YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ATLAS III reporting working group call taking place on Thursday 30th of April 2020 at 17:00 UTC.
	On our call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Eduardo Diaz. We have received apology from Maureen Hilyard. From staff's side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Alperen Eken and myself, Yesim Nazlar. And I see that Joana Kulesza has just joined us as well. Welcome, Joana.
	Just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, and now, back to you, Eduardo. Thanks so much.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you, Yesim, and my apologies for starting before the recording. Thank you, everyone, for taking the time again today. Let's see if we can work on this, and the rest of the work that we have, I don't think is as complicated as what we have done so far. We just have to review a few things here and then go to the final reports that people wrote.
	So Heidi added this comment here in the policy for question number Q10B, and the question Q10B is, do you regularly attend weekly Consolidated Policy Working Group meetings? I remember the conversation last time that there were a couple of ideas there for the policy category, and one was that we should have some kind of schedule for the next three months for the CPWG meeting so we can increase predictability for participants and also after they use a slide

deck, have at the end a final slide promoting or encouraging new members to join.

For new members to join, it means that the new members have to be in the meeting to see that. So it's really for new members to stay engaged. Right? Or should we leave it like that? For new members to join.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't believe that that promotional piece in the slide deck was meant to be within decks used in CPWG meetings, although I think some sort of, "Don't forget that the next meeting is on and blah-blah," time, etc. should be there. That's not a problem . I think it was other slide decks.

So if we're doing something in an ICANN public meeting, if we're doing one of the webinar series, any other time, we're doing any other slide deck work, that we also promote the weekly CPWG, and now I would suggest the [OFBSC] as well. So it's not that they have to already know about it to get into it. It's if they're doing anything else, we promote the two, CPWG [inaudible] mention here.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, you're correct, and that's exactly what it says there. So for some reason, I just went over the ICANN meeting presentation. So we're not talking about CPWG. You're correct. So the way it's written is correct. I'm going to mark this as reviewed. I think this shows what we wanted to say last time. Stop me—

HEIDI ULLRICH: Eduardo, sorry, as noted by Cheryl, given that the FBSC is now the OFBSC, that does have some policy activity there, perhaps we could also just make an additional line noting that given the revision to the FBSC into the OFBC, that we should start recommending people go to that call as well.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So you mentioned a bunch of abbreviations there. I'm not sure what they are.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's now the Operations and Finance Budget Subcommittee.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So what you're saying is to add recommendation for them to do this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, let me just draft something quickly.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just add it there. The timing of the weekly meetings—are we talking also about the weekly meetings for the financial [inaudible] working group too, to have a [schedule] for them too? Or it's just the part of adding the final slides at the end during those meetings?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can answer while she's drafting. The OFB-SC is not going to meet weekly. It'll meet less frequently. But so it's just the term "regular calls" is all it needs to be. So yes, the OFB-SC calendar update also needs to be equally available and equally accessible, just like the weekly CPWG one. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Cheryl. While Heidi is writing that, I'm going to move forward to the next item. Heidi—

YESIM NAZLAR: Eduardo, if I may, I think Heidi had to step away because her phone was ringing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, sorry, I'm here, I'm just getting my daughter organized for a virtual playdate. So I'm here for the next hour.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. We're in question 11 for recommendations. Heidi, is that the same—your recommendation here was referring to another recommendation, question number six, the idea here was that you were going to [inaudible] for the recommendation here. Is that we wanted to do? Because I can just pick it up from there and put it in here. Question 11 is—

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, let's take a look.

EDUARDO DIAZ: At-Large needs active participants but they need not to be in official leadership roles like RALO chairs or ALAC members. There are different levels of participation and leadership with the RALOs and At-Large as well as within the wider ICANN community.

Question is, what skills do you bring to the work that At-Large does within ICANN? There are a bunch of skills here. And then I believe the general recommendation in question six, we go there—

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, yeah, that's the item for the ambassador tracking.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Right. So do you want me to copy this in the other one so it's [directly] there? Is that the idea?

HEIDI ULLRICH: That might be a start, and then we can make any other revisions as needed.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Sorry to go—[inaudible]. Like that. Categories, skills, [inaudible] action item to take the skills and he categorize them under these five columns. That's really what we wanted to do. I haven't looked at this table yet

but I think, Alp, do you want to talk about this table, how you put it together?

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes. Thank you, Eduardo. The table is from the skills list above from the answers to the question directly. Some of them are really not related to the question, like there are some answers that are saying that, like, advanced technologies. It is better. But there is one answer, [inaudible] ccNSO so it is not a skill, really. So I'm not sure if I had to take them out or just—I just left them on the table for now. We can talk about the table if you can have a look, and then I can modify further.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay.

ALPEREN EKEN: And the last meeting, Heidi told that we can do five categories. I do these five categories. Some people indicated that they had skills in multi categories. If it is strong, I put it in one category. For example, if capacity building is strong, I put it in the capacity building. If like there's three of them, I just put it in the general column. So we can discuss and I will take notes so I can make modifications.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is a new table. Cheryl, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd like to go over the table in a little bit more detail. I just want to learn more from Alp about the criteria or the terminology he was using, strong, etc. I'm all for data capture, but I also need to understand the specifics of the criteria to make the assessment of where things went. It's a multi-factorial analysis and I need to understand the factors. That's all. Love it, let's go into a bit more detail. That's all. Thank you.

ALPEREN EKEN: Hello Cheryl. I just categorized them roughly. If it feels like more policy, I just put it in the policy. But now we can talk about the criteria further, so I can make further modifications on the table. Especially, we can talk about some examples so it will be more clear for me. Because sometimes I felt like I'm not sure if it is policy or not, because this is about—I feel like what person says is about the policy process, the skill can help for like in a policymaking process, but it can also help At-Large in outreach and engagement—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, or comms or—

ALPEREN EKEN: Or comms, yes, exactly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. That's exactly what I thought I would hear from you. I just wanted to make sure we then put them in both places rather than arbitrarily stuck them in one. Not that I'm suggesting that people should

have to spread themselves as thinly as those of us on this call usually do, but there's also no need to lock them in just one paddock. I think we need a little bit of cross-[inaudible] as well. So as long as they've ended up in more than one box when they have skillsets that are demonstrably likely to be applicable across, it would be like having Hadia only in webinar world instead of in CPWG and EPDP as well. So we wouldn't want to have Hadia in just one of those, for example. We'd want her across several of them. So I'm hearing what I wanted to hear, Alp. Thank you.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you, Cheryl. I think it makes sense. And I was going to ask, what about some of them that are not really skills or not really good answers? For example, there is one [statement,] not really skill.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The one for example, organize the region where I participate?

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can you just highlight it, please?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Is this an example of one of those, Alp? That one is under outreach and engagement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Eduardo, when I read that, my first assumption is that what I'm reading is a product of English not being the person's first language. So to me, I would say let's now have a look at that and drill down with the person because I think what they're indicating is that they have skillsets and experience in organizational aspects of their region. And I guess I'm a little more generous on these first cuts.

But the other thing is, I could say all sorts of things about myself, and it be bullshit. We need to not just take these things at face value. These are their statements. One also needs to then see exactly how good they are at, you know, multi-stakeholder consultation as opposed to just saying "I'm good at multi-stakeholder consultation," they actually need to be demonstrably good at multi-stakeholder consultation. You see what I mean?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah. So this table, it's really categorizing [inaudible] to show what people answer about their skills that they were bringing to the table and we're just categorizing them based on—somehow categorizing it, but really, the real work that is going to happen with this table is whichever group takes this—I don't know who that's going to be—will look into the raw data, and let's say we'll find, I don't know, this one we were just

using as an example, we [inaudible] this and then going to that ambassador and see and go deeper with the person as to what that skill means.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When it's matched with the statement that says wide experience on the history of ICANN and ALAC and servicing leadership roles in ICANN, one is going to guess that this person is not a novice. So yeah, at the moment, as Heidi said—let me try that again. Sorry, it is just after 3:00 AM—qualitative statements that couldn't be used as evidence on the skill diversity, but it's also an indicator of where criteria for skills [inaudible] experience can be used to match these characteristics with roles. But then you've always got to take it to the individual participant and actually see whether their own assessment fits the requirements of the role that they may be engaged in. That was me trying to be polite. Try to put that into some semblance of non-Langdonese, Heidi.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Don't think I was making myself very clear then, so Heidi might be able to interpret me. That's all.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Heidi, do you want to say anything?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This table, as I mentioned, can be used as evidence of qualitative diversity in the skills within At-Large, and might be able to feed into the tracking system of At-Large ATLAS ambassadors. Somewhat along what Cheryl was saying, that perhaps this could be used as a way that working group chairs, the groups that we have, policy, capacity building, outreach and engagement can use this information as a way of gathering general info on the direction of the group's work. Cheryl, I don't know if I'm way off on that or it needs finessing a little bit.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Might need a little bit of finessing, but you're certainly on track. To give you a silly example, this table is the equivalent of where one looks in a dating app for whether they like long walks on the beach or fireside chats with books. What type of thing looks like the other, is what we should be looking at here. So yes, you're on track. Clearly, I'm not.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm having a problem loading the table here.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, I love that analogy because of that word "matching," that this will help match volunteers up with their groups and with the engagement that they might become involved in. And there's nothing yet here about coaching and mentoring, and this might help match—

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, it acts as a gap analysis as well. So these are statements about skillsets and experience. When they get matched with criteria requirements, then you also end up, by default, with a gap analysis. And some of us do this almost innately as we make teams. A long time ago, I was involved in a study on successful team development and management and how you can do those things, ranging from long-term laboriously planned ones with interviews, etc., and how people can also do them on the fly. And sometimes, it's just this ability to match skillsets and experience as well as recognition of the potential and then you put all of those varying parts together and they shore each other up, and every one of the team members ends up more upskilled because of the sharing of individual particular characteristics and learnings.

I guess that's where I see this as being a benefit.

EDUARDO DIAZ: How can we summarize that into one sentence?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good question, my friend. That was a huge study and I just paraphrased it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible] something to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure that needs to be stated here, but it definitely needs to be the backbone of what the people who are managing all of these people need to be doing. So yeah, it's the Joannas and Jonathans, and you and Maureens, that need to understand that that's what you're trying to do, both with the luxury of time and also when, hell's bells, we've just got to get on with it and do it in 72 hours because coronavirus is suddenly [inaudible]. So just like you wouldn't want to have presentations in the first virtual meeting we ran which were by people who are very much basic [talk and chalk] experience, but you could use them well facilitated, well moderated, in a carefully structured panel. That's where you're not disallowing or [uncaring and unrecognizing] of the boring old chalk and talk presenter, but you're helping them by controlling their inputs and experiences in a way that is for the greater good and meets the current fitness for purpose. Hopefully Joanna's taking notes and she'll make the magic happen at some point in future.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [Maybe Heidi's cooking.] [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Eduardo, if you're speaking, you're on mute.

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, I'm not speaking, I'm just seeing what you're writing.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So I'm changing that because I noticed that what we took from question six didn't really fit this so well because I think we need to reference that this table includes those four areas that we're noting, all the way through, which those reference the post-ATLAS work. And as we've mentioned, this is really a way for skillsets and experience to be matched by the working group chairs.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So, do we take this part out?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I'm about to do that, and what I'll continue putting in there, just note that this table uses those four areas of work, i.e. policy, capacity building, outreach and engagement and communication or operational issues, and puts them here in this table in terms of existing skillsets or interests among At-Large participants.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You can go on and come back if you'd like.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just make sure with this table you always say it's stated existing, because we have no evidence. This is self-evidentiary, these are declarations, not proof.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Good catch. Yeah.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I see a note by Alp there that says skills categorized [inaudible] people's statements. After the meeting, I can modify table according to discussions. Are we suggesting that we change this table?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm okay with it because really, we're just showing the data in a different format. But good or bad, this is [inaudible] how to categorize it. But the real work is what Heidi is writing over there. The fact that this information from these participants can be used to actually go and talk to each of the ambassadors and help them through this journey based on the information [inaudible].

Well, I'm going to resolve this, Alp, use it the way it is, because we haven't changed anything. We just categorized it. It's better than having it like this, which is what came out from the raw data. So it's another way of putting that information here and that's it. Joanna, go ahead.

JOANNA KULESZA: I'm wondering about this takeaway from this conversation. We had a similar signal yesterday during the Capacity Building Working Group

with Abdulkarim indicating how do we verify those that provide input for the webinars or courses, and I'm not sure this is the place where we need to establish it, but I'm curious what the takeaway there is. And I'm keen to learn more about the study that Cheryl mentioned. I don't want to take up time. I know we've been at this for too long. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Joanna, feel free, you and Jonathan and me, to take me into a dark room and pick stuff out of my brain, and I'm happy to donate some time [inaudible] because it is important to pick that up, but he verification and the analysis of what one does with—I'm going to start using words like [inaudible] analysis which is not a place we need to be using it here. Alp probably is comfortable. But there are ways of putting [factors] in where you can credibly categorize the report and ongoingly track and develop. But yes, you do need to—and what Abdulkarim also said, at least what I heard him say, was that we need to verify the accuracy. You can have the best communicator in the world but they need to have correct information they're communicating. That's also part of the story. It doesn't belong here, but it's a product of here that is used in that very important work, and I'm afraid, that belongs to either the leaders of the various component parts, you and Jonathan and whoever is taking the roles in the future, or you have a small cadre of very specifically tasked individuals who are mandated to run that sort of program and operation. Sorry, it doesn't belong here, but it is an important conversation to have. Catch me before I die, is what I'm suggesting.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Cheryl.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Joanna. Question 12, you may realize after attending ATLAS III and the ICANN meeting in Montréal that you are still on a learning curve about At-Large's role in ICANN. What is your personal plan for your At-Large journey towards greater participation? These are their plans. [inaudible] plans and statements and [inaudible] all kinds of things, policy participation, and so forth. So I think this—I just copy what's said on the previous one, because I think both of them are related. One based on skills, there is information about skills, and there's information about plans.

So I think the recommendation should be more or less the same. Don't you agree?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Skimming through them, I would say the majority are useful. Some not so much. And I wonder if, Alp, there may be a way that we could use that journey slide that you produced with Cheryl in Montréal and somehow track the categories—if there are any—for those steppingstones. And we might want to color code, the more people are saying that they want to do policy, the darker that zone is. I don't know if I'm explaining that right, but there might be a way—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You are perfect, Heidi. You have been working with me far too long. I apologize to your family that I've ruined you. Yes, that's a great way forward. And remember, those stepping stones are only the great, big stepping stones in the mind map exercise that goes with that. There's a whole lot of little pebbles and another bunch of support stones that go into it and all that sort of stuff. So you end up with a mosaic with these big panels [inaudible]. But yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I didn't take it down, however, I'm just now looking at some of these, and I wonder—obviously, we could pull these out, Alp, I think, and identify them as policy, capacity building, outreach and engagement. Some of them are saying very general, to continue participating and working, I hope to continue my present level of engagement. Not sure we can really do a whole lot with some of those. But some of them are clearly in one of those stones or the other. So perhaps, Alp, you could say, using that color spectrum, if five people are under, between one and five says capacity building, that color goes into that stone. If it's six to ten say capacity building, it gets to a darker blue and the darker the blue, the more people—that's where the area that people want to engage with, perhaps, Alp. I'm going to leave that to your—

ALPEREN EKEN: I understand, Heidi. I will try to construct it in my mind too. So yeah, I get it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What's fun about working with you, Alp, is I get to corrupt yet another human mind. It is so rewarding.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Should I put that there? Now this recommendation, does this make sense to leave it there? I don't hear any objections, we leave this recommendation here. And we'll see [inaudible] what Alp comes back with [inaudible]. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, I think that once we see Alp's chart, then it will make sense to change this. And interestingly enough, I've just read this one and it pretty much tracks with what I've just written in question 11 recommendation.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Is this exactly the same thing?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Did you just copy and paste that? Okay. [Not that good.]

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [We said that, Alp. And he said it, obviously.]

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi, I know it's hard to multitask, but clearly, you've been doing it a little bit too long with [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: My daughter does not understand when that door's closed, it means I'm on a call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right. So I understand very well, and you can do it, you just need a little less stress and a little more practice. It'll be okay. Take a deep breath, mom, because it's starting to show. Humm quietly and realize that we don't care and it's not going to break anything, and she can sit on your lap and we can turn on the video and she can be entertained. That's fine, because clearly, she needs to interact with you. Okay? She needs you too, not just us. This is me being grandma again. Bring her along, it's fine.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Now we get into the [evaluation] reports, and basically, this is an extraction that Nadira did. She's read all the reports, [made an extraction of it,] and basically, the analysis goes that all participants

submitted their individual reports, but I'm not sure if all participants did. Because this is not part of the survey, this is in addition to the survey. Remember that everyone that participated in the event as an ATLAS III ambassador had to [inaudible] report. And I'm not sure if everybody did. [inaudible] how many [inaudible] were there, 42, 43?

In any case—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There were 43 on it, and I think more did do the evaluation than the survey, if memory serves. Alp, you should have that data.

ALPEREN EKEN: Sorry, Cheryl, I missed it. Can you please repeat?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If memory serves—and it may or may not—of the 44, there's 30-something that did this survey. There was another cadre who were also handed in what was compulsory, but again, not everybody did it, the evaluation report. And I think the number at hand is in the evaluation report is different and indeed higher than the number that did the survey. You need to double check on the stats.

ALPEREN EKEN: I will tell in a second.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know you've got it, you've just got to find it.

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes. Out of these 43 people, 32 reports were submitted and 35 surveys were.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's it. Fantastic. I had it reversed.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So then we can say all ATLAS III ambassadors [or participants?]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, not all of the—yeah, hang on.

EDUARDO DIAZ: There were 43, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But not everybody submitted their report. Of the 43 participants, one number submitted reports, and another number—which was slightly larger than the number that submitted the reports—did the survey.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Eduardo, we have [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can say it to you but Alp's got the data.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, it's at the top.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We just need to put it into words.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think there were six who did not submit.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [Are you talking about the survey?] Well, [inaudible] Hold o an second, let me see if I can go there very fast.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe it's more did the survey than did the report, but I could be mishearing the stats.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [Right here.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I occasionally like other people to tell me I'm as right as I know I am. Thanks, Alp.

EDUARDO DIAZ: It says [21] reported, because there were 43 ATLAS and 11 did not report. That's the way I read it here.

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's right. That's the way to read it indeed.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So 40-whatever percentage that is. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I see a graph being docked in here. Time for graphs.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Where?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Back down in 12, not here where we're looking.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That's 42% of the participants.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. When we start talking about percentages, then I start thinking graphically.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, so what kind of graphs are you recommending?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I leave that to the experts. Alp's doing pretty things, let him continue to do pretty things. I'll end up giving you complex scatter graphs. You don't want that. They look pretty but we don't have a PhD to understand them. So Joanna will be fine.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So should we put here reviews and a table, some kind of graph? Or is it okay to just say that?

ALPEREN EKEN: If you can just put my name, Eduardo, please, I can—yeah. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. [inaudible]. One of the recommendations is to create resources to support ATLAS III At-Large ambassadors to carry on their outreach and collaboration. The following are the suggested resources that have been summarized from the report.

Now, are these ideas that were—I don't remember what kind of topics they're supposed to report on, but is this a section that we have for ideas for this and these ideas are coming from the report? I'm not sure. Alp, can you say? Nadira was the one that put this stuff together, so Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, thank you. I think that these were put in earlier, and in the meantime, we have done so much in terms of strategies, we now are moving along very quickly with the communication strategy, with the outreach and engagement strategy. I think Joanna, you mentioned that soon-ish there might be a capacity building strategy. So I'm wondering if we could then put that in, all of those strategies before they are final should read this document. If we can get this out pretty quickly, they should read this and incorporate that into their strategy, how all of those recommendations in the policy, capacity building, outreach and engagement, communication should all incorporate elements from this. I think that's one.

And then even on the first one, this financial resources to support having local or regional outreach, well, that's going to change given the current situation where things will likely be virtual for quite a while. Also, in terms of what we just rolled out was this At-Large regional policy engagement program that we're working a lot closer with GSE, so all of that will be streamlined [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Isn't that then resourcing? It may not be specifically financial but it still is resourcing.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Correct.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Looking down this set of bullet points—and they're all valid. Interestingly enough, some of them are giving me déjà vu moments. The provision of an online meeting platform [Zoom link to ALSes] and their ambassadors to help them out. Heidi, wasn't that why we provided access to individual Wiki spaces [for] communication? Back when we did it the first time. Everything old is new again.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yeah. [inaudible] all of that—
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	They are just resources. I would redo that list—not here, but as a product of this list, I would be saying to the JZs and the Joannas and the Daniels that they need to have a different list that draws on this list, and their lists would be a major heading called resourcing and then three bullet points under that resourcing that is fitted specifically to their group's task and requirements. And then they have a director and educational services big bullet and then the specific subpoints under that. I think this is an excellent resource, but it's not the fait accompli, this is not a key and lock fit that is requirements on the other groups,

but it's guidelines and guidance. So, can we also make a note to work more on this outside of this report? And that can be done as soon as possible, because really, you can categorize those into resourcing, communication and accountability. Because the communications is one thing, but the ongoing tracking and archiving and who said what and how you double check on stuff and all that is another. There are almost three baskets that we can throw that in, and then the subpoints [inaudible].

And for the pedantic, you can end up with a checklist for each of the primary activity areas in the future that [inaudible] there is equity in the thinking that people are doing with their strategy.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [Hold on, let me check this.] Heidi, can you do that, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, I'll do that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. And then we move down and the other suggested recommendations that Nadira put out, develop a program for new participants to provide [gathering,] mentorship, coaching and [to work them to] understand ICANN policies and how to [use contributors to penholders for policies.]

Paraphrasing what one of the participants wrote with respect to this, if you want to involve new people who have a different background, you

need to first understand what their views are and put yourself in their shoes before trying to [indoctrinate them] by providing a standard learning path. [inaudible].

I believe Roberto Gaetano wrote this. So I don't know if this recommendation, any comments on this, or is this here enough for this part? Because there's nothing here about all these ideas.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not quite sure why only this particular quote is—I understand what the quote is trying to say, and it's almost —

EDUARDO DIAZ: [You can take it away.] It doesn't add—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It doesn't add anything to it.

EDUARDO DIAZ: It adds confusion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's the sort of thing that if you're going to say one, you need to say ten.

EDUARDO DIAZ: remember these are strawman recommendations, so [inaudible]. So if it's confusing, we take it out because I think the main thing about this is this part here, this whole thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And here, what I would be recommending to all of the policy—I think that it shouldn't be none, none, none. All of the sub-units, policy, CapBuild, O&E and comms, each one of these need to take these points to work with these points to create a set of fundamentals that belong in each of their own strategies. So I don't think that there's no recommendation. I think there's the same recommendation for each of policy, CapBuild, O&E and comms.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Which I think is what Heidi is going to expand [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, but we need to take away none and none, and we need to asterisk, put HU next to each of those, but I think we should agree or not that it's the same use, the same construct is advised for each of those four [inaudible].

EDUARDO DIAZ: Like something like this? We put an asterisk here and then we scroll down?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I just don't want that missed. We're getting close to the end and I don't want you to put it into a final form without us dotting the I's and crossing the t's. And this is a dot the I and cross the T moment.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. We have only three minutes. We can go over this one in three minutes and then we can do the interview [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I mentioned last time that I was going to have some kind of report [inaudible] looking at the format, but [inaudible]. I was working on something else. So anyhow, [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. [Things happen.]

EDUARDO DIAZ: So this here is recommendation for the communications that came out from the report that [inaudible] categorized in the communications because there were ideas towards that.

So if it's okay, we'll leave these here, and also—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, the only tiny thing on the third bullet point, the tens is wrong, it has to be hold regular, not held regular. These are the guiding principles which I'm very comfortable with. Heidi's got her hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just for the next steps, so I'll wait until you're finished here.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Let me put a lid on that here. While we have still two minutes, should we go through the next one very briefly? These are interviews made by Alp and basically these interviews were more geared to receive more emotional in-depth responses over quantifiable results.

So basically, there were 21 individuals that participated, but some of them were coaches and some of them were people participating. So I took this summary from Alp's report and recommendation is —well, [there was a second review] coming from Glenn McKnight that there— no, I'm sorry, the [Alp] exercise was done with 21 of the individuals that participated.

Glenn made six recorded interviews, and those were two coaches, and four participants. So from Alp's interviews, these are his summaries, and from Glenn, the interviews provided some kind of validity of what ATLAS III was intended result, meaning people, when they expressed [inaudible] they were talking about what they were learning and they understood what they were talking about at that point.

From the coaches' part, people were very happy with the way the whole thing was done and felt that it was successful in that way.

Now, I'm not sure—we don't have more time, so we can look at this part next time, and the other two things that we have there, and then we'll take it from there. So hopefully next time, we will finish with this part, but I can start working—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just what Heidi put in chat, Heidi's [inaudible], we started a couple minutes late and I have no problem giving another five minutes of my life to this either. But all this is very important. It's giving the depth and color to the statistics, which has to happen in a good report.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I totally agree. I think this depth, I think Alp has done a great job interviewing these people, and we should highlight that and perhaps have another column that states, okay, in the time since ATLAS, the post-ATLAS activities have addressed these, whether directly or sort of indirectly, and we could note how we've addressed the concerns, etc.

For example, as I've put into the chat, there was a comment about feeling lost at the beginning because there was no proper onboarding. Well, we could take that and on the next column, state this has been addressed through the series of onboarding slides that the Capacity Building Working Group has prepared.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible] score card [is what you mean.]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Exactly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's perfect.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And again, that's all part of the depth and color, and it is a next step.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Heidi, [inaudible]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just one more thing, for next week's call, I wonder if we can talk a little bit about how we're going to roll this out, how we're going to make sure everyone's aware of the results and the next steps, and whether that means a webinar, another ATLAS webinar. We've held one already. Or does that mean all of you attending the working group calls, the CPWG, the [inaudible], outreach and engagement? And I know that several chairs are on this call, so maybe you can commit to explaining this report.

Anyway, just a flag to maybe talk about next steps during the next call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think that's really important, but I also think we need to bring our ambassadors back together, because not all of them will have survived. I don't mean in literal terms, but that's also a possibility. Things change, different [inaudible] happen. For example, one of our challenged ambassadors has, for all the right reasons, will no longer be as available to us as they would have been if they weren't [inaudible] in a new career path, which means that they won't have the time or the ability to [some of what they would have done] in this program otherwise.

So we need to bring our group of potentials and emergents back together as well. the thing is I don't see that happening until well after ICANN 68. So it is a little bit of a next step, but it's a next step with a launchpad. But it has to be well launched and properly resourced, and right now, we're getting ready to do that. let's not forget to do it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Cheryl, just on that, perhaps one year later at ICANN 69, we could do a virtual reunion. But something where we can bring them all back and see—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Between 68 and 69 is where you do the work with them, and then at 69, that's their celebration of where they are and what they're doing and their mutual sharings and their learnings, gathering together and little breakout sessions. And we can do all of that even if it's virtual.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, we can do that. Okay. So those are very good ideas. Heidi, I will make sure I put something like that in the agenda for next time, and I think we have just a little bit of more minutes to look at this area and just if we can add recommendations there based on our conversation today, that would be great.

In any case, I think we went over five minutes on this meeting. Thank you so much, with that in mind, I'm suggesting we adjourn this call.

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

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[JOANNA KULESZA:] Thanks, everyone. Bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]