
TERRI AGNEW:

We'll go ahead and begin at this time. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party on Friday, 1st of May 2015 at 14:00 UTC. On the English channel we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Barrack Otieno, Ali AlMeshal, Siranush Vardanyan, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Eduardo Diaz, Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Alan Greenberg. On the Spanish channel we have Fatima Cambronero. I show no apologies listed for today's conference.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Larisa Gurnick and myself, Terri Agnew. Our Spanish interpreter today is Sabrina. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for our Spanish interpreter. Thank you very much and back over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Terri, and thank you everyone for your time. We were originally going to spend a bit more time looking at the paper that Larisa had shared, but in the past couple of days what has happened is a little bit of a rethink on timelines, from the Board, which means the first Item on the Agenda is going to be, Larisa, if you will walk us through a proposed new timeline for the Review? We can get some feedback on that and some discussion, and then we can go back on the original discussion, which was scheduled for today, which was for a little bit of feedback from all of us.

That's in terms of you were looking particularly at the questions for the need for interpretation, who should be interviewed - some of these

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

issues that need to be addressed. Those things will just have to wait until we can agree on your timeline. So Larisa, over to you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Hello everybody. I'm happy to be giving you this briefing on the At-Large Review proceedings and timeline. In the last several days, at the last Board Meeting, there's been continuing discussion, as Holly suggested, about the timing of all the reviews, of which At-Large is one. This has been prompted to a great extent by feedback received in Singapore from the community, concerns about bandwidth and workload, and timing of a lot of work.

So with that in mind, the Board directed staff to post for public comment some proposed timeline modifications that would address some of the concerns that they've heard from the community. I also want to underscore that what that could possibly mean for this Review is actually I believe it's pretty well aligned with the conversations we already started having in preparation for this meeting, and we had already started discussing doing self-assessment and evaluating to what extent prior Review Recommendations have been implemented, and how effective they've been.

That's as well as addressing some of the other questions that staff had included in the listing of considerations for all of you to think about. Our process has already anticipated, to a great extent, the importance of spending more time upfront in planning and working through these important considerations to make sure that the At-Large Review and

Plan, and particularly the RFP, will be carefully and precisely tailored to the needs of the At-Large organizations.

Originally, we were intending to complete planning by June and culminate in hiring or engaging the independent examiner to start the actual Review in July, and the Review was supposed to last from July 2015 through March of 2016. With the proposed timeline you now see on the screen, we've added some steps into the planning process so that between May and October there would be the self-assessment component as well as developing plans based on the kinds of questions that have already been identified, and certainly others that would emerge based on feedback from all of you in the Review Working Party.

Then the competitive bidding process would start in November with the independent examiner being engaged in the spring of 2016, and their work beginning in April of 2016, and so proposed to last for [nine 00:06:57]. Then all the other phases would follow based on that. So to summarize the key aspects of this timeline proposal, it's basically a slower start in terms of planning and putting more activities and time into the initial phase, to be better prepared with the engagement of the independent examiner, and have a more focused, precise and timely Review once the independent examiner is engaged.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Larisa, thank you. Do you want to continue?

LARISA GURNICK: Actually, at this point it would probably be good to have dialogue and discussions, because this in substance is the key point that I wanted to underscore.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fine. First of all, to say that the people who are looking for the earlier slide, the Wiki page for the Review has the earlier presentation that you gave, and the previous timeline is on that page. For anyone wanting to check the previous timeline, it's available on our At-Large Review Wiki page. The main focus for the change here, as Larisa has said, is that we were thinking we would be starting the Review, we'd have the independent examiner in place at the end of June, and the actual Review would start.

What's being proposed and is up for discussion and adoption is in fact starting right now, which is obviously May, the self-assessment, it goes through until probably the October Meeting, where we can finalize a lot of questions, the self-assessment, and then be in a position to have all of the information you would like so that the competitive bidding process for the independent examiner would be starting after Dublin, and then the actual Review will start in April.

It allows a lot of time, but given the bandwidth that people really don't have in their lives, it means some of the critical times for some of the major things going on - for example the set of IANA issues - this will allow people to be involved in that, but at the same time to progress the Review. At this point, I think what you'd like is simply for people to

make probably some suggestions about self-assessment, but to start by saying, "Is this a timeline that's now doable?" Am I right?

LARISA GURNICK: That's correct.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Cheryl thinks it's perhaps even a good thing, and Alan, go ahead?

ALAN GREENBERG: This may well be doable, the current one, given the other activities some of us have been focusing on was ludicrous - but there didn't seem to be any way to stop it, so I'm very grateful. If you'd like to delay it a few more months it would make our lives even easier, but this is something closer to reality that would not be a fiasco, which I'm afraid it would have been otherwise. If we had had the reviewers show up in late summer this year, we would not have been prepared for them. There's just no way. So much better.

LARISA GURNICK: Alan and Cheryl, thank you very much for your feedback. I wanted to underscore that the objective of these Reviews is to end up with a Final Report and set of recommendations that would be useful and productive. So to Alan's point, to progress with a plan that from the get-go had some concerns would not necessarily be productive. So thank you for that feedback.

I wanted to also underscore that a public comment period will be opened within the next several weeks pertaining to the entire set of Reviews, which, as many of you know, includes several AOC Reviews that are [unclear 00:12:45] as well as the At-Large Review and various other organizational reviews. So the Board will be seeking feedback from the community on the entire timeline, as well as a set of suggested process improvements to make the Reviews function more effectively.

Once that feedback is gathered and analyzed the Board will finalize the timeline and make their decisions based on the feedback they've received. It's anticipated the public comment period will likely close in mid-July and then at the following Board Meeting in September this will take place. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Larisa. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Larisa, what I'm hearing is regardless of the comment period, the timeline we had before will not be adhered to, because clearly the Board will not even be making a decision until way after we should have had the examiner engaged. So there will be a delay, regardless of whether it's the delay we're talking about right now or another one. Before I continue, do I have that right?

LARISA GURNICK: You're absolutely right, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to tell you where I am - and we're not asking for sympathy, but reality has some bearing on our lives - when I became Chair in October I said we'd be doing not a review but a revamp of some of our At-Large overall rules and ALSes - partly because it had to be done and partly because it really should be done before the Review [unclear 00:14:43]. I announced that in October in Singapore. We came up with a detailed process by which we would do that. It hasn't started yet. That gives you a place where we are. Thank you. That's all I can say. Thank you Board.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just adding, I think everyone's lives have been taken over by the various aspects of the IANA transition issues, so the things that we were going to do have been left to not quite as done as they should be. I think there are some deep sighs of relief that the timeline has been extended, but that said, could you, Larisa, now go through the next step, the May to October, and what you would like us, as a Working Party, to do between May and October leading up to the Dublin Meeting.

At the Dublin Meeting, do you foresee some kind of final meeting with the Working Party? What would you like to accomplish between May and October, that being the revised timeline?

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you Holly. Obviously you've heard this proposed adjustment to the timeline is relatively new, so it will take staff a bit of time, several weeks, to think through how to implement that in the most productive

and effective way. I did want to call your attention to the slide that's up on the screen now, which also has been shared at the last presentation, and [unclear 00:16:49] that we've added to the slide really speaks to what the next steps will be, and the more clearly articulated role for the Review Working Party that will be very critical in the next period of time - I would say May through November.

You will see now in the Review Working Party call that the first several steps are new. It's conducting the self-assessment, which we'll talk about in a moment. It's also helping collect evidence, and the reason for this point being added here - as you all know, lessons learnt. We continue to refine the process and learn from what we experience in other reviews.

Given that the job of the independent examiner down the line will be considerably easier and more effective, if between staff and the community we're able to provide them very clear evidence and documentation of how the prior Review Recommendations have been implemented, and also some sense of how effective that implementation has been. You will see these questions reflected in the two-page set of considerations that I've circulated several weeks ago. We'll be talking about that in several minutes as well.

The third component of the key steps to address in the next several months is really to think through the other considerations and help formulate a plan and a method that can be used to conduct the survey, and the mechanics, operational type of mechanics, as to how many different surveys, how we handle the translation issue most effectively, what constitutes a good response, and various other considerations

that, if formulated well during the next six months, will really set us up for a more productive time, once the independent examiner is engaged.

So I would like to come back to this group in the next several weeks with a revised timeline for the kinds of deliverables and accomplishments that would be needed with this new proposed timeline in mind. But the focus of what we're asking for you to think about accomplishing in the next six weeks is really contained in the questions and considerations, and in any other document that we have already articulated. Once we get some good discussion on those kinds of questions, I suspect there will be other items raised that we probably haven't considered yet.

Holly, I think that if there are no other questions on the timeline and the process, maybe we could spend a bit of time hearing from your group about whether we've asked the right questions, and possibly if people have some time to consider answers to those questions that would be very helpful.

HOLLY RAICHE:

That's excellent. Now, I'm sorry I didn't ask for it before, but either Heidi or anyone else, do you actually have, as a slide, Larisa's questions? Larisa, or do you want to say them out loud? I've circulated those questions but people may not have them in front of them. Can we quickly go through them and then we can get some feedback? If people's memories might not be as good as they might be?

LARISA GURNICK: Sure, I'm happy to talk to that, but I'm wondering if Charla or Ariel can put a link in the chat, because I believe the document has been uploaded to the Wiki.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl just has.

LARISA GURNICK: Very good. The questions are really formulated into several categories, as you will see. There are questions pertaining to the survey. There are questions pertaining to the interviews and questions pertaining to the self-assessment. Starting at the top with the survey, of course it's anticipated that when the independent examiner will be engaged they will follow a general process where their starting point will be to assess how prior Review Recommendations have been implemented and how effective they've been, and on that they would rely on the self-assessment work.

The other component of their work will be to conduct a survey of some kind, something similar to an online tool that would collect feedback from a broad and diverse group of people within the At-Large community, but from other stakeholder groups, constituencies, and ICANN structures as well. Within the survey component, we identified several variables that generally tend to complicate or extend the timeline of the survey and need to be factored into the development of the survey.

For example, the kinds of considerations we're asking you to think about is the numbers of languages the survey should be translated into, for example the six UN languages plus Portuguese, or some other considerations. This would be relevant. The other important component is to recognize the fact that At-Large organizations have different aspects to them. There is the ALAC, there are RALOs, and the ALSes, and in previous discussions there was agreement that the next Review of the At-Large organization should focus on the RALOs and the ALSes in addition to [unclear 00:24:35], because those are significant components.

[unclear] surveys, if there are some similarities between the way these components of the At-Large organization conduct their business, and really think through the mechanics of how to construct a tool so that, with the goal of clarity and gravity, I would say, so that large numbers of people would respond and really understand the questions, and have a basis for providing their input and feedback. The other important variable is survey tool, and the independent examiner obviously is ultimately going to make recommendations on what the tool should be.

They'd be fielding the survey, so to a certain extent some of that will be left to them. But it would be helpful to understand from your team, Holly, the kinds of mechanisms or tools that are most comfortable and useful, based on prior experience. Because if there are certain things that have worked well in the past for this particular group, we'd certainly like to flag that and make this process as user-friendly as we possibly can. Then of course the function and the purpose of different components - do these functions require a different set of questions for each component?

Or can we simply come up with a set of standard questions that would apply equally, and be equally relevant, to the RALOs and the ALSes, for example? That's a broad painting of the kinds of questions that pertain to survey structure. In the document itself we've actually articulated these questions in hopefully very specific terms, to get some thought as to how to structure this. Lessons learnt from having gone through this process for the GNSO, it's important to think about creating questions that would give a chance to different categories of participants to respond; meaning people that have deep and extensive experience, that have participated in the operations of the At-Large organization - that point of view is very important.

But also the point of view of newcomers that may not have had the benefit of extensive involvement yet; that point of view is important, and sometimes these two categories of people wouldn't necessarily be able to answer the same types of questions. So that's something else for the group to think about - how to reach out to both people that have deep experience and can provide meaningful feedback, but also to people that haven't had a chance to get engaged extensively yet, and what would be relevant to both of those groups, so that they can provide thoughtful and relevant answers based on their view of the organization.

There is also a set of questions that we included pertaining to the timeline, and the reason for including these questions is once again, the more we can anticipate ahead of time what would be a realistic timeframe for fielding the survey, giving people sufficient time to respond, doing some follow ups perhaps - the more we can [fork at

00:29:20] that within some reasonable realm, the better our project planning will be for the Review.

What we're hoping to achieve here is some early thinking on: what would be a reasonable timeframe for people to respond to the survey? How many follow ups would be reasonable? Are there certain periods of time within the year that are absolutely off limits or should be off limits? For example the month of August as an example. That's the reason for asking these questions, so that within the more detailed planning and project management we've [unclear 00:30:08] feasible anticipate some of these areas, and plan a survey that gives people sufficient time to respond.

It also gives the independent examiner sufficient time to analyze the data so that then they could move onto the next phase of their data collection, which are the interviews. Are there any questions at this point?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I was just going to say that's a huge mouthful. Now, I can say straight off the bat, in terms of beginning some answers are the number of languages. Obviously, I think most people will say the six UN, and there are some others. We have started to use Russian for some, we've started to use Chinese, particularly for Asia Pacific. I think the language question will be an important one. I think from the APRALO point of view - and Siranush can talk about this, as can Maureen - we have done a very brief survey of ourselves, and probably learnt a few lessons about who will actually answer what, and there are some thoughts there.

I also think there are probably some thoughts that people have about survey tools, but I guess I'm going to leave the floor open to welcome input at this stage. I would particularly ask for people like Cheryl and Olivier, if you've got some experience you want to share, or some new people... Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I was reading the document on the slide, and I noted that we need to meet certain requirements - we, the group members. I have some ideas about preparing surveys, et cetera, but I don't think I'm fully qualified. If we had some kind of explanation from somebody who's really knowledgeable in survey techniques then that would be very helpful, because who is going to be our target audience? How many replies or responses do we need in order to have a clearly positive result? To be honest with you, I am willing to help, I am willing to participate, but I am not knowledgeable of these topics.

So if we had someone who's knowledgeable in survey techniques who could provide this information, we could work more efficiently and in a more expedient way. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Larisa, do you want to respond?

LARISA GURNICK:

Did you want me to respond, or Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll have a go. I'm not going to rain on your parade, Larisa, I just wanted to share with Alberto my perspective, and then I'm sure you'll have more to say. Alberto, very few of you have that professional level of expertise that I see you're concerned about, but ICANN staff do have amongst them people with that expertise, and of course the independent examiner may very well have specific expertise in that area. If we don't have the expertise we can always hire it in - as long as ICANN picks up the bill on this exercise.

Remembering of course that our group is a facilitation and specific guidance and input role, it's not as if we, per se, are going to be out there, other than encouraging and facilitating the pre-questions, the questions in the surveys, and the right tools they use, right through to forming of the interviews. We're not going to be "conducting" them, as such. I think what Larisa and the team need from us, as a diverse group, is rather more answers to these questions that are in the preparatory questions doc.

So things like number of languages, the answer is pretty simple from our point of view; it has to be the six UN plus - and with the plus we include Portuguese and Arabic... You know, all those sorts of things are easy for us to answer as a group, and we could actually go through this document almost line-by-line and give [unclear 00:36:05] reactions to that. That's the type of input that I believe we will be best equipped - and we are equipped - to give. But we will have, other than that, input and guidance of these things [unclear 00:36:22] for it to be "professionalized" and "performed".

But we're also central in promulgating of the information out of using our communication channels, of facilitating, and ensuring that the proper level of engagement happens. So with that preamble, Larisa, how do you want to respond to Alberto?

LARISA GURNICK:

Cheryl, thank you very much. I couldn't have said it better myself. We recognize that many of you, as well as many of us, don't have the technical expertise, and we think it will be important to let the independent examiner... Well, first of all engage an independent examiner that has that expertise, but also allow them to use the important feedback from this group and from staff, to formulate the survey that ultimately they can stand behind and feel certain that the methodology resulted in information that they can analyze and rely upon.

At this point, if the questions feel that they are getting into some of the more technical aspects of the survey techniques, that was not intentional, and possibly some of the questions will end up being directed to the independent examiner. But the kinds of information that would be helpful to get from this group, as an example - and I will use the obvious example - is that the ALAC has a certain number of Members as part of it, and I'd expect somebody would say, "There would be an expectation that every single Member of ALAC respond to the survey."

Or, "90 per cent of the Members respond to the survey," or some other target that you would find reasonable. That's not to say we will let the

independent examiner determine what the ultimate response rate needs to be in order for the information to be reliable, but this will help us understand when we launch the survey, are we going after roughly 100 responses? 1,000 responses? 50 responses? What would be considered a reasonable expectation?

That's the kind of feedback from all of you that would be very helpful, particularly with all your deep knowledge of your various organizations and people that participate. What would be a good target for us to start out with? I hope that was helpful.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Larisa. That is very helpful. We have got a number of issues. It's not only how many, but it's who. Are we looking at all of the ALAC? Are we looking at the Chairs of the ALAC? Are we looking at the Members? And to pick up on the points that you made, given that this is a Review that, this time, is going to focus on the actual RALOs and ALSes, we need thoughts on: how do we look at and get information about ALSes? Do we just count them? Do we try to find out about the awareness in an ALS?

How do we envisage getting that kind of information? Or indeed what kind of information are we wanting? And then how will we get it? As well as in the RALOs, what do we expect from a RALO? What do we measure as success? Not success? What kind of activities are we looking for? So I think if we are looking at a Review, I think we are asking a range of questions of ourselves. My understanding is that's the kind of feedback that you would like from us. So for us to formulate the

sort of things that we think will form a good review. Now, is that on the right track?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, Holly, that's exactly right.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I wanted to come back to some process and possible wins. Hopefully I won't say too much of what Olivier wants to say - actually, I like doing that. That isn't a joke. We certainly have a critical mass of people on this call, and I believe we have a bit of time on this call to do so. I want to propose, Holly, that we could in fact go through these questions, or the preparatory questions in front of us. Some of them will be quite easy to get a group-think response to, if you want to do that. I think we'd cover a few of these off in today's call.

A number of the others will probably need to be dealt with separately; both perhaps with group-think discussions, in a separate call, a follow-up call, and then most specific polling on consensus views on it. Each of the sections are for that. I've got Olivier to put his hand down, so my work is done. Holly, should we start quickly from the top of the list and see how much we can cover off?

HOLLY RAICHE: We've got 15 minutes. I think my question to Olivier is, is your hand up or down?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm going to go in my corner and sulk now, because we do have a little time. Let's go through some of those questions we have on the screen. I think many of these we can answer pretty quickly, and as Cheryl says, we have at least someone from each region, so let's get going.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. We have the number of languages. Larisa, I think we've said at least the six UN languages. Fatima, go ahead.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO Thank you. I have a comment on something you were addressing before. Thank you Holly. My comment is the same comment I made in the Singapore Meeting. Personally, I still have these concerns, and maybe it's a comment that is more specific to this group internally. Cheryl explained that we are facilitators in this group and that we will then be helping the independent examiner. Personally, my term in ALAC will finish at the end of this year, and this timeline extends up to 2018.

My concern is the lack of human resources, the lack of bandwidth we have, since most people are focused on the IANA issues and on accountability, and they are not looking into the other activities that we are doing. What happens with people in this Working Party? Will we continue in our role within this Working Party even if our terms are concluded later on? It's a bit of an internal question or issue. I'm

concerned about that. There is very few of us working on this topic, which is really relevant to our community. That's my question and concern. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is a subject we've already discussed, because one of our other Working Party Members, who unfortunately isn't on the call today, is in the same situation. I'm talking specifically about Eduardo. When it was brought to me I looked at it and said, "The Working Party really needs to have continuity." Given that in Eduardo's case and Fatima's case as well we have people with pretty wide experience within At-Large - both within the region and on the ALAC - there is no reason to believe they cannot and should not continue as active Members of the Working Party.

Perhaps not being able to attend ICANN Meetings for lack of travel is a potential problem, because although in theory all this work can be done remotely and telephonically, the reality is it doesn't work as well as it should. From my point of view, I see no reason to replace someone because they're no longer on the ALAC, even if they were selected because they were ALAC Members at the time of selection. How practical that's going to be as we go forward does remain to be seen. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Given we've got ten more minutes, Olivier, was that for the same matter or another matter? We're starting at the first question, which is the number of languages, with about nine minutes now. Let's go to the languages we've dealt with. Maybe in the next few minutes we can ask for at least a little bit of feedback about the components of the At-Large that we're looking at, and here we're looking at- remember, this is a Review not just on ALAC but on the RALOs and ALSes - so some initial feedback on that is probably as far as we'll get. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, two things. To answer your main question, clearly we'll have to focus on the RALO structures as a structure and the ALSes specifically, as well as the individual Members within our unit. We could also ask the RALOs and the ALSes to identify or, if our group here is not fully equipped to do so, any other external interested parties, et cetera, that may wish to have some outreach, and the opportunity to input on this. I think that's a pretty simple question to answer. Regarding the languages, I think we're about to have a partition drawn between the eastern and western hemispheres here.

If you're going to stick to the working languages, Olivier, which of course is conveniently English, French and Spanish, that's great. But APRALO will not be satisfied unless you include our primary and indeed numerically largest usage language, which takes us to the six UN, because it picks up Arabic and Russian. Also we've already established in other work with LACRALO that Portuguese has been seen as essential. Yes, seven languages: the six UN plus Portuguese is the answer, as far as I'm concerned, to the other question. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Cheryl. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. In the chat I have said I agree with the six plus Portuguese, but Cheryl mentioned plus the ones from ALSes that are any others identified as required by the RALOs. I wonder what that would be in addition to the six plus Portuguese. The concern is that with six plus Portuguese we have capacity for already at ICANN, but other languages, I'm not sure if there is such capacity.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, my shorthand has failed me here in communication. Olivier, again, I was thinking specifically from an Asia Pacific perspective which, while it's not the only reason I'm here, I think you probably want to pick my historical memory as well, but we have a local languages program that we run via the office in Singapore - the regional office - and so we are all equipped locally to move primary material identified within our ICANN work, as essential to moving to other local languages, for that to happen.

So some of the Indian scripts, for example, it's acting locally, at the regional level, as opposed to the burden of trying to find them through traditional language services channels - not that I think they couldn't do it, I'm sure they could, but we do have our local languages work being done, at least in Asia Pacific. But I would suggest, my dears, that Asia

Pacific is the one with the greatest diversity of languages, and we are best left to our own devices in this.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you Cheryl. I'm very conscious of the time. I think we're not going to get very far with these questions. I think that we could use a webinar. We can go out to the Working Parties and ask for feedback in the next week or so, and then meet. Larisa and I could meet, or Larisa and Cheryl and whomever else would like to meet, to go through at least some of the answers with you, Larisa, in Buenos Aires, if you think that now that we've got a bit of time up our sleeves we can go through these questions over the next couple of weeks, three four weeks, and give you some more answers and more feedback?

Just asking people to at least make some suggestions against each one of these headings, and have a couple of teleconferences, now that we have the time. Does that fit with your timeline, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Holly, thank you very much. Yes, that would be fine, and I would welcome any specific feedback on the questions that people can provide so that by the time we do have an opportunity to be face-to-face in Buenos Aires we can have some ideas of how these various attributes will come together, because the more concrete ideas we have about things, such as languages for example, and some of these other elements, that will also help us frame the elements of the request for proposal - that obviously has budget considerations and such.

We want to get to a point, by Buenos Aires, or shortly thereafter, of beginning to formulate some consensus around these criteria or these drivers, particularly the ones that will have time and cost implications.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Now, we've got two other new hands for both Cheryl and Olivier. You each have 60 seconds.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just a few things: on the survey variables, these are all very mundane questions. I think we've answered the number of languages, we've answered the number of components of At-Large organizations. The survey tool, I would recommend we leave it to staff to decide upon, because I gather they'll be building the survey using the survey tool. The function and purpose of At-Large components is an interesting question here, and I'm not quite sure I fully understand it there.

I was going to ask Larisa for a quick explanation of this, although I have looked at the GNSO Survey and it was asking the same question for each of the constituencies. Then finally, the interaction with other relevant organizations is mentioned here with ICANN structures - but what about organizations that are not ICANN structures? What about organizations that are not ALSes either? In other words, At-Large as seen from outside of the ICANN ecosystem? That's my intervention for this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you want to go straight onto me, Holly, for once Olivier has said a few things I wanted to say. Good on you, dear. Doesn't it feel good? I

would suggest that we tick off, as Olivier suggested, the first three on survey variables, we reconvene for short and regular, where we can fit them in, teleconferences, and you work with this group through the rest of these questions. We should in fact have the majority of them dealt with well and truly before we get to Buenos Aires.

The truth of the matter is, as far as I'm concerned, particularly as we're all so busy, gathering us together for a 60-minute commitment on a teleconference means you will get the input here and now. Collect it and move on. If you're going to ask us to find time in our already ridiculous working life, and volunteering for ICANN to remember to go off and respond in writing to all of these questions, I don't believe you're going to get the same quality of response. I think you've got a successful model using this collaboration tool, and what we can do is decide, in bite-sized bits, which ones we deal with when. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you very much. It is the top of the hour. I think we've got a cut-off point. Thank you everyone for your participation. Larisa, we will be meeting to get some feedback to you, and this time the timeline is not as critical, because I think the first and most important take-out is that you have approval from us for the revised timeline, and the second task for us is to get back to you to work through some of the answers to the questions. I think with that, and the fact that I'm one minute over, I'll say thank you, and we'll all be in touch. Thank you everybody. Bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi, if you're still there, is that AI as I captured it suitable for Holly's request?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm here, and I will note that. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No problem. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]