor of having regional offices. I would like to -- we get even to the point that it will be much more difficult to set up Regional At-Large Organizations if we don't have regional offices. Because the first thing that we encounter in contacting people, potential at-large organizations or users, is the perception that icann is a U.S. Business. So I think that, you know, the first statement is that At-Large -- at least the ALAC -- is supportive of the regional offices...And I think that we should see things in a strategic perspective. The perception that the world has by and large of ICANN as being a U.S. type of thing..., in the best of the hypotheses, type of thing, is a problem that has to be countered with a strategic move. So in order to remove at least the perception of this, we need to have a global presence of ICANN. And the global presence can be enforced by having regional offices and by having translation of the material in national languages. That will bring icann closer to people. And will be only strategically beneficial.

Marilyn Cade: I actually don't think yet that I see broad community buy-in to how to increase regional participation or regional presence. But I see, I think, a lot of sympathy to increasing the participation and visibility, et cetera. I have a concern, however, about regional activities that are not linked back to the global activities of ICANN.
And I witness, in my perspective as business in some orbit international institutions, the regional forums that take place that exclude some of the multi-stakeholders. And so people get together in the region. There's not a strong link back to the rest of the participants. And some gaps begin to develop that are unnecessary. If we go to a regional approach for workshops, et cetera, then you're not going to have necessarily -- I think you're going to have to work real hard to have a broad multi-stakeholder participation. And we need to look at that carefully and say how do we make sure that that happens and examine the risk and not just think that meeting regionally is the solution.

Jordyn Buchanan: In considering the discussion of the regional offices, and I'll try to keep this fairly brief and uncontentious, most of the reasons I've heard as to why the regional offices are a good idea seem to reflect other values or other goals of the strategic plan. So it seems to me that it might be a perfectly reasonable thing to do to eliminate 3c and build them anyway, because in doing so we would fulfill the goals.

Now, I'm not sure whether or not they actually do that, and I think there's a lot of discussion on both sides that is still taking place as to the value of the regional offices. And I think if we took out 3c a lot of people would probably view that as saying we're not going to do it. And if -- I think if the board were -- or if the staff or the board would take my suggestion and do it anyway, they might find themselves with a lot of people at a microphone at a future ICANN meeting. So instead I might suggest that we might change the goal to consider establishing regional offices if doing so supports the rest of the strategic plan. Allow this dialogue to continue and allow the staff and the board to further consider the issue as time goes by, because it sounds to me like we're not quite settled yet as to whether it's a great idea.

Meetings in Luxembourg

Mark McFadden: …I love how this particular item has been rewritten. As you know, my constituency and myself in particular have been very suspicious of this particular item that sits in the strategic plan. And I think that the input that ICANN, the board and the staff, got for this particular item that appears in the strategic plan has been redrafted and reoriented in a very positive way. I like a lot of the way that things have been reworded here in terms of the liaisons and the way that the emphasis is on presence, the presence in those places. I'd like to combine them. There's another item that's actually (inaudible). Another objective that's in here (inaudible). Combine them with the international outreach objectives that sit just a few below this that actually specify ways to accomplish this. For me, and i think for my constituency, a real breakthrough in the thinking about how to move forward with that regional presence. And i really think this is well - Very well rewritten.

Strategic Planning Session

Q: How should ICANN facilitate participation from the global community of Internet stakeholders to ensure that policy development incorporates all relevant perspectives and stakeholder values?

Selected Answers Relating to Establishing Regional Presences:

    regional presence

    Regional presence - central to the awareness program and outreach; knowledge of local laws, cultures and context; moving beyond a US focus; opens the possibility for real involvement

    building capability in local communities - technical training; infrastructure support; education and information sharing

Q: What are the major issues that need to be addressed in the 2006-2010
        Strategic Plan?

Selected Answers Relating to Establishing Regional Presences:

        How to effectively internationalize ICANN_

        Internationalization

Q: If ICANN is working really well in 2009, what does it look like?

Selected Answers Relating to Establishing Regional Presences:

        truly global

        Multinational corpporation and budget to match

        True global Org.

        ICANN should have a global virtual presence

ICANN On-line forum

Paul Kane: Proposal to add ICANN staff for providing support to regions should be
reconsidered as there are regional offices such as CENTR, APTLD that already have
budget to assist, e.g. with travel costs.
ICANN should instead consider a role of coordinating existing resource base.

Marilyn Cade:

Developing regional offices

-   The Strategic Plan has defined a clear objective of Regional Offices to be
    established over the next two years. However, the relationship of the Regional
    offices and their co-existence and collaboration with the ccTLD community,
    RIRs, and RALOs is very unclear as has been previously mentioned. It is
    important not to exclude the gNSO from these considerations, nor the Advisory
    Committees.

-   ICANN needs to have further discussion and consultation with its SOs/ALAC and
    Advisory Committees on the role and functions of Regional Offices, to ensure
    that there is an effective mechanism for all to fully participate in regional
    programs and activities.

-   The existing RIRs, regional TLD organizations, ISOC , and other entities may
    have a strong contribution to make in achieving/or supporting the objectives
    presently envisioned for the regional offices. Other mechanisms and approaches
    for service delivery/support should be fully considered; if that has been the case, it
    isn't clear in the Strategic Plan.

Recommendation: ICANN should provide a more detailed description of the possible models, and solicit contributions from all of its stakeholders, including the gNSO, regarding these initiatives and their funding and functions.

Marie Zitkova: Similarly, we have questions about the idea of having regional physical presences. One of the benefits of the Internet is that we can conduct global business online without having to be in every location around the world. Like any organization, ICANN needs to weigh the costs and the benefits associated with the establishment of additional offices. How will these offices operate within the overall ICANN process? How will they contribute to ICANN's mission? How will ICANN coordinate its "speech" by far-flung representatives? How much discretion will these representatives have?

Sebastian Bellagamba: In order that ICANN become international as from the opening of regional offices, it is of vital importance that   regional members be consulted, not only to measure the resources necessary for such regional office, but also to reach a consensus on the set-up conditions. Strictly following the criteria to   evaluate the so-called "local offers" for setting-up the office mentioned in the plan, may mean not safeguarding ICANN's impartiality and independence within the region.

Steve Crocker: On page 23, section 3-4c), ICANN offers a statistical breakdown of regional presence, indicating that "approximately 50% of accredited registrars in North America, 30% in Europe, and 20% in Asia/Pacific". SSAC suggests that this may paint an inaccurate picture, given that ccTLDs generally do not use ICANN accredited registrars.

Koki Higashida: We suggest that ICANN identify more concretely what services and operation ICANN is proposing as the responsibility of the regional offices.

Need and purpose of establishing each office should be different from one region to another, so it should be judged separately for each region on a case-by-case basis.

Further, JPRS expects ICANN to take advantage of existing outreach efforts already made by the local and regional organizations such as JPRS and APTLD. We are willing to collaborate with ICANN in addressing the regional presence issue.

Jordan Carter: APTLD members are not certain of the rationale for opening ICANN offices in other regions, but say that there seems no case made for an office in the Asia Pacific region. APTLD suggests that each regional office should be justified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the regional internet community.

Outreach in the regions, if that is part of the goal, may more easily and economically be achieved by ICANN staff working with and through the offices of the regional organisations. Fund for Developing Internet Communities

APTLD does not accept that it is within the ICANN mandate to fund outreach activities in developing countries, or to "pursue all available means" to address their needs. Much work is done by other organisations in this area, and the prospect of duplication and collision is of concern.