EN

YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ATLAS III Leadership Development Team call taking place on Tuesday, 12th of February 2019 at 15:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel we have Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Pastor Peters Omoragbon, Vernatius Ezeama, Natalia Filina, Lianna Galstyan, Justine Chew, Amrita Choudhury, Aris Ignacio, Ejikeme Egbougu, Kaili Kan, and Priyatosh Jana.

On our Spanish channel, we have Sylvia Herlein Leite, and on the French channel, we have Gabdibé Gab-Hingonne and Michel Tchonang Linze.

We have received apologies from Eduardo Diaz, Sandra Hoferichter, and from Alberto Soto.

On today's call from staff's side we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Nazlar present, and we'll have Spanish and French interpretation for today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and David, and our French interpreters are Claire and Isabelle.

Before we start, I would like to remind everyone to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now I would like to leave the floor back to you, Maureen. Thank you very much.

EN

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome, everyone. It's great to see a good team of us for the session. Today is really just to – I know it's been quite a rushed activity, but I've been very pleased to see how the teams have actually been working very hard on the issue, on the task that they were given, and we'll hear the results of these. But it's to get some feedback from the different groups on what their top criteria were from their discussion, but also the indicators which are also very important.

I don't want to hold us up too much because we want to give everyone a good shot at doing their presentation. We're just going through the list of the groups, which were group one, group two, group three and four originally, and the team leaders will do their presentations of just [inaudible] the criteria that was chosen, why they were important, and the indicators.

As you'll see later on, next steps is actually going to be consolidating those criteria, first of all in the groups and then we'll see what commonalities will come out of that as well.

Okay, so let's move on then to the presentations, and we'll start with Tijani, and Yesim should have the presentations ready for the speakers when they come [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello.

YESIM NAZLAR: Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Do you hear me?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, we can hear you. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. So, our subgroup tried to find the right criteria. By the way, we liked very much this concept of hard and light criteria. Assuming that the hard criteria should be passed by everyone and the light criteria people can pass some of them but not all of them.

So, before presenting our crtierias, I would like to tell you that there was a very long and very deep discussion in our group, and also with Maureen, about the regional representation.

While Maureen said no consideration for the regional representation, some in our group, and I would say most of them, want regional representation, but some are very strongly against anything where there is not a regional balance.

We are making our proposal inside this template, and since there is no place here to mention that, I put it in the last part of the table and I said that the regional balance based on the concept of the At-Large, which is based on the regional balance, and this is in the bylaws, and some of us also spoke about countries which wouldn't have a lot of people from one country, and other countries where there is no person.

So this is the first remark I wanted to say. Now coming back to the criteria and indicators, the first one, it was given by Maureen. I will not speak about it. The second one is participation and contribution in the activities of the RALOs and ALAC. The indicators are the records that we have about ALAC calls and meetings, RALO calls and meetings, RALO and ALAC calls, and ALAC capacity building webinars.

So, it is not meant that every applicant should have done everything of that, but if you want, those are the indicators of the participation, and in my point of view, in our group's point of view, we should apply all these criteria with the indicators on all the applicants, and according to the result, we will see how is the requirement that we will fix. We cannot fix it now because we don't know what is the result.

Okay, so those are the hard criteria. The soft ones, if you want, number one is participation in the working groups. We think that is a very important thing. So working groups and RALOs and ALAC and ICANN, means the cross-community working groups or the GNSO working groups, etc.

The second one is the reports on local and regional activities. So for us, the regional activities is a basic metric, basic element of activity of the member.

The third one is the contribution in policy input, and this is very important. I know that not everyone is able to make contribution in any kind of policy, but at least in some cases, some very easy cases, perhaps people should have at least done some contribution in the policy input.

Outreach activity, this is very important, and this is something that everyone should have done.

And the last one is involvement in Internet governance activities at the local, at the regional and at the global level.

So those are the soft and hard criteria. Now for the task B, if you want. We put the regional balance and the country representation, and then skilled in team working. In our point of view, team working is something very important for our community members, because people who cannot work in team cannot contribute, in fact. So it is one of the criteria that we discussed, and we wanted to put it even at a higher level, but there are other criteria that have more priority.

The next one is managing complexity, but we don't have indicators for that. To be proactive and perhaps the responsibilities taken for entities related to At-Large and RALOs can be kind of indicators. Motivated, I don't have indicators for that, and understand ICANN and At-Large, and this also I don't have indicator for it.

So this is all, and thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tijani. I'm sorry it's taken me a bit of time to unmute myself on my phone. [inaudible] have any questions at the moment, we want to leave those until the end. If I can just go through all the participants today. So we've got Justine next.

JUSTINE CHEW:	Hello. That is very small. Okay. I hope you can read it. Firstly, I'd like to thank the members of my team for their contributions to [inaudible]. I think we had very good and robust discussion about the subject matter at hand. What we did was concentrate on the list of the top five or six criteria because in some cases, there was a tie. But basically, the top five or six criteria that were generated from the survey that Maureen conducted. So most of our suggestions are based on those top five or six criteria.
	First of all, I'd like to just point out that there were some assumptions that the group had to make in order to come up with, especially the indicators that were suggested. So in terms of the assumptions, I just would like to highlight them.
	It's written there, but I'd like to highlight a couple, which is, number two, we understand the assessment of the submission in terms of the EOIs, expressions of interest will not be undertaken by the members of this working group, and the reason why we brought it up was there was a discussion on we thought that we might exclude membership of this particular LDT, leadership development team working group as one of the criteria, because we got confirmation that the members of the team wouldn't be the ones that were assessing the EOIs. That means that there would be a conflict of interest. We would be taking advantage of being in the group that's setting up the criteria and then applying at the same time, and then conducting the assessment. So there's no possibility or risk of conflict, so therefore, we included that membership in – okay.

We also assumed that there was going to be ability and support for verification and/or corroboration of the applicant submissions, and I will come back to this point when we talk about indicators later on.

We also assumed that ICANN Learn class tracking was already in place, and although we had some suggestions as to the applicable ICANN Learn modules, we did note that the specifics of the implementation would be left largely to the ATLAS III program subgroup.

So moving on, I'm going to jump straight into the [inaudible] criteria item number two. We thought that there were two criterias that applicants must meet or have met, the first one being indication of commitment and passion, so to get indication that [inaudible] we thought that an applicant has already been in at least two working groups. Tijani mentioned a couple, but the working groups could be either At-Large working groups or cross-community working groups or GNSO PDP or ccNSO even. And the time period for tracking those would be in the last 12-24 months, and they must also have contributed to the work of those working groups in some way or other.

In terms of indicators, we suggested that the name of the applicant must be in the membership list of those two working groups that they nominate. As you see the other comment, what we're suggesting is that the applicants can list as many working groups as they're participating in, but they should nominate two of those working groups and also indicate what their contributions are in those working groups for assessment purposes, which is why we said that the name of the applicant must be recorded on the membership list of those two working groups.

The second indicator for this criteria, number two, is that – I mentioned it before already – the applicant must specify the nature of their contribution, and it must be able to be corroborated. The exception we did think about is that if the contributions that were specified cannot be easily identified and it cannot be easily corroborated, then we could possibly draw inference from the attendance records, if such records were available.

Moving on to criteria three, knowledge, the aspect of knowledge. We thought that the applicant must have the requisite knowledge on ICANN, ICANN ecosystem, and must be able to [inaudible] policy affecting the end-user community. The indicators would be quite a lengthy one, which is one, mandatory completion of certain ICANN Learn modules, and modules A through D as listed there were drawn from the list that was presented in the survey results.

And then in terms of ICANN Learn, there was a suggestion from the team that we could possibly have some sort of test or quiz associated with those ICANN Learn modules in order to establish whether they actually went through the process of learning or sat through the actual modules.

Moving on to the indicator number two, they must be able to provide examples of demonstrable knowledge in leadership and policy, which could be one out of any or more of three elements, which is, A, participation in the Consolidated Policy Working Group as a contributor or as a penholder two statements, or someone who has volunteered to review the need for a statement. Element B, must be a participant, as in attendee, in at least three At-Large or cross-community capacity

building webinars. And element C is participation in Internet governance-related events, and we mentioned a couple of examples such as IGF, APRICOT, RIPE, DNS forums, School of Internet governance and that sort of thing, or at least participation in the program setting of those events. Okay? So we're not talking about logistics, but we're more interested in someone who has contributed to the content programming of such an event so that they can demonstrate they have knowledge of the subject matter.

We note also that for element two, if you look at the comments, these will require value judgment to be applied by the assessor, and corroboration would be needed, especially if the criteria is not clearly established from submitted EOI.

Moving on to the soft criteria, we had as number one, again these are drawn from the results of the survey that was conducted earlier. So criteria one is collaborative – we combine a couple of what we thought were common attributes, skills, traits [so that] we can address them together in terms of indicators.

So collaborative, promotes team building and teamwork. We thought indicators could be that applicant be asked to provide one or two past examples demonstrating these traits, attributes, skills, and these examples must be related to the membership of the two working groups that they nominated for assessment.

So in terms of [need,] there would need to be [applicable corroboration] from either ALAC or the leadership of the At-Large working group or any

two At-Large colleagues depending on which two working groups that were nominated for assessment elements.

YESIM NAZLAR: Justine, I'm so sorry for interrupting. I just got a note from our interpreters that your audio is not loud enough. Could you please speak close to the mic and louder, if possible, please?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I'll try that.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Criteria number two, motivates and/or inspires others. So in terms of indicators, we suggest that applicant be asked to provide any one or two past examples, again demonstrating these attributes, skills, traits. And again, the examples must be related back to the membership of the two working groups that they nominated for assessment, or alternatively, they can be asked to provide any one or two past examples of their having influence in their local or regionality or at an international level in respect of any outreach and engagement for ICANN or At-Large, or on any Internet governance [matters] which can be corroborated. So again, there's an element of corroboration that is needed for these indicators.

EN

Criteria number three is ability to organize and lead by example. Here, we said that indicators could be one or two examples but must be limited to within the ICANN ecosystem and must be able to be corroborated. Such examples of these traits would be having chaired or cochaired a working group, or having led a specific process in the working group, or having initiated a policy or organizational discussion for a specific purpose, or having organized as policy or O&E event or a publication. So as you note, a lot of these things will have requirements for corroboration by the assessor, so I'm not going to repeat the comments on the right-hand side.

Moving on to criteria number four, effective communicator. We think this is important as well, and the indicators would be that it could possibly be [gleaned] from the submitted EOI, so the assessors would have to look at the clarity and the succinctness of the EOI submitted to establish whether they think that the applicant is an effective communicator.

The second element would be where possible, applicant could be asked to provide examples of speaking at engagements or presentations that they've undertaken, including the nature and the platform location, and whom they represented.

Number five, manages complexity. We think that is also an important attribute, and in this case, the indicators could be one or two past examples, again limited to the ICANN ecosystem so that we can corroborate it. In this respect, there was as suggestion from one of our team members that a small case study-type problem exercise could be administered, basically asking the applicant to propose a solution to a

problem that has some element or some amount of complexity, and then we see how they respond in order to understand whether they have the ability to manage complexity or not.

Moving on to task two, the other criteria that we selected were, number six, accountable, responsible, honest and has integrity. Indicators of this would be to be gleaned from the submitted EOI, and applicant to be asked to nominate two At-Large colleagues that can attest to such traits and attributes.

Number seven, acts strategically. Again, applicant to be asked to provide one or two examples that can demonstrate this attribute.

Number eight, applicant should have purposeful mission and vision for the future. We suggest that applicant be asked to provide a brief statement. There was also another suggestion that the applicant be asked to record a video answering the question of what does participation in ALAC or At-Large leadership development activities mean to [you.] I personally don't know, not too sure about that suggestion, but since it was put up by one of my team members, I've included it.

And the last criteria would be number nine, which is – I'm not sure whether this is something that was discussed – definitely not discussed, but raised in the survey, but one of our team members suggested that the creativity and use of new ideas in approaching the work or tasks in ICANN and/or At-Large could be one important criteria, and to assess this, indicators would be to ask the applicant to provide one or two past

examples, again limited to within the ICANN ecosystem so that it can be corroborated, which would demonstrate this attribute.

Again, I'll repeat that many of these require value judgment to be applied by the assessor, and in most cases, corroboration [would be needed] from some party within the stakeholder group. Okay, that's it. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Justine, and thank you for that very comprehensive presentation. And it's going to be useful when we put everything together later on, which we will discuss later on. We have Lianna next.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Can I –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, who's that?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters. Can I speak?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, can we leave all the questions until the end, Pastor Peters? Is that okay?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Alright then.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Lianna.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Yeah, thank you. First of all, I'd like to thank my team for the work that we have done [inaudible]. We have [gathered all the] criterias in the Google doc, and then we had a call [inaudible]. And I'd like to thank also Maureen that she presented this sample. With the sample, it was easier to gather it and [inaudible] discussed and [inaudible].

[Also interesting for the] criteria number one set by Maureen, that is really important as I think not everyone had a clear understanding that this program is for the already ALS member or individual member who already have membership. [inaudible] some clarification.

YESIM NAZLAR: Lianna?

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Yes?

YESIM NAZLAR: Lianna, I'm so sorry, once again, I've just received a message from our interpreters. Could you please speak louder and closer to your microphone, please? Your audio is a bit low for our interpreters.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Okay, Yesim. I will try louder.

YESIM NAZLAR: It's much better. Thank you so much.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you. So, what we've done with our team for the hard criteria, we thought that the applicant should be actively engaged in any ICANN working group or be a contributor to public comment calls. So this is one of the important things according to our group, that the applicant should certainly have an experience in this. And as an indicator, this information can be provided by the staff. And in the cases of working groups so that we can test that applicant has an experience with working with any working group, the working group chairs could make some comments about the level of contribution of that certain applicant.

                        The second hard criteria that we brought forward is that the applicant should be actively engaged in local events in relation to ICANN activities. Here we had somehow a discussion which one is a priority, is it a hard criteria, a soft one? But we thought that the local event is also very important and one of those indicators that someone is locally engaged.

                        So the primary achievement or the mission is to learn whatever is happening in ICANN and then bring that information to the local community, so that's why we felt that this criteria is very important, and that applicant could be in any event, could be in any role, be an

organizer, speaker, rapporteur, communicator, program committee member, or [inaudible] local event which has any relation with ICANN activities. As how that could be proved, they can put the links where they have the agenda of their names and their roles in that local activities.

So those two are the hard criterias, and later on, we have another [inaudible] soft criteria that can be considered. One of them is that applicant should be an active participant in his or her corresponding RALO monthly meetings, and Tijani represented in their group that they can be participant of ALAC meetings, RALO meetings, they have a broader participation there, and this information can be provided by the staff.

So with those, we only put it here RALO monthly meetings, which has a direct connection with the ALSes and what's happening in their region, but I would agree to expand this to the other, the ALAC meetings as well. And the RALO chairs could comment on this about general communication, because sometimes, it happens that you send something and the particular applicant [or somehow a member] of the ALS, they are very active. Sometimes the RALO sending the surveys, whatever. So if they are communicating or giving a feedback, etc., those things can be [inaudible] as a comment by the RALO chairs, and it would be an additional asset to that applicant.

Then what we also considered is the fellowship coaching experience. In general, coaching experience or mentoring experience would be a value added because that would mean that their applicant has as lot of information, a good knowledge of what is ICANN and what is ALAC,

what is At-Large, so all of that information being a fellowship coach, the certain applicant would be a good indicator of their knowledge, and this information can also be provided by the staff, and the coordinator of the fellowship program, Siranush, can also make some comment, add something from her experience.

The other one is how many face-to-face meetings, ICANN meetings the applicant has participated, and indication of in which capacity. We considered here that an applicant might have different roles and different constituencies, and then later on, come to the RALOs, to the At-Large. And so the number of face-to-face meetings can be a good information, because in any face-to-face meeting, actually, whatever you do, it is not comparable of the remote participation, the [inaudible] the network, the speaking, discussions that someone is participating at the face-to-face meeting really has a big impact, so that can also be considered. So it is not for the newcomers, actually, but for those who are actively involved, including the face-to-face ICANN meetings.

Another point is any leadership experience within the ICANN. Here we had a discussion like is it important to have experience outside of ICANN, like just in general, any leadership experience? But since ICANN can be some specifications, we only mentioned here the leadership experience within the ICANN, and this information can be provided by applicant himself or herself, and the links could be put there and this can be easily confirmed by the staff.

Another criteria that we put in our document is the leadership experience outside of ICANN, so we separated those experiences. Both of them could be taken into account.

Some additional criteria that we had the discussion and [brought in this] document is the ICANN Learn course. We thought that it could be, in general, a very good addition to the knowledge to be [proved.] Actually, even the current leaders, as much as they know, but it would be easier for them or it's not a problem for everyone or for any applicant to go through these ICANN courses, and I'd like to thank Justine for their group that they even put it, which ICANN Learn course could be considered. It's really very great that they have searched this. But we just put it as a general notion that ICANN Learn course would be good to be considered as well, and they can send their certificates if they have passed this course, and that can be taken into account as well.

Another thing is discussion facilitation experience, so that if some [work] breakout group sessions or [they're experienced with] moderating or facilitating any workshop, any breakout session. This is like a communicator criteria, and facilitation experience. This is very important to consider the teamwork and facilitation, the kind of leadership skills that can be showed, and the information could be brought by the applicant, whatever session or whatever experience they could have in any of the sessions, wherever it happens.

Another point that we added here is the activity in social media. This is another criteria that can be somehow considered as well so that those who are active, they could have an impact, they can have followers, and whatever they write there, this is also somehow a group of followers which will show the indicators of their impact on the general community and all of those who follow them. So whatever they put in their blogs and posts and articles in their social media, that could also have an impact on their followers.

So this is basically what we have done in our group. Once again, thanks, and we will discuss all the other criteria [together later.] Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Lianna. Excellent work in that group as well. With the final group that we have, it's Silvia's group.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Thank you very much. Being last is very interesting, because you can observe what the other groups have been working on. And I especially want to thank my group. We have been needing to meet during weekends because of our work schedules, so we communicated through a WhatsApp group and by e-mail, and we finally managed to do our work.

I just wanted to say we considered two principles. One principle was the equity principle, and then a participation principle in the RALOs and in ICANN in general. One of the discussions we had is because we are considering this ATLAS III for the new leaders, we want new people, we want new leaders, and we do not want to have the same people all the time.

So we realized it is a bit difficult to consider the criteria that are related to the past, to past activities and to the activities within the ICANN ecosystem. So with respect to the participation criteria, we believe because we are part of At-Large that the verifying criterion has to come from the RALOs, because they are the maximum expression of the

ALSes, and following the principles that we already follow, which is the bottom-up principles, reaching then At-Large.

Now, with respect to equity, we believe we need to have an equity layer, and all the RALOs need to have the same possibility to participate and there should also be an equitable representation among all the RALOs.

Now, with respect to the principles that Maureen has already mentioned, she has given us this table to include the principles there, we consider there has to be a minimum amount of the hard and soft principles, and what we also consider the other principles, and we believe the hard principles, the three that we placed there, they all need to be mandatory. That's why we are calling them hard principles.

We have had a discussion in the group, and that is why I have highlighted these [inaudible] in yellow referring to the registered individual members of At-Large. Half of the group considered that the candidate should be a member of an ALS, because in this case, the idea of a leader, if we define what a leader is, we see it is a person who is leading a group or a social movement, and so to look for a new leader, in this number one, we would need to have a person who can demonstrate a certain leadership. That is why we would only consider an ALS member.

Now, if you look at number two, it has to be a participant. This is probably demonstrated in the RALO meetings. Even LACRALO, which is the reason where all of the members of the group [belong to,] we hold webinars and small courses, and in the first half hour of the meeting, we

record all the participants and we even do a certain [draft.] So we do have a way to prove how many members are there in our virtual meetings.

Number three for us is knowledge of the ICANN ecosystem. This is critical for us, and there are many ways to see this and to test this as all the other groups have said. ICANN Learn is essential. I think somebody has mentioned looking for something new, but I believe that with the certificates that the system itself provides us, we can just prove it that way, and of course, all the participation in all the meetings and webinars that we hold are important as well.

As for the soft criteria, we have added five criteria here, and we have said that the candidate needs to comply with at least three of these criteria. And for all the criteria in general, we wanted to see how to weigh the criteria to assist the evaluators and we have provided a certain weight to each of those criteria. So the evaluator needs to say whether a certain candidate meets one, two or three criteria, and then you add it up, and with the result, you can have the summation of these five.

So that's why we decided that out of these five criteria, these soft criteria as having been a chair or co-chair in the working group, on the RALO especially but also in ALAC or ICANN, and then also that staff can help us prove this participation and these positions.

In number two, we have given significant importance to mentoring. We believe this is an important characteristic for [official] leader.

EN

And in number three, we have said that the person must have occupied a management position, a leadership position both in ICANN as well as outside of ICANN. If you have new people, we cannot demand to have an extensive experience in ICANN. That's why knowing that they have these skills can be confirmed outside of ICANN.

In number four, we added a leadership position in the RALO, and number five also in ICANN. So out of these five, we want the candidate to meet at least three criteria.

With respect to the rest of the criteria, those that are in part B, we have added seven of them, and we consider that he candidate needs to meet at least four of them. This is a summary [of what you had said] before. It has to be a person that works, that cooperates, that participates, that is present. In number seven, we said that the person has to keep in touch with colleagues, with other members of our ALS representatives to actually see whether they do have a connection, and if there is a certain feeling, that is if they actually connect with the other ALSes in the region, if they're committed with their work.

And for the last one, we believe that because they are very subjective and very personal, we believe the evaluators could be in contact with the last [two] chairs on the RALO, whether it is the chair or the secretary, it has to be the last two because it is very difficult to assess [this.] And so we believe the former chairs and secretaries can provide some feedback and can speak on behalf of that person, and to provide a [inaudible] idea.

All of these issues are very difficult to assess, and there is why we believe the former chairs and secretaries can help. This is it. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Sylvia, and thank you to all our leaders for their wonderful presentations this morning. Morning for me.

Okay, so I just want to allow a few minutes for questions. We'll have a look at what questions we get. We don't want to spend too much time on this, but I think that if I can just explain first of all the next steps, which is number five, but just to give you some context as to what we're moving on to.

You've actually seen four completely different sets of criteria and different approaches, and as the organizing team was keeping [a watching brief] over these, it was really good to see how the different groups interacted with each other and the types and the ways in which the leaders actually led their activity. So we're getting a good sense of what is important to our members, the members of this particular group.

What we want to do now is to consolidate those lists and try and see what common understandings we get, having viewed everyone else's submissions. But I see Alan's got his hand up.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a few quick comments. Tijani earlier mentioned regional balance, and it was referenced after as well. Regional balance is a fine target, but regional balance is not something we can guarantee, partly because we only have to deal with the applicants we have, number one, and number two, we're likely to have to make substitutions very near the end of the process. And given that, we're not going to end up with exact regional balance. But those two together, I think, have to be factored in. So just keep that in mind as we move forward.

One of the things that I did not hear, and I'm not quite sure how he put it, I think it's actually a hard criteria, is that the candidates make a commitment for active participation and putting time into this going forward after the ATLAS, assuming they participate.

I'm not sure exactly what it is we're going to ask them to commit to, but I think we do need to say, "Are you willing to put N hours into this and to participate in…" and follow it up with that, because simply saying you're committed but without actually making a commitment – now, we can't hold people to this, but I think we do need to have a record that they have made a commitment and said they would do it. So just two things to think about as we go forward. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Maureen. Thank you, Alan, for this remark, and I will speak about the second one. I do agree with you that we have to add another hard criteria about commitment, and the commitment will not be only, "I am committed." It will be according to the program we will do, "I will be in one of those groups, those topics groups that will discuss topics, etc., and follow it and work with the group all the time. I will be in the general meetings that we will do as At-Large, etc." So it will be precise tasks that people should commit to. I think that this is perhaps the most important criteria, because we saw before in other summits people coming and go for [sightseeing,] not working with us. So this is very important. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Tijani. We've got Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTOS:

Thank you, Maureen. I'm going to be very brief. I think the equity principle in this ATLAS will be very small in terms of the number of people that will be participating, and that's why it has to be essential. There are many criteria that has been here, for example, what are the number of courses in Spanish in ICANN Learn, but it is very likely that out of the courses in Spanish, I feel like [an American will be] able to take them, an d those that are in English, we will not be able to take them. And if we take a criteria from the list, then very probably, the Latin will be very few.

So I believe we need to have a criterion that does show regional balance. And we will try to make a significant effort so that none of the

different RALOs have more participants than the others. I don't mean that there has to be an equal participation, but there has to be an equity principle so that when we have participation from an international organization, [there is a sensitive where we'll] show a large number of one and not the other. That's all. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Sergio, for raising that.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's a very important –

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Pastor Peters, is that you? Can I put you after Cheryl? Thank you. I will call you. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani, I think [you're] talking about a different commitment than I was. Certainly, we are asking for them to commit to participating in ATLAS and not going on vacation. I was talking about on a longer term afterwards. And I don't think we could be very specific about what they

EN

must commit to, but we are expecting a reasonable number of hours per week or per month on the medium- to long-term that we're looking for new leaders, we're looking for workers, and this has to be someone who's willing to put that kind of commitment in later.

Now, it'll become obvious over time where their interests are, so we can't have a specific, but being told afterwards for instance, "Oh, I can't attend meetings at night or during the day because at night I'm with my family and during the day I have a job that won't let me do anything," that kind of thing, we have to try to make sure one way or another that people going forward will benefit from what we're doing, and we can reap that benefit by having them actual – as workers later on. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl, I saw your hand go up and then go down. Is it one of those issues with your phone?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, it's an issue with my keyboard, but Pastor Peters can go before me. Thanks, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Pastor Peters then.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yeah. Just a comment. I was going to ask or suggest in terms of trying to verify the record of an applicant participation in ICANN's activities, either in subgroup or major events, I think this task, ICANN staff could help with that. I believe they have the records of all ICANN members and the various groups, subgroups they have participating or they are members of. So [inaudible] not everybody will [inaudible] record of all their activities he or she has participated in over the years.

So depending on when you became involved with ICANN, somebody will have more than ten years involved with ICANN, [you don't have the record of all he has done] within ICANN. But I believe the staff of ICANN should have such records if we request for them.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Pastor Peters. I think that that has actually been raised in the submissions that have been made by the leaders, so I think your engagement within that leadership subgroup will be very much appreciated. Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. I wanted to just touch on a few things that have been raised by others. Firstly to Alan's important point on undertakings. After the assessors have agreed on the established criteria, etc., and this is all great basic work to help that process occur, there's a number of points in your process where you can ensure that there are appropriate undertakings made by the applicants, and again, some of those undertakings could be made at the early expressions of interest stage, some of them can be made at the pre-allocation of actual travel slots

and support stage, some of them can be made and extracted at the preparation of the endorsed travelers, and I suspect you'll probably have a travelers on standby list that would make sense on another matter Alan raised as well. And of course, some of it can be undertakings made during Atlas itself where [hand on heart] highly active and successful individuals who've proven themselves during the ATLAS process to be as valuable as we hoped they will be can of course have a good faith undertaking that they're now not going to disappear from the activities of ICANN until the next opportunity for travel funding [before some sort of complication] occurs, because we have all seen that happen in the past as well.

And as far as tourism, I think we've established in the past of course that, should one become a tourist, then it is perfectly within the rights of ICANN to ask you to repay, in part or in full, the travel support you have been given. So that alone should deter too much tourism over people actually being engaged.

Tijani, I'm going to stop now if your hand is up to respond to that, please. I may as well take any counterpoint you want to raise against that overview as we go. Back to you, Tijani, and I'll hold my place. Thanks, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. It doesn't have anything to do with what you said, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am trying just to say that we have to be careful not to put in the hard criteria things that are not reachable by the majority of our community members, because this criteria will be eliminatory. People who will not meet them will not be able to make the summit. So we have to put in these criteria the very essential criteria of being, as Maureen put at the first place, he has to be member of the community first. And second, he has to participate. This is the minimum that any member should do so that he will deserve to make the summit. So we don't have to put other hard criteria that may eliminate people, because not anyone in our community can do a lot of things.

Also, the commitment. Two commitments perhaps. One for the summit attendance and for the participation in the summit, and another commitment after the summit. Those [can't] be put in the hard criteria in my point of view. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Tijani. Can you just finish off then, Cheryl? Because we're a little bit over time. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. Happy to do so. I think the matters of all diversity, including linguistic, are important to consider if indeed ICANN Learn telling us that things are more linguistically diverse than they are in fact, then that's something, Maureen, that your leadership group needs to take up. But of course, that can also be considered when you decide what is or is not mandatory versus desirable coursework. But it behooves me to remind you all that ICANN works in English, and ALAC and At-Large does a huge amount to ensure that linguistic diversity is not an impediment to At-Large contributing to that. So I'm not underplaying the challenges, but I am pointing out the facts.

And then the only other thing I wanted to say is just to note the high degree of commonality of some of the hard and indeed soft criteria. So this has been a very interesting exercise to observe. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. And I agree and will raise what Sergio mentioned about that equity principle. And I'm sure that Olivier, who is on the call, will also take note of that and pass that on. Those issues are really important as far as making sure that it is all clear for everyone and everyone gets an opportunity to participate.

But [inaudible] spending too much time on it, because it is actually pretty clearly laid out as to what the next steps are. Keeping within your groups – and I think that you have now established a relationship between the leaders and the participants of the group – is actually looking at the four different submissions, plus the discussion that's actually come out here, because I think it's really important that as Alan

mentioned, we can have leaders, but we need to make sure that we have their commitment to be – it's got to be an ongoing thing. It's a pretty hard call for volunteers, but at the same time, it's an important criteria.

What we need to do therefore is that the groups will be sent the four submissions, and they are to consolidate a list. After that consolidation is done, then the leaders will actually make the final list. So we will look forward to having the next consolidated list from each and see what the commonalities are, taking into account – and after the discussion that we've had today, plus the discussions we've had before as to what you consider would be a final list.

Okay, so we're really over time. Thank you very much for the participants who have joined us to this session. I'm sure that there's going to be some really good discussions happening. You've probably noticed that I'm keeping a watching brief on all of them and having my little input when I see something of interest to me. But good luck over the next two weeks, and I look forward to seeing – we will [call] another meeting in two weeks' time and we'll notify you. Thank you very much.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now ended. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]