CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large capacity building webinar on the topic of At-Large review on Wednesday, the 19th of December 2018 at 21:00 UTC.

Our speakers are Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Maureen Hilyard. We will not be doing a roll call since this is a webinar. We have French and Spanish interpretation, so may I please remind everyone to state your name before speaking to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channel and for the transcription purposes also.

Please do remember to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation, and a kind reminder for all participants on the phone bridge as well on the Adobe Connect, please mute your speakers and microphones when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Thank you all for joining, and I will now turn it back over to you, Tijani Ben Jemaa, the chair of the At-Large Capacity Building Working Group. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Claudia. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the last webinar of the Capacity Building Working Group for program for 2018. This is the 12th one normally, and for the next year, of course, we will have another program. We are counting on you to g I've us your preference for the topics that you

---

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

want us to address for the next year, and the program will be done early January if everything goes well.

Before giving the floor to our speakers today, and today we will address the issue of the topic of the At-Large review, we have three very good speakers about this subject who are Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Maureen Hilyard. Before giving them the floor to make their presentations, I will give the floor back to the staff to make some housekeeping items. So please, Claudia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you, Tijani. I will now run over a few housekeeping items before we start. For questions and answers during the webinar, you can submit these via the chat pod by typing the word "question" followed by the actual question. These will be directed to the presenters. Please do however note that we have a question and answer session after the presentations and the popup questions.

Regarding the pop quiz questions, we will display these after the presentation for all those in the AC room, so please be ready to answer the questions via the polling tool.

Finally, at the end of the webinar, after the question and answer session, we will have a user experience survey composed of six questions. Please stay around for an extra three minutes or so to complete them. It is important feedback for the At-Large capacity building program. Thank you, and back over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much, Claudia. So now I will give the floor to, I think, Alan Greenberg who will start the presentation. You have the control of your slides, Alan. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much, Tijani. Once the slides are up, I will have control. Is there any way we can get the whole slide showing, not just part of it? At least on my screen, it's only showing part of it.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I think now it is. I don't know.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Maybe it's just my screen. I'm only seeing –
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	No, it is not your screen. It is also here. Okay, now it is centered. Do you have a better image?
ALAN GREENBERG:	It's centered, but I'm not sure it's going to fit. Let's see. Hold on. I have it set at 125. Maybe at 100%, it seems to fit. Okay. I don't know if that gets reflected on what other people see or not.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Well, right now, someone set it to 112 and it seems to be okay, so we'll leave it be for the moment. Thank you very much for joining us. This session over all is about the At-Large review. I'll be covering the history part of it, and then we'll come back at the end to talk a little bit about outcomes and what we hope to achieve with this whole thing.

At-Large was created in 2002. The ALAC first met in 2003. The concept of RALOs and ALSes existed in the bylaws, but there were no such creatures at that point. The bylaws mandate that every AC and SO, with the exception of the GAC, be periodically be reviewed to make sure it's still relevant and it's doing a good job and so forth.

We had one At-Large review that started, I believe, in 2005 and ran through to completion probably about total of three years. Cheryl, when she speaks, can comment on whether that number's accurate or not. I don't quite remember, but it took a while to get the review done, approved and then implemented.

I'm seeing the top of my title cut off a little bit. Is everyone else seeing the same thing? The beginning, it says, "The beginning." Alright, we're not showing the whole slide, so in some of them, we may have to scroll to see the whole thing, because there should be a title row at the bottom with page numbers which is not showing on mine anyway.

Okay, the review started in early 2015. We started talking about the review. That was the schedule where it should have begun. However, ICANN at that point was heavily in the midst of working on the IANA stewardship transition, that is transferring the IANA operation from the

control of the U.S. government directly into, as it turned out, ICANN's responsibility, and then moving into the ICANN accountability activities which were associated with it.

So, we put the review on hold, essentially. In May 2016, a little over a year later, the review had essentially really been kicked off, an RFP was sent out to organizations that could do such reviews, and ITEMS International was selected to carry out the review.

We first met in June of 2016 at the Helsinki meeting. That was the first meeting with the ALAC and the ITEMS team, and we spent a fair amount of time, both individuals and the group, briefing the review team on what we believe the issues were.

Now, they of course were charged with independently assessing things, but we felt it was reasonable to tell them what we thought were the problems, strengths, and what we had to work on. And of course, we knew at that point, since it was not a secret, that our largest single problem was a difficulty in getting a significant number of committed workers to actively work on ICANN policy issues.

We understand the difficulty, the amount of time it takes, the learning curve, and of course, since many At-Large people are not working in the domain industry, there's no personal relevance to them and their employers, so it's even harder than it is in many other parts of ICANN.

And as I said, the problem – although we certainly have other things that we need to address in At-Large – was the lack of sufficient involvement in ICANN issues.

So the review went on, the review team interviewed a lot of people – that, it turned out to be one of the interesting side issues associated with it – and they issued a draft report that was sent privately to us in December.

We looked at it and had a number of problems. Partly, the largest single problem that we saw at that point was it was clear that the reviewers had decided early on – and if we go back a bit, I think I skipped something.

Yeah, what I forgot to mention in the discussion of the meetings in June 2016 was it was clear that although the reviewers were just getting involved, they were already coming up with solutions. Some of us found that a little bit troubling, because this is a very complex organization we have, and I didn't think – and some others didn't think – that this was the right time to start looking for solutions.

In any case, the draft review came out, and there were a number of things. The solutions they were proposing, we believed, were problematic for a number of reasons. Not because we just didn't like them, but because we didn't think they were implementable.

The second problem was the report quoted, either verbatim or indirectly, a lot of the people who were interviewed, making very negative comments, and negative comments which were not necessarily substantiated by facts, and yet they were accepted as facts.

The actual report was issued after we had made a number of comments to them in January, the following month, and with little changed.

We met with them in March, and again, there were very significant discussions, a lot of time was spent. We explained in some detail why we had some issue with a number of the recommendations, including in some cases recommendations which were just in violation of ICANN bylaws. So some of them were quite problematic at that level.

There was a public presentation which I didn't go to. Other people may be able to speak to it. I'm told it was one of the more confrontational sessions they've ever seen in ICANN.

The final report was issued in May 2017, again, with minimal changes. The report had 16 recommendations in it. It recommended an empowered membership model. The term "empowered" was coined during ICANN Accountability in a different context, but they liked it and used it here. Essentially, it was saying we should emphasize only individual members, deemphasize ALSes.

They believed, because of the comments made, that there was as significant problem of leadership stagnation. That is, the same people were taking the same roles ten years later. Something we could demonstrate was not the case, but the statements were made nonetheless.

A revision of At-Large leadership which would have halved the number of people involved in leadership positions, doubled their workload responsibility, doubled their workload because people would take on two different roles, so an ALAC member would also be the chair of a RALO, for instance.

And more problematic than that perhaps was, in many cases, they were assigning responsibilities not based on skills and interests but randomly. The people who were no longer leaders and therefore didn't need to travel to ICANN meetings would be replaced by other people who essentially applied, and again, a significant amount of random selection to choose who it was who would be coming.

There was a major funding proposal that is ICANN should no longer fund At-Large out of operational funds but should fund it out of auction proceeds, something we had pointed out was not going to be allowed for a number of reasons.

Several of the recommendations talked about social media and several of them talked about outreach. Sorry, what I didn't say on that slide is that on the analysis of it, we were asked to complete something called a feasibility assessment and implementation plan, a rather large and complex document.

In the end, we accepted about half of the recommendations, with significant changes in how they would be implemented, and we rejected about half as being not implementable, impractical, or based on a false premise.

The board Organizational Effectiveness Committee was, at that point, in a somewhat awkward position, because typically, in response to a review, the organization will say – they may reject one or two recommendations for various reasons and would explain how they're going to implement the rest.

Since we had not really said we were going to implement any of the recommendations as described and we had rejected a very significant number of them, there was a real problem of how do they proceed to get board approval over what we said we're going to do, since it clearly was not going to be based directly on the recommendations of the reviewers.

The board came up with a rather interesting proposal and asked ICANN staff to provide a mapping between the issues raised – not the recommendations but the issues – and what we were proposing to do about those issues.

ICANN Org delivered that mapping in December of 2017. What we proposed is we redid, essentially, the mapping, making it – we thought – a lot clearer and more understandable, but still, it was the same mapping that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee had asked for, that is, how we plan to address the issues identified by the reviewers, or not, in cases of some of them.

We delivered that document. A very significant amount of work went into all of these phases, and many of the people who did it are on these calls. In June, we delivered the proposal, and the ICANN board approved the implementation proposal that we had submitted without any changes.

The targets in the proposals we made were to get more people involved in ICANN processes to ensure user input. However, these people would come from two different [sources.] One is individual members, something which was already common in most parts of ICANN and we

are in the process of making sure all regions have individual members, but the second is to capitalize on the ALSes.

The original concept of an ALS was to make sure that we have pools of people who can learn about ICANN. It's individuals that do work, not groups. So the question is, how can you use an ALS to identify individuals who are interested in ICANN?

We'll be talking at the end a little bit about how we're going to do that, but clearly, we need to make sure that we have lots of people who are interested in working. And something that we haven't successfully done very well over the years, we clearly have perceptions, even when the issues identified were false, they are perceptions people have, and we need to clear those up.

We need to do effective outreach, but outreach with a goal. It's not sufficient to do outreach just to get more people. You have to do outreach to get more people who are willing to work. Better use of social media, and of course, metrics to be able to track whether we're successful or not.

With that, I'll turn this over to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I just unmuted myself. I'm just waiting for my slides to come up. Just as an introduction, although I was involved a little bit in the early stages of the writing of the proposal of the review document, I wasn't involved in the proposal side of it, so a lot of the stuff that came up was quite new, but at the same time, it was quite an exciting time for

us because we were actually able to start making some recommendations ourselves based on the proposals that had been made and that the board had agreed to.

And of course, it was in a board meeting on the 23rd of June of this year that the board accepted the proposals that had been made with regards to the 16 review items, but the proposals were how At-Large felt was going to be the most appropriate way of dealing with the issues that had been raised within the review.

So the board resolution really just asked us to do three things, very simple. The first one was to establish the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group, which affectionately became known as the ARIWG. The purpose of this group was to oversee the process itself in relation to the implementation proposals that were in the overview proposal, and also leading up to the actual development of the detailed implementation plan, which was our ultimate outcome of this particular activity.

So the board had these expectations of things that we had to do with regards to the steps, the approach that we were going to take with each of those items, and that they should have clear metrics, goals and a methodology for actual implementation.

And of course, the second thing was that they did offer, in a way, [inaudible] was a budget implication that we had to justify exactly what that budget would be used for and how, and the implementation process had to be really clear on that.

They gave us some advice on how we might approach the development of the plan and that we could look at prioritizing the 16 items that Alan mentioned into the easier ones that may not need much in the way of funding or resourcing that we might be able to remedy internally, and that any others could be kept for later that may need additional resourcing could be dealt with and that the resourcing that was required if it was funding would probably go through the normal budget request process. So that's something that we can look at down the track.

And of course, the third thing was the normal reporting [inaudible] semi-annual reporting to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and then ultimately to the board.

Okay, so before we even started, we decided that we really needed to find out what was required, so Cheryl and I met with MSSI, which is the Multi-Stakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives group, and their job is to help those of us who have gone through a review, help us meet the requirements of the board.

So they gave us a template of the implementation plan document, which is what we worked on for those several months, but it actually had provided us with a template for which we were able to detail what was required for each of those items.

It was an interesting activity, but one of the things that is important to note is the fact that we only had to deal with eight. And although we started off with – we actually started off probably the wrong way, and that was all my fault, but we looked at the whole 16, and we looked at,

first of all – I thought that we might be able to collectively make a decision on what those eight, what the easier ones were, although in the proposal document itself, it already had listed which ones were going to be the ones that were going to be short-term anyway and would not require too much in the way of resourcing.

But we were able to look at overall the 16 so that there were people who were actually keen on some of the issues that were not identified as the first eight, and so we have already got some – [in fact,] they're already starting to ask us, "Okay, so what about these other eight? What are you going to do about them?"

So we've made a start on that. That's good. But once we had decided that we had to get cracking with it, we focused on those, the eight that we needed to proceed with immediately because we knew we had to get this document completely filled in to be given back to the OEC to go to the board, and we're trying to get this document to the board, of course.

Our deadline was December the 23rd, and we made it in time, but they're asking us for some extra information, and this is the OEC, so [inaudible] MSSI, so we may need to make some additions. The list is here, you can actually read for yourself which are the ones, and I'm really pleased to see so many of the people who were actually involved in this process are here today, just in case they missed anything while we were going through it, I guess. But I really do appreciate the support and help that they gave us.

I think one of the good things about this whole process was the fact that there was a section in the template that actually had the ARIWG comments that we put in, so as we were developing and people were looking at the issue and making comments, we had people from all over the At-Large community adding comments to this particular section, and these comments were incorporated into the implementation steps, so they were identified by the community as relevant to that particular issue as it had been identified by the proposal.

So their suggestions were actually incorporated, as I said, into the implementation steps, and from there, there were metrics developed. Not for all of them, but some of them, it was easier to develop the metrics and getting numerical [inaudible]. So are were some that we're still working on those metrics, but there are ways in which we'll be able to evaluate how well they have been achieved.

And another section as well was the fact that as people were becoming involved in the discussions about the various issues, that other things came into [inaudible] and they were the sorts of things like if we go beyond, once we complete this particular activity as is in the proposal, how can we engage in continuous improvement moving forward? And that was just on the eight easy to do items.

I think when it all boils down, although my involvement here was really to do with the process of actually getting this document ready for a stage which after everybody had had their say, we had actually started looking at how we might meld some of those suggestions into implementation steps, got things into a pretty rough order, and then Cheryl – because she's got so much spare time – was able to sort of take

it under her wing and she put together an amazing document with the help of Heidi and Alan.

So I can very confidently move on to Cheryl who will tell you about what was required after this process to get it to a stage where it was ready for the board. Thank you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Maureen. Maureen is overplaying my role. I merely acted as an editor writ large from the comments and work that the ARIWG group had done.

What I'd like to do is, when you have the time [and as you have the] inclination, encourage you all to take a look, not necessarily back at the redline document, but certainly at the final document, but also at the slides, the screen captures that Maureen has put in today's presentation to remind yourselves that this, in my opinion, is an excellent example of an exercise of widespread At-Large community and cross-regional input. I would not at all suggest this is an ALAC exercise. It was an At-Large exercise on behalf of the ALAC, and I think it's a demonstrably good example of exactly what can happen in good transparency with the right encouragement and enthusiasm. And I suspect having Maureen come in with fresh views, and certainly greater energy and enthusiasm than Alan, Olivier or I have managed to muster for a few years now, to do the whole team approach. I'm sure that it's a product of that that we've got to where we are.

No, there are no slides from Cheryl, because Cheryl is not going to do death by PowerPoint. Cheryl is in fact a simple piece of sandwich filler

between Alan and Maureen and back to Alan – [Tijani after in fact] Alan and Maureen to present here. Maureen simply coopted me into manage the little bit that I'm doing now, particularly because I'm one of the few people who've actually lived through all of this cycle of review in the past.

The time taken for the initial ALAC review last time, as Alan pointed out, was around three years, although around three years is perhaps a slight narrowing. It was around three years for the full process, but a few things were not implemented until after that. That's not unusual.

But one of the things that wasn't implemented until we actually almost finished the external examiner's review of this one was the recommendation, which was approved by the board and was a requirement for us to implement, of having individual members across all the RALOs.

So I don't believe, in this second review, that we'll have anything that ends up with such a long implementation time, because it is in fact a group of sensible mechanisms and modalities of increasing the opportunities for end-users and individual registrants within our At-Large community to become better engaged in At-Large, and indeed, should they be crazy enough to serve on the ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee, which of course is only the 15 persons.

With that, I would like to remind you all also that with the board's acceptance, I trust, of our detailed implementation plan and what we've talked about today beyond the history that Alan filled in is a

development of that detailed implementation plan, which was a resolution requirement from the ICANN board.

What we now need to do is come good, make good, and do in a timely manner all the things we said we will do. We will have six-monthly reporting to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, often called the OEC. We will be also reporting in that not only on our progress but how we're tracking on any budgetary implications that we have declared.

We are also needing, at this point in time, from January on, to look at operating with the extensive networks that we trust can be deployed, not just within ARIWG, the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group, but most importantly, with key personnel, both existing leadership people and aspiring thought leaders within the At-Large structures – not my terminology there, within the At-Large structures – and within the RALOs, be they individual members or not, to help us make the magic happen.

There's a lot of these primary or first-phase implementables are about making sure we work smarter, harder – well, no, more effectively, not harder, and more efficiently with ICANN's dollar.

With that, I'm not going to preempt what we will be doing too much more than that other than to remind you that the very rare situation of having an albeit lightweight ATLAS running in the 2019 time when the majority of our implementation work will also be being carried out has given Maureen's leadership team an ideal and rare opportunity to nurture and create a better empowered – and I'm sorry, Holly, I am

using that word, but I'm using it on our terms, not from the terms that we used in the independent examiner's review – an empowered set of people within each of our regions – again, note I'm saying regions, not just RALOs – to assist in not just the implementation that we've planned here but in the ongoing and continuous development program that Maureen also alluded to.

Maureen, is there anything else you desire of me, or can Alan now take everyone through the [action-packed and] exciting part of where to in greater detail?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No. Thank you, Cheryl. I think it'll be interesting to hear what Alan has to add as rounding this all off, although one of the things that I know that we're really sort of hoping, as I mentioned before, is that the sooner we can get our plan okayed by the board, the sooner we can really start actioning some of those plans. Although, to be honest, we already started on those things that actually don't require anything more than a little bit of effort from the ALAC as well. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Maureen, that's an excellent point. A number of things that we are declaring we will be implementing and planning to implement are already underway, although we can ramp up to greater activity as a result of this review process and the backing that the board will give our ability to implement them.

But also, yes, we are doing our very best, and Maureen, again, is underplaying for the public view here how much work staff and she are doing, particularly with our lead in the board, and of course, member of the OEC, León, but also other members of the OEC to ensure to the best of everybody's ability that we are on the board's agenda for a consent agenda approval in their January meeting. And it hasn't quite come home to roost yet, but it's certainly the plan.

But believe me, it might look like the swans are swimming on top of a very tranquil pond, but there are some very fast pedaling legs, and I wish to particularly thank Heidi, who is doing a heroic amount of work from the staff paper point of view, and working probably harder than she should have to on it, I suspect. But with that, I suspect we should also hand over to Alan.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. And while my slides are getting put back up, I want to make a comment. It's well-understood that you can motivate people when you have a common enemy or a common cause, and one of the things the At-Large review did do, because we did – and I see "we" in a very global sense – objected to a number of the things that the reviewers were proposing.

It did cause people to be motivated, and we had perhaps the widest group of participants across – not only from the people who were

considered leadership but from the rank and file of At-Large working on these various documents to make sure that we made our case clear and that it was very clear this wasn't, as the reviewers claimed and as some individuals claimed, the work of one or two people, but was the work of the group and was very actively supported by the group.

And moreover, because there were negative comments made – and those continued up until a month or two ago, and there were people who wrote letters to the board telling them to reject our proposal, and we replied to those and made a strong enough case that the board ended up unanimously accepting our proposals, even though there were also people on the board representing those groups who wrote the letters.

So I think we've done a very effective job at demonstrating that we not only know what we're doing but can get support of our own group, and because of that, have the support of the larger community within ICANN, and certainly at this point, the board.

Alright. The next part of my proposal is one slide long. It's not at all long. And let's skip down to it. There we go. Now, as I said, there were – someone has now flipped it back to the first slide. If we can go to slide 19, please. Apparently, my moving it down is not sufficient.

Alright. Thank you. There were 16 recommendations, some of which were just bogus, and many of which identified an issue which we do need to address, albeit not necessarily in the way the reviewers recommended.

But the single recommendation or the single issue that they identified which was not a surprise, because we told them about it, was that we are having trouble motivating people. We are having trouble getting enough people who will invest enough time and energy to be actively working on ICANN policy issues.

And although we didn't like the way they suggested we address it – we didn't believe it would work, as a matter of fact – but we did accept the issue and say we're going to address it. And this is something we had in fact been talking about for about three and a half years. But because of things like the IANA stewardship transition and Accountability, it just took too much of our resources to focus on our internal issues.

But it centers around how do you get people to work. Well, the first thing is to realize ALSes are a good resource, but an ALS as such, unless it's a very unusual ALS, is not going to actively work on our issues. People within that ALS may work.

Now, if you get everyone in an ALS who's interested, that's great. But typically, we're not excepting everyone. ICANN's issues are somewhat arcane, are difficult, and time-consuming, so we're not expecting thousands of people to come to our door. But we are expecting a small number, and the question is, how do you find them? How do you reach out to them?

And one of the reasons that we believe ALSes are a critical part of this is there are thousand upon thousands of people within ALSes, and if we can get messages out to them, that is if we can forward messages to ALSes, get them forwarded to their members, and phrase them in ways

that will be understandable to these people who aren't already part of the ICANN family, we believe we will attract enough people to satisfy our needs.

Given that we have hundreds of ALSes, if we could attract one person from each ALS, we would probably have more people than we could manage. So our demands are not large, but you have to reach out to those people who don't know we exist right now, and that's the critical part of what we're doing.

We need to make sure that the information we send out is usable and comprehensible, and that's not easy based on the kinds of things we do. And when we get someone who shows an interest, we need to make sure we don't lose them. We need to have a mentoring and coaching process so that we don't lose this people and so that we can make sure that they stay involved and their activity grows, not disappears.

When we talked about stagnation and we don't have enough turnover, it turns out if you look at our statistics, we have lots of turnover. The problem is most people leave after one term, and the catch is to keep them.

And as Cheryl said, the ATLAS we'll be holding about a year from now is one of the keys, we hope, that will help us take people who we've identified as good potential workers, good potential future leaders, and try to put some cement into it to make sure that they stick. And that's about all I have to say. Thank you. Tijani, are you taking it from here?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you all, Alan, Cheryl and Maureen for your presentation. Now we'll go to the pop quiz questions. Claudia, please.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. One moment, please. Okay, can everyone [inaudible] okay?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: [Let me resize it.] One moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Claudia, read the question so that – okay.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. The first question is, when did we start working on this At-Large review? Okay, almost everyone got it right. the correct answer is C, 2017.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: The next question is –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 2015.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hold on, I have my notes. Sorry. Should I go back to it?

ALAN GREENBERG: One could say we actually stated working on it in 2016, but that wasn't an option.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, the next question is, why did we need this review? A, it is a good management practice to periodically assess performance. B, the ICANN bylaws require it. C, not enough other work to do, or D, all of the above. Looks like the correct answers are A, B, or C.

ALAN GREENBERG: I must say that based on how ICANN works, sometimes, we think C is the operative reason. But I don't think that's the real reason.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. And the final question is, what is the largest single problem found? A, not enough money, B, too many leaders, or C, not enough

people working on ICANN issues? Or D, we don't [meet soon enough]. And it looks like everyone agrees with C, not enough people working on ICANN issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I'll point out the reviewers did say our poor use of social media was one of the significant causes. One could question whether that is valid or not, but it was an opinion raised.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, and that concludes the pop quiz questions in this portion. Tijani, we're now moving on to the questions and answers, or would you like to do the [Q&A?]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. This is the last pop quiz question? Okay.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes, there were only three.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So now we'll go to the questions and answers. So your questions to our presenters. Do you have questions for them, or everything is very clear? Alan said that one of the main problems is that the evaluator or the reviewers came the first time with their solution already, and this was a problem.

I think there was another problem. This is that they came with the spirit and with the conviction that they are here to reform At-Large, not to review it. And they wrote it in their report. They spoke about "reform At-Large," not "review At-Large." And I think this is one of the main problems. They didn't understand well their mission. Any question for Alan, Cheryl and Maureen? Claudia, if there is in the chat questions, please read them.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. I do not see any questions in the chat, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. It should be very simply. No questions? Okay. I have a remark.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, as chair, you should have a few questions ready for us.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. I don't have questions, but I have a remark, Alan. I hear very often that our mission, what we have to do is to work on policy in ICANN only. And this is not the only point of our mission. We have a lot of points, three points at least.

So we need also to say that we are not only commenting on policies or participating in policy development, we are also making comments and giving advice to the board on other issues that may interest or may

impact he end user interest as it was written in the bylaws. This is one remark.

Yes, I see Alan Greenberg. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I'm happy to wait for you to finish, if you'd like.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, go ahead. It's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. These have been an eventful few years, and I was chair for four years and presiding over the existence but I don't claim at all to be responsible for a lot of what I'm going to talk about right now. But in parallel with the review and prior to the review going on, At-Large participated in the IANA stewardship transition and in the ICANN accountability efforts, and we made a very significant contribution to that.

I can say with some confidence that the outcomes were very markedly affected by the contributions of the people that we had working on that, and we also demonstrated that we could involve other people in the At-Large in the discussions, not only those who were physically present in the room.

And I think that has given us a level of maturity and confidence that allow us to move forward and say we will – At-Large has been around

now in its current form for 15 years, or 16 years now, and it took five years for the RALOs and ALSes to become a reality.

We're now at a stage where I think because of what's happened over the last number of years, I think we have the confidence and assurance that we can fix some of these problems and make At-Large an even better contributor to the ICANN environment and to the ICANN ecosystem.

So I think we've matured in many ways, not all because of At-Large itself but because of how we have carried ourselves. And I think we can be proud of that, and the At-Large review process itself, as I said, was another thing that has drawn the group together. And I think although it wasn't a whole lot of fun, I think the end result is better for having gone through it. So there certainly is a positive effect of the review other than the actual outcomes, because it has drawn us together as a family, and I think that's a really good thing.

But as Tijani says, the IANA stewardship transition and accountability was not ICANN policy as such. We are charged with working on policy, but also working on anything else related to ICANN that we believe is important to end users.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. Maureen, go ahead. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tijani. I had to unmute my phone. I just wanted to say that I think that the review process, the involvement, as I mentioned before,

of people within the ARIWG really contributed to something which I think is going to impact for us when we're looking at ATLAS III for example.

I think that what we're doing and that involvement actually encouraged more people to become involved, and I think [it's just one way,] as Alan mentioned. You can't have a one size fits all model of approach to trying to engage people in the sort of work that we're doing.

And I know that for example even just what we're attempting to do in ICANN 64 with some of our ALAC and At-Large leaders looking at doing workshop and our working sessions so that we can be more inclusive of people who come to visit our sessions and to allow them to become involved in the discussions that we actually have, they're all ways in which we're working towards building our community, building interest in the community as well as making it empowering – in the way that Cheryl used it – empowering people to learn more and to become involved.

I see that that's one of the advantages of the review, the review process and how we can use it as we're working through the implementation process to develop the outcomes that we want at ATLAS III, that we have better-informed, better-skilled, better, more active participants in the At-Large process and our contribution to ICANN. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Maureen. Yes, I have a hand. Alberto Soto. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. This is just a comment. I would like to congratulate this small working group which, during the face-to-face meeting – I even have already said this, but I want to repeat this – as we were working, or having whiskey at the bare, they were working until very late at night with the reply for the board.

I firmly believe that we are improving with this review, and there will be more involvement, but there is an issue that's still pending for me, and that is the customers, the clients. We have been said that we have no activities in certain ALSes. And actually, they didn't know the ALSes. ITEMS did not know that our ALSes had very significant activity.

And [I think this is pending,] we need to record the work that our ALSes are making and say that they are actively participating. It is one thing to say that they are working and another to participate in our monthly meetings, in the webinars, etc. This is something that is still pending that we still have to do. But we also need to record that activity to prove that we are reaching out to thousands of users and that the word of ALAC brought to the policy or to the board is supported by those activities and by that contact that our ALSes have with the end users. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alberto. Yes, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alberto raises an interesting issue, and I'm not sure I fully agree with him on the current status. One of the problems that we've

had over the years is when we attract an ALS, it's not clear that we have made really clear what we expect of them. So we do have many ALSes that, as Alberto says, are very active. They are doing really good things on the ground in their countries and their cities. But they're not necessarily related to ICANN.

And as we go forward, it's going to become more and more important to not only have good people but good people who are involved in ICANN. And that's one of our challenges going forward, because we're not the Internet Society that simply says, "Go out and do good things related to the Internet.'"

ICANN's scope is far more narrow than that, and we have to make sure that as we reach out to people, we explain to them what we're doing, why they may be interested, and make sure that there is a real intersection, a real merger of what they're interested in and what we need done. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Thank you very much. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. I just tracked down one of these letters that was mentioned, which was objecting or saying that – letter to the board saying that the review implementation plan should not be accepted.

One of the items in this says the role of At-Large is not to engage in policy work. I don't know whether it's just badly phrased there and the person means the opposite, or – Alan, you know what I'm talking about,

probably, can you explain that? Either our role is to engage in policy work, or what is our role?

ALAN GREENBERG: "Explain it" – and I'll put that in quotes – is something that I can't quite do. The words they used were quite curious, that At-Large people should be engaged, so we're allowed to join a [GNS] PDP, but the ALAC should not be involved in policy issues. And as far as I can tell, even the reviewers thought we should be more engaged in policy issues.

From my point of view, the ALAC is the senior body related to policy issues in At-Large, and how one can say our people should be involved in it but the ALAC should not be involved in it, I'm afraid it makes no sense to me, and I cannot explain it.

You could go to the people who wrote the letter, there's e-mail tracks from that group that show who was involved, and you can ask them for an explanation. I can't give it to you, because to be honest, it makes no sense to me and is directly against what the ICANN bylaws say.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So I'm afraid I can't help a lot more than that.

MARITA MOLL:	I get it. And I don't think I'm going to go and ask the question, I think we'll just let that sleeping dog lie.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Marita, you're probably a wise woman.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Marita, I can give you an answer to your question. Those people said that we are not allowed to be engaged in policy development. Not policy issues, in policy development. Because we are an advisory committee, and advisory committees don't develop policies. This is their reason.
	And this is right, but we are not proposing policies for the generic names or for the country code names. We are participating in the policy development inside the GNSO groups, we are giving advice to the board about the policies developed by the SOs, so we are engaged in policy issues, but we are not developing – initiating, if you want – policies regarding generic names or cross-community names. This is the answer to your question in my point of view. Okay, Alan, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I'm not sure I still had my hand up, but it may have been left on. Let me get the exact words out of that letter, because I think it is worthwhile. Just trying to find it, give me a moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: It says the role of At-Large is not to engage in policy work. And you are correct, the role of At-Large and the ALAC is not to develop policy, because we have no mandate. Even the GNSO develops policy to recommend to the board. It's the board that actually makes it policy. The ALAC does not have the right to say, "Here is a policy you should implement."

What we do have is a right to be involved in the process, and if we think ultimately that a policy that has been sent to the board by a supporting organization is ill-advised, we can advise the board and explain why we don't think it's right. But our job is not to build policy, but to be involved in it and make sure there's an At-Large perception and a user perception that is integrated into it.

The wording in their letter unfortunately said "not engage in policy work", which I believe is simply false. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You're right, boss. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not the boss no more.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Always the boss. If there is no other questions, I have another remark, Alan, about our discussion in general. Saying that the main issue we have today is to have individual members. I think this is a false way to think.

We need to have active members. Active members can come from individual, not affiliated members, or members from the ALSes. The merit of ALSes is that we are sure that those people exist in their countries and those people are really not government, they are not business, they are end users. They are users in general.

But when you have individual member, you don't know. They may be a representative of their countries, but you don't know about them, and they come and say, "I want to be individual member in At-Large." So the ALS has this merit to give us the – how to say – we are sure that they are not from government, they are not from business entities.

The second merit is that they have people behind them. So normally, if we stick to our mission, to our real mission, we need to give those ALSes the information about the activities and about anything that happened in ICANN to those ALSes so that members of ALSes are aware about it. And we have to bring their point of view about these activities and these things to the ALAC and to the ICANN.

So this is also something that we cannot do with individual members, but individual members have the merit that even if they are not affiliated, they may be contributing and they may be very good contributors. And we have one example, who is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, may I make a comment?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think I used the term – when we talk about individuals, that's a word out of the bylaws. At-Large is here to represent individual Internet users. That is not corporate users.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that's a word in the bylaws. So everyone we're talking about are individual users. Some of them are grouped together in an ALS, some of them are unaffiliated, and that's the key word that differentiates the two. so it's not that they're individual. The individual members is part of the bylaws. That's who we're here for.

We have used the term "individual members" in some cases in RALOs to imply they're not associated with an ALS, but the key word is unaffiliated individual users as opposed to affiliated individual users. Ultimately, the people who help write documents or who go on to a teleconference are people.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have to find those people wherever we can to help us to do the work. And I don't think there's any disagreement on that. We're going to have lots of discussions, maybe disagreement too, on how we do that and how they're organized, and we can have long debates on whether if you're paid by a government, that disenfranchises you or whether you're in business.

Most of us, for one reason or another, actually need money and have to be employed somewhere. A couple of us are old enough to be retired, but most people actually work somewhere. And we're going to have to figure out ways to make sure we don't lose people because they happen to be working for a government or for a company that may have their views.

We all know people who will tell their company to say, "I'll quit if you tell me what I can say and can't say in public," and there are other people who will simply say, "I can't participate because it violates my company's rules." And we have to differentiate that. It's not going to be easy, but the bylaws give us our mandate, and that's where we have to follow it. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Alan, it's not about to be employed by government or by business company. Not at all. You may be an end user contributing in At-Large and you are paid by the government. It is not the question to be paid or

to be employed by the government, it is the question to be representing the interests of the government, to be representing the interests of your company.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're exactly correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: These are things that we have to avoid. Thank you very much. Any other question from the floor? Any question, in fact? No questions? The speakers were very clear? That's right. They are the best from this issue.

So if there is no more questions, I will ask the staff to go to the evaluation questions. I have a hand. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Tijani, please look at the chat, because I can speak, but I think I've put my question in the chat twice already.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, please speak.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But I will read it if you hear me okay. I was wondering how we are ensuring that they are really unaffiliated. I am not sure that it's task we are doing and a question we are really asking to each of the individual

members who are joining us. [inaudible] the reverse, but my questions is how we ensure that, how ALAC is taking care of it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you, Sébastien, for this question. I have two hands to answer your question. I don't know who is the first, but I will give the floor to Cheryl since Alan spoke before.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, go to Alan first, he's probably going to say what I'm saying. Go to Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. The short answer is we can never be 100% sure. We live in a world where there are spies and counterspies and people masquerading in one thing and are something else. So can we guarantee it? No, we can't guarantee hardly anything.

Should we be at least asking when we have an individual member, "Are you here speaking on your personal behalf or speaking on behalf of someone else?" Yeah, we probably should. And a large part of the At-Large review implementation is going to be, "Let us look at what rules we should have when admitting ALSes, when admitting individual

members," because similarly, you can have ALSes that are government-sponsored or sponsored by something else.

We do have some rules currently about that, but it's a really [irrelevant] question. Can we ever be sure? No. Should we at least be trying to make sure that we don't have government shills or corporate shills saying they're speaking on their own behalf? Well, if people are willing to lie and do it well, we may not know that. The world is not perfect. But yes, should we be thinking about that? Of course we should.

We also have an issue of if people are participating in other parts of ICANN, are they double dipping, essentially, and getting votes and whatever in multiple things? These are things we talked about before we haven't resolved, and we need to focus on them. There's no question about that. Is it going to be perfect? No.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Tijani. Thank you so much. Following on from Alan, two things. First of all, in terms of the concerns about some definition of what the word "affiliated" means, the statements of interest and the requirements – indeed, it should be a frequently checked requirement for continuous disclosure on updating those is the best way that most parts of ICANN have come up with to do their bit in watching for what some people would fear as the aspects of [inaudible] affiliation.

But I actually put my hand up to highlight what the whole region of APAC, the Asia Pacific At-Large very specifically defined unaffiliated to mean in their RALO. And within our RALO, "unaffiliated" has a meaning that may in fact resonate with other RALOs, but may not with all, and that is that an unaffiliated member is not affiliated, i.e. a member of, another At-Large structure within that RALO or within that region.

It does not mean that people cannot be individual member from Australia just because we have two At-Large structures who happen to be Australian-bound. It simply means that should an individual member become a member of Internet Australia, they then would stop being an unaffiliated member. And that's the way that we've approached it. So we have a very clean and lean definition of affiliation and unaffiliated in terms of our region, and it may be a similar system in other regions as well. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I think that the question of Sébastien is very relevant, because now we are accepting individual members even without due diligence. We are doing due diligence for ALSes but not for individual members. And I think this is wrong way.

And Alan is very right when he said we need to think about it. We need to think about what are the criteria of accepting ALSes, of accepting individual members or unaffiliated members. So this is a question that we have to address.

Sébastien, you still have your – and Alan. Alan, you want to speak? No. Okay. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you very much, and thank you for your inputs, both of you, Alan, Cheryl and Tijani. I didn't check, I hope that Alan is right saying that the definition given by Cheryl is one for all the regions. I have doubts, because I am almost sure that I know at least one, but I guess more than one member who are in an unaffiliated and with member of an ALS. And I really think that we need to take that into consideration.

And if the ALS is not working well, it may be a good role for somebody to push this ALS to work better, not to go outside and to be an unaffiliated.

The second point – and I think it's not the question for the review here and for discussion here, but I think it's important that we discuss about the double dipping, the possibility to vote in various SO/ACs and so on and so forth. It's something [with a] global question for ICANN. There were no really big damage with that, but it could be in the future, and we need to think about that. But once again, I think it is outside of the discussion of today, because it's outside of the ALAC review [efforts.] Thank you very much for this presentation today. Bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Sébastien. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Actually, the double dipping is not outside of the review, it is part of the overall review that we need to do with ALSes and individual members.

I just wanted to point out that Sébastien is right. I'm sure we have individual members that are members of ALSes. I have absolutely no doubt.

We had a case a couple of years ago of someone applying to be an individual member because he did not believe he was a member of an ALS. It turned out he was on the board of one of our ALSes.

And that describes the problem. Someone on behalf of that ALS in the previous year, that organization had joined as an ALS, but someone who was on the board – and it may even have been the chair of the board, I don't remember – was not even aware that they were an ALS.

So he didn't do it maliciously, he just didn't know. And that alone, I think, describes part of the problem that we need to address. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah. I think it is even worse. If it is to do with the bad idea, it would be better for me, because not knowing that he's on the board of an ALS, that means that the ALS doesn't do anything. That means that the ALS almost doesn't exist. So it is a big problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: And one we're going to fix.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah. We need to fix. Any other question? Okay, no questions. So Claudia, please, the evaluation questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to have to drop off right now, but thanks for a great meeting. Bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. Bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, the first survey question is, how was the timing of this webinar? A, too early, B, just right, C, too late. Okay, moving on.

Next question is, how was the technology used for this webinar? Very good, good, sufficient, bad, or very bad? Okay, moving on to the next question.

Did the speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic? A, extremely strong, B, strong, C, sufficient, D, weak, or E, extremely weak? Okay, next question.

Are you satisfied with the webinar? A, extremely satisfied, B, satisfied, C, moderately satisfied, D, slightly satisfied, or E, not satisfied at all?

Next question is, what region do you live in at the moment?

Next question, how many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community?

And our final question is, what topics would you like to cover for future webinars? Please write your answers.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Claudia. And please fill this question field, because we need your input. We need topics that you want us to address in our future year, in our upcoming year. So please fill it in, and if you remember later other topics, you can send an e-mail to staff so that we know what are your preference. We need it for our next year program.

Good. Now we have some input. And even if you remember later, please send an e-mail. And with that, I'd like to thank very much our three speakers, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Maureen Hilyard, for their presentation and for their passion also.

Thank you for our interpreters, for our wonderful staff, and thank you all for making it and coming to this webinar. This webinar is now closed. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining. This webinar is now adjourned. Please remember to disconnect your lines, and enjoy the rest of your day or evening. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]