GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome on today's At-Large Regional Secretariats Meeting on Thursday, 22nd January at 14:00 UTC. On today's call we have Pavan Budhrani, Siranush Vardanyan, Alan Greenberg, Humberto Carrasco, Wolf Ludwig, Yuliya Morenets, Satish Babu, Evan Leibovitch, Maureen Hilyard, Glenn McKnight – who should be joining back shortly – and Barrack Otieno. Apologies noted from Judith Hellerstein. From staff we have Heidi Ulrich, Silvia Vivanco, Terri Agnew and myself, Gisella Gruber.
	If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Siranush.
HEIDI ULRICH:	Gisella? Siranush was disconnected.
GISELLA GRUBER:	We're just dialing back out to Siranush. Thank you. Mohamed El Bashir will also be joining us.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Okay. Let's start. I welcome everyone to this Regional Secretariat Meeting prior to our Singapore Meeting. Let's move forward with our Agenda. The first Agenda Item is the upcoming At-Large periodic review, and I'd like to give the floor to Heidi to start and then all the RALOs to provide their input.

HEIDI ULRICH:	Thank you Siranush. As you may recall, all ACs and SOs within ICANN go through periodic reviews. The last review was on the ALAC itself, and that was between 2008 and 2012. I'm putting the link into that review. That link actually goes to the improvements, which is basically the last stage of the review. The next review for At-Large – and that's the key word; it's not ALAC, it's At-Large this time – that's going to have an emphasis on ALSes and RALOs and that's starting now. The process includes activities such as the first review, which is external, and that is going to be done by an external reviewer. They examine documents, records, observations.

Then there will be the results of the report. The report will be the next phase, and that will go out for public comment. Once that document is finalized the Board will be looking at it and hopefully accepting it. Then the third phase is the implementation plan, and that's where At-Large staff, working with a Working Party made up of At-Large Members, will prepare and coordinate a plan. The Board needs to approve that, and then it goes over to the Working Party and it's implemented. We're hoping that that process will take just a few years just this time, not as long as last time.

The Working Party right now consists of Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon Orr, and there will be a meeting with Members of the Structural Improvements Committee of the Board in Singapore on Sunday. I think that's a summary. Alan, do you have anything else to say?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Before we give the floor to Alan, just one clarification to Heidi. Does that mean that the team who is doing this review should come to RALO Chairs, RALO Secretariats, RALO Leadership, and ask for information? So that we're ready?
HEIDI ULRICH:	Do you mean the external reviewer or the actual At-Large Working Party?
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	I mean the At-Large 360' review.
HEIDI ULRICH:	I'd think they would wish to speak to you, yes. Looking at documents on that, I'm not sure. Looking at documents in terms of what At-Large, ALSes have done, et cetera, probably yes, but I don't think anything deeper than that.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Thank you. Alan?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. Heidi left out one of the stages that's likely to happen. The first review under this new process is a gNSO one, which is going on right now. They chose to start the process, but essentially with a survey of both gNSO people and the rest of the community. That is something we're likely to do as well. The first phase will in fact be asking people

potentially what they think of us and what we think of ourselves. That will form a significant part of the input into the process. In the gNSO example they found that the external reviewer didn't have to talk to quite as many people, and when they did they could focus on issues that were raised in what was originally called a self-study but became a review involving other people as well. So we're likely to do that as well.

The questionnaire will be created by the Working Party, with interest of course from anyone who has any interest in it. So that's going to be the first phase. The second part is – I'll focus on what Heidi said – this is largely going to be an At-Large review. The ALAC will certainly not be excluded, but will not necessarily be the focus. The timing of this is interesting in that we also are doing essentially a review of the non-ALAC components of At-Large, in that we're looking at ALSes and how to make them more effective. We're starting a bit before they will, and that will hopefully fit well with what we decide on our discussions on engagement and criteria.

It should fit well into their focus on how do we make At-Large, and therefore the external parts outside of ALAC, more effective. So we're actually starting the process before they are, and that should hopefully point to good results in the end. We'll talk about that a little bit more in the next Item.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Just a small comment on the At-Large review. Maybe some of you may recall that at the LA Meeting, when we met with ICANN Leadership, I suggested that I would like to be part of this At-Large review for EURALO, particularly regarding my term as EURALO Chair from 2007 until this year, and I would like that my performance would be part of the review as well.   So far, the RALOs weren't included, to my knowledge, in previous At-Large reviews, but it could be a new element. I'd like to suggest this for the upcoming review.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Okay. Heidi, do you have any answer for Wolf? Is there any possibilities for him?

HEIDI ULRICH: Absolutely. Wolf, are you just confirming that you'd like to be part of that Working Party?

WOLF LUDWIG: No, not of the Working Party. I'd like to be an object of the process, and because of that I think that wouldn't be good to be part of the Working Party. Otherwise I would volunteer for it. But suggesting to be under review myself, I think it's not a good idea, or it would be a potential conflict of interest, being a part of the Working Party as well.

HEIDI ULRICH:	Thank you for that clarification. I'll let Holly and Cheryl know that you'd like to be reviewed, or interviewed, but I'm sure that as a RALO Chair you will.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	I also would like to add that I think that all of us will be an object for this review, so Wolf, I'm sure that you also will be included. Alan? If you can also clarify the questions Glenn posted Alan? That's what is in this 360' review and what is the process?
ALAN GREENBERG:	I can try. The 360' review… We're using the terms in conflicting ways. If I understand correctly, the 360' review is the aspect of the overall review that I mentioned. It will essentially be a survey open to both At-Large and the general ICANN community as well. It's not technically a 360' review in the way that it's used, in a human resources or person review, but it's a term that's been adopted by ICANN. We don't need to analyze whether it's fully 360' or not. That's the term that's used to describe the survey part of the process. What will be in it will depend largely on the Working Team deciding on what will be in it.

There will likely be an opportunity for ALAC and Regional Leaders and maybe the wider community to provide input into that. I'm not sure if that fully addresses Glenn's question or not. In answer to Wolf, I don't think there's any conflict. It's presumed that all people who have played a substantial role are likely to be either interviewed or considered one way or another. Whether it's an in-person interview or a telephone

interview or email exchange, I think the criteria for whether you want to be part of the Work Pary is whether you want to work a lot.

If you're willing to put a lot of time and effort into this, which is what it will likely take, then you are welcome to be part of that, regardless of whether you're going to be subject or not. The Work Party is not doing the judging. That's the external reviewer that's charged with doing the first phase of that, and of course, with interaction with us. I don't think there's a conflict at all. Don't volunteer if you don't want to put a lot of effort into it. If you're willing to put a lot of effort into it, volunteer. Like any other process within ICANN, if we have too many we're going to have to pick and choose, but rarely do we have too many hard workers. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Alan. Any questions? Glenn, I suppose there is no attendance bit, but there should be a contribution in the sense that if it's a review, and we all may be approached with questions, we may contribute by answering those questions. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Glenn, your question implies this is a review of individual people. That's not the case. It's a review of the organization, so attendance at meetings does not really factor into it.

HEIDI ULRICH: Just for all your questions, which I'm really happy to see, there will be a session on Sunday in Singapore with the Chair of the SIC and some staff

that will be supporting the first two phases of the review. It's around 11:00 or 12:00 on the Sunday. Please bring your questions there. There will be a really clear presentation and a Q&A period.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Any questions related to the review? Let's move to the second point – outreach. Heidi?

HEIDI ULRICH: Over the holidays we had calls with the Outreach Sub Committee and with all of you at the Regional Secretariat level. We received agreement that we'd go ahead and design, with Communications, a set of new At-Large and RALO outreach and perhaps engagement documents. It was agreed we'd work with you to start developing this. What we've done is we're just about to receive a first draft, which we'll show you during the Secretariat Meeting in Singapore, for your input. That session, where we'll be showing you that document, will be a joint session of Secretariats and the Outreach Sub Committee.

Once we incorporate your feedback on this initial At-Large document, then we'll go ahead and develop the individual RALO documents as well. Silvia, Ariel and myself have been working with Communications on this. It's a vast improvement so far, so we haven't seen the final version but what we've seen is a much more modern and usable approach to an outreach document. At the same time, for Singapore we'll have At-Large business cards for all of you. They're generic business cards with a call for action on the front and on the back all the social media and all the other ways that people can get in touch with us.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Heidi. This Item will also be included in our Secretariat Meeting in Singapore, so we'll see the draft there. I think that from then we'll start discussions and provide our input.

HEIDI ULRICH: Correct. Thank you. Yes.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Good. Any questions on this new At-Large ALAC document, to be used for outreach purposes? Glenn, answering your question, we'll have draft documents in Singapore, so we'll have chance to see them in Singapore and comment on them. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi. I think what Heidi said is very interesting, in she elaborated the term from outreach to also engagement. I think that's a philosophical shift and I think it can be run over too quickly. I think there's an important, subtle difference between what outreach is and what engagement is. I think that's something that will probably be integrated into the document as well.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. I think one of the results of outreach is engagement, so it's important to do outreach in order to engage others. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I want to comment on that. Outreach in various venues has different meanings. In ICANN it has literally become synonymous with marketing – that is go and find people who don't know we exist and tell them about us. In our case, if you look at the ALSes and the participation that many ALSes engage in with ICANN, it's very little, and our problem right now is not so much finding new bodies as to try to figure out how to make effective use of the people that we have right now and the people in the organizations, and as we grow make sure the new ones are also similarly engaged.

So the engagement is a term already used in ICANN, which is the other half of what outreach means in the global sense. Some people in ICANN have been using the term "inreach" to talk about talking to the people who are already largely connected with ICANN, but not necessarily doing a lot. It's not a problem unique to At-Large. It's a significant issue in virtually every other organization within ICANN; certainly the gNSO, I suspect the ccNSO, and the GAC has similar types of problems. Since the term "outreach" has come to mean something in many people's minds within ICANN, we're trying to have a shift in terminology. We could redefine outreach but that doesn't seem to have the right impact. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Alan. There is a discussion in the chat space on the terminology; engagement, outreach and in-reach. Some confusion is there. It would be good if, while having any new At-Large document, we also have the purpose for the usage of this, because while doing outreach to involve new Members is very important, we must also work

on keeping the old Members engaged. This is very important content to be discussed, and I think this is also one of the topics for us to discuss during our face-to-face in Singapore. Any questions related to this topic?

Let's move to Agenda Item #3, Metrics. Silvia has sent the compiled document, and thank you Silvia for sending this out. It was very helpful. All RALO metrics were incorporated in the document. I think we also were discussing having cross-RALO, general metrics for all of us, related to different aspects such as de-certification process or involvement process or due diligence process, or involving new ALSes. Silvia, if you'd like to say something on that?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes Siranush. This is a comparison of all RALOs, related to decertification of ALSes only. I also did a before, and none of the documents related to metrics in generally.   The one I sent around is only related to decertification, and the first thing I notice is each RALO has its own procedure. Its ad hoc in many cases, so there is no equal treatment for all the RALOs.   Each RALO is acting on its own really, related to decertification of ALSes. The idea was to give you this as a starting point for a discussion, to see if we could have some common rules that would apply for all.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Silvia. I'd like to add here that in APRALO, our Metrics Working Group Member, Maureen, already contacted Glenn to see how NARALO is doing their decertification process, and I think it would be

very important to have a cross-RALO approach; one strategy that can apply to all RALOs for this. Any input on this? I think we need to have a separate discussion on this and how to come up with the general cross-RALO strategy for this. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. As anyone here that's on ALAC is aware, there's already a vote going on about decertification that NARALO put forward. We're a little bit at a disadvantage in that Garth, who did some of the original contact with the ALS, is away for a while, but we do have documentation of non-participation, we have documentation of the attempts to contact them. They've essentially disappeared, as far as we're concerned. We have published guidelines that are on the web. In addition, multiple people from the region have tried to contact them via email and using whatever contact information we have. We've been unsuccessful.

As far as we know, either the group has either ceased to exist or has ceased to have any contact with us. That's why we initiated [unclear 27:01], which is considered to be a very ordinary event that we tend to want to use very sparingly. Generally within the region, I think the intention is to be very liberal about what we accept as an incoming ALS, and be very stringent about the criteria of what's necessary before we actually try and decertify one. We have a real-world example of a decertification going on right now. It's been a long process. It hasn't been an easy process. But we want to make absolutely sure that every single opportunity has been given to the ALS to participate.

They refused to contact us even to tell us why they're not participating, so probably now they don't exist anymore. There's simply been no contact. Given that, it's been an extreme example and we feel very comfortable to have launched a vote to decertify. Under normal circumstances we'd be very careful about going through this process and making sure that either there's no contact at all, or that we're very aware that the ALS wants out. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Alan. Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you Siranush. I'll try to speak English. Just to tell you about our RALO. In AFRALO, a few months ago we started a discussion about individual membership, weighted votes and metrics and also decertification. Until now we were at the discussion phase about [unclear 29:19]. Before this we had already obtained the validation about individual membership and weighted votes, because for example for the same country we have six or seven ALSes. Maybe we will have a finalized document before the end of 2015. We want to have the same decision in all the RALOs about decertifications. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Aziz. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.   I want to make it clear that the formal process for decertification is an ALAC process, just like certification is an ALAC process. Our tradition and means of operation has been that a request often comes from a RALO, but that is not necessarily either required, and is certainly not mandated. Currently, as you know, and as you know because of what we're going to be doing with looking at ALSes, we don't have a lot of criteria that are ALAC-wide on what makes a good ALS or not. That's something that will likely change, but at the moment the criteria tends to reside within the RALO, and therefore the request comes from the RALO.

But that is only a request to the ALAC, and I posted in the chat what the formal rule is, within our rules, of the process for decertification. It's important to keep that in mind, because as we develop At-Large-wide criteria and expectations for ALSes, although the RALO will continue to be involved and we're not likely to decertify an ALS with a disagreement of a RALO, the initiative may come from different places once we have expectations and metrics in place. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you.   Thank you Humberto for posting the updated LACRALO metrics. I'd also mention here that APRALO, with the support of Silvia, started to collect some statistics, from a one-year perspective, of how many ALSes participated in our monthly calls, how many [unclear 32:09] – so we are collecting some kinds of metrics for ourselves in APRALO. In order for us to somehow use these metrics related to our next GA, which may happen with the next Asia Pacific Meeting, not this one in Singapore. We will be going to keep track of this participation, and not

only participation in monthly calls, but also ALS participation in Working Groups – so their input, their support.

This is for us to keep track, before the next APRALO GA. Anyone who'd like to comment or provide input for this topic? I don't see any hands raised. Silvia, if you can also incorporate the new metrics provided by LACRALO and we can compile some final version for all of us, to see who is doing what and maybe to work on a strategy to have cross-RALO metrics. This would be good. I just want to highlight once again that APRALO is looking for metrics whilst counting how many people participated how many times. We'd like to look to this point from a positive point of view. We want to encourage those who are active participants as an example for others to engage; those who are not active.

APRALO is at least looking at these metrics from a positive point of view; as an encouragement tool, not discouragement tool. Thank you Silvia for adding LACRALO's metrics in there as well. Any other questions on this? No. I assume that also metrics will be an Agenda Item for our face-to-face meeting in Singapore as well. Let's move forward to Agenda Item #4.   This is ATLAS II implementation progress on RALO recommendations. During our last RALO Secretariats call we discussed that Heidi will be working with a small group to develop a report for the Board on these ATLAS II recommendations, and the specific recommendations from RALOs will also be included there. Heidi, any update on that part?

HEIDI ULRICH: Yes. The latest on this is that the ATLAS II Implementation Team held a call and identified the recommendations for the Board. Again, there were recommendations for others as well as for the Board. The Wiki pages I've put into the chat are just those recommendations that are to go to the Board. We're just focusing on these for Singapore. The ATLAS II Implementation Team identified several. There's a new column called "status" to the far right on this page. As you will see, the progress on a handful of those, for example Recommendation 26, 40, 41, 42, et cetera. In Singapore there will be a very short presentation, about 15 minutes, with the ALAC, when they meet with the Board. We'll update the Board on these recommendations.

I think after other activities, such as the [unclear 36:29] transition – after they reach a point where there's more time for volunteers to work on this, that will be done. That's a brief update on that, Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Any questions on that? I don't see any hands raised. We'll have an update during out meeting with the Board in Singapore. I think we also have discussed about having the cross-RALO survey. The draft has been sent by Alberto already, and we'll see that at least APRALO is going to use these questions and include some other questions to conduct the survey among ALSes. If there is a need to discuss an Item, we can do that during our next meeting in Singapore; about the use of this survey and how we're going to implement it.   Any questions? Humberto is saying he cannot see 28 and 29 in the list?

HEIDI ULRICH:	Humberto, those recommendations are not to the Board. All recommendations are on the main page, which I'm going to put in the chat now. These are not being looked at for the Board right now. Thank you.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	Thank you. If there are no questions on this issue, let's move to #5 – agreement on the Agenda for the Singapore meeting. The Agenda is already posted, and I think someone from staff is going to update us on this.
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Regarding the Agenda for this RALO Secretariat Meeting, I think we still need to decide whether the cross-RALO issues are of interest for everyone to discuss during the Singapore Meeting.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	You are talking about the specific Secretariat Meeting Agenda?
SILVIA VIVANCO:	Correct, the face-to-face meeting.
SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:	I think that we came up with some topics to be discussed. These will be the 360' review – the process by which it will be done – the outreach; the new At-Large document presentation with the Communications Team. There will also be a metrics topic to be discussed, and this ATLAS

II report update will be provided. Any other feedback from participants of what we also want to include? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess one issue I'd like to add to the Agenda, and also call everyone's attention to is that not on the Secretariats' Meeting but on the first day of the ALAC Meeting, late in the day, there's going to be signing ceremony between NARALO and ARIN. I'd like to put a brief Agenda Item onto the Secretariats' Meeting that deals with the relationships between the RALOs and with the regional Internet registries – the RIRs. So whether it's between EURALO and RIPE, between LACRALO and LACNIC, between NARALO and ARIN. I'd like to find out, in terms of cross-RALO interaction, of how relationships work. We're just signing our MOU. We're newly into this.

I'd like to find out how other RALOs are maximizing their relationship, and those RALOs who haven't done it yet, is it because there's no interest or because they've tried and there are difficulties? Since we're getting into it a bit more I'd like to have this as a brief Agenda Item; to deal with the relationship between RALOs and RIRs. On this call, if anyone can make any suggestions about the best way to run the signing ceremony, that would also be appreciated. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Evan. This is a very good point. I will be ready and present how APRALO MOUs are working with APNIC and APTLD. I will provide some details. For this call, I'd also like to tell you about another MOU APRALO is planning to sign in Singapore, during our Showcase. We'll be

signing an MOU with .asia, who are constant supporters of APRALO activities. just one more update on our activities with APNIC: two Members of APRALO applied for CROPP, to participate in APRICOT where APNIC and APTLD, our regional RIRs, are conducting their annual meetings. They supported our participation by covering the [unclear 42:44] for Satish and Maureen.

We will not be paying for participation for APRICOT 2015. This is also another result of our collaboration with local RIRs. I also will be ready to provide some update in Singapore, and everyone is much more welcome to provide their input. I know NARALO is now working with ARIN for signing an MOU, and NARALO people will be able to provide updates on how it's working and what the process is for signing this agreement. Any other input from that side? Silvia has already posted in AIs that relationships between RIRs and RALOs will be another Agenda Item for the Singapore Secretariat Meeting. Everyone's able to update from their RALO.

We don't now have anything in our Agenda. If someone would like to speak up and say something to add to what we've discussed, or what we want to discuss in Singapore, this is the time to do so. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a quick reiteration on the subject of ALS criteria and expectations – we're going to be launching a process very soon, but please start thinking about it. What do you expect from your ALSes? What do you want? What would be optimal? I guess going along with that is how do you characterize an ALS that isn't really participating? It's not just a

matter of what numbers we look at. I'm looking at conceptually, what are we expecting from ALSes. Thank you. That's not asking for answers now. It's something to think about, because we will be going into that process in detail.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. This is a very good question for us all to think about, because this is how we'll work in future, because if we don't know and don't have any expectation or anticipate something, we'll have no participation. Glenn is asking if all the RALOs are required to sign an agreement with their RIRs. If I'm wrong please correct me, Leadership and staff, but I don't think there is the requirement. Olivier just posted it's not required but encouraged – yes, I agree. This is how we, in APRALO, are working. This was an encouragement for all of us, from both sides; from APRALO, ALSes and RIRs, some kind of official engagement. It's not a requirement for us. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. The discussions between the Address Supporting Organization and … I'm going to have to go on mute for a minute. Let's start again. In Beijing there were discussions between the Address Supporting Organization, which effectively is the part of ICANN that relates to the RIRs. I think the ALAC Leadership Team at the time, we had breakfast together with the Chairs of several of the RIRs, and extended collaboration between RIRs and RALOs was something that was seen to be a positive thing, simply because it would allow perhaps

for sponsorship of various events within At-Large, but also sponsorship of some of our ALSes to go to the RIR meetings.

So essentially be involved within a more extended way, and Internet governance for their region. That's' really where it started. It not something that's mandatory for RALOs to sign agreements with RIRs, but it's something that's encouraged, because it certainly opens the door to further collaboration, including RIRs that are looking for that essential end-user component input, as far as their policies are concerned as well. The ALAC and At-Large community has got a pretty large reservoir of such people being able to take part in RIR meetings. It's all about being able to be part of this multistakeholder, bottom-up governance system that governs the Internet. Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you Olivier. This is a clear explanation. Thank you for this. Just to add to this, many of our ALSes are also local ccTLDs, so it's very important to be a part of those discussions, so I completely agree with what Olivier has said. Okay, any other input? I don't see any hands raised. Olivier, you have your hand raised. Is this a new one? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I forgot to add that when I saw there was going to be something signed between ARIN and NARALO I was absolutely delighted. I think it's great. It's great that APRALO has started showing the way and that there's work going on in all the RALOs for this. Yes, the world is certainly changing from those days when everyone was working at their silos to

now; having this extended, extensive collaboration across the whole Internet space. Great. Kudos to NARALO for this.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. Kudos to NARALO doing that, and I like this MOU new terminology! It is already five minutes to seven and if there is no other input from participants I'd like to just wish you all a safe trip to Singapore, and don't forget that this is in the APRALO region and we'll have our APRALO Showcase. I'm sure there will be a lot of stuff that you'll like there, and don't forget about the red APRALO color there, so wear something red. I'm looking forward to seeing you all in Singapore in less than two weeks.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you everyone. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]