
HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Okay, we can start and we can actually have what I hope will be a productive and short meeting. Has everybody had a chance to at least receive the revised charter to understand what we're doing?

ALAN GREENBERG: You have low expectations, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, all right. I will go through it, then.

TERRI AGNEW: Would you like me to start with the roll call, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I beg your pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] to start the meeting for you.

TERRI AGNEW: Would you like me to start with the roll call, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, please.

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.

TERRI AGNEW: Certainly. We'll go ahead and begin with the roll call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party Meeting #4 on Monday, the 23rd of November, 2015, at 18:00 UTC.

On the English channel, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Eduardo Diaz, Wolf Ludwig, Siranush Vardanyan, and Olivier Crepin-Lebold.

On the Spanish channel, we have Aida Noblia.

We have apologies from Charla Shambley.

From staff, we have Ariel Liang, Larisa Gurnick; and myself, Terri Agnew. Joining us in a little bit will be Heidi Ullrich and Gisella Gruber.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm here, Terri.

TERRI AGNEW: Oh. Welcome, Heidi! Our Spanish interpreter today will be Veronica. As a reminder, we ask that you state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes, but also for our interpreters. Thank you very much, and I'll turn it back over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you very much. And just a reminder, we have a Spanish interpreter, so would people speak slowly and clearly and only one at a time? Thank you very much.

Now, to start the meeting, I'm hoping everybody at least received revised charter for this working group because it's a reminder of what we're doing. And today we have a particular task which is to talk about two things in particular to meet our timelines. One is to talk about the selection of an independent examiner and the other is to look at the criteria for review. But I will first walk through the charter just to remind everybody of why we are here and what the review is about.

Starting with the ICANN itself, its bylaws require independent reviews of all of the structures to look at organizational effectiveness of the various components of ICANN and we're one of them. The first review of ALAC was held in 2008 and was finally finished including implementation in 2012. The focus of that review was just on the ALAC structure itself and its rules. At that time, the RALOs have just been formed and looking at the review structure of RALOs and the ALSes would have been not very productive. So the focus of this review is going to be on the Regional At-Large Organizations and their At-Large Structures.

The actual review process is going to begin in April, but there's a lot of things that have to be accomplished before that time. We have to, as a group, work with ICANN staff to develop the sort of criteria that will be used to actually select the independent examiner who will be conducting the review and to look at the criteria for that examiner. We're also going to have to think through how we want to survey ourselves, who we want to ask, what questions we want to ask. So we

have some tasks in front of us as a group before we get to that April start date. It's very important that the At-Large community – and that's you – is involved in this process and participate because it will not be very effective unless we can find [inaudible].

Where we're up to – and I will now go to the timeline which is in the charter and at the end of the paper – we're in the stage of the processes to select an independent examiner.

For those of you who were not involved at the Dublin meeting and go through the timeline, the tasks that are involved now would be, first, to think through what we want in an independent examiner. What sort of qualities are we looking for, what sort of experience? Then the actual criteria for some of the methodologies will – and in terms of what surveys are we going to look at, what questions we want to ask, who are we going to talk to – and it's going to be ourselves. So who amongst us are actually interviewed face-to-face? Because obviously not all of us can be. In terms of the online surveys, a look at the surveys and maybe what we want to ask each other.

Now, in terms of membership, we've all been involved in working groups, those [selected yourselves-], were involved in the working group. The working group – actually it's the working party – does include members from ALAC but also representatives from all five RALOs because all five RALOs will be involved. Our role as a working party is going to be a liaison between us and between ICANN staff to help them coordinate the various activities that surround this review.

We're encouraging ALAC [inaudible] involved as much as possible in a number of ways, participants in this working party providing input or even just organizing meetings amongst ALSes and RALOs to provide input into this review.

At this stage we have not worked through how much time we expect working party members to take, but it's going to be a lot of work. So in our charter we've got this lovely sentence, the expected time commitment in and then we've got X hours, but we haven't decided what's that going to be. I promise you it will be a lot, certainly in lead-up and then during the review itself.

What's expected is once the review is complete, there will be an Implementation Taskforce to oversee the implementation of the recommendations that come out of this review, and I imagine there will be several that should start in July. Actually, it will be later. I'll go through the timeline in a minute.

What we have to do, the responsibilities and scope of work – and if you look at the changing environment of ICANN and you look at all of the reviews that everybody is [caught up in], you're going to realize we're involved in a bit of a changing environment. So it's just going to make our task a little bit more difficult, but we will persist.

The things that will happen – the first thing, and this is now on page two – we're going to be acting as a steering committee. It will be the primary working group and we are going to be functioning as a liaison between At-Large, then the At-Large Community and the independent examiner

and the organizational [inaudible], the Board itself. So we're going to be the sort of go-to working party.

Our first task in our task today is to think about the selection criteria for the independent examiner. I'll get into that in a minute. There are some standard criteria that ICANN looks for, but for this particular task, we may think there are other criteria and we will talk a little about that.

We are also going to look at content for online surveys. What do we want to be asking ourselves and others. We want to be identifying who should be interviewed and how we might go about sampling for the At-Large Structures.

Another task we've got is the additional input conduit in terms of organizing meetings between ALAC, the RALOs, and the ALSes, and acting as a sounding board between us and the independent examiner.

One of our final tasks is going to be to coordinate the At-Large Community to prepare an implementation plan and then carry it out. Throughout it's going to be supporting the communication and awareness activities between us and the Board Committee and independent examiner. So that is our charter and the timeline, which are pretty critical at the moment.

The first thing we have to do is talk about the criteria for the independent examiner because the processes have to be put in place in November/December to establish what's called a Request for Proposals to go out to seek an independent examiner and the criteria has to be part of that RFP, and that's our first task.

Our other task is to contribute to the development of the assessment itself and coordinate the self-review and, again, that should be happening between now and when the independent examiner is selected. So we have a few weeks for that.

During the review, as I talked about, we are going to be... This is a [inaudible] group in the middle coordinating the RALOs and the ALSes and coordinating with the independent examiner and with the Board Committee. So we've got a full plate ahead of us. At this stage, has anybody got any questions or comments?

Alan, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It is indeed. Is the charter going to go the ALAC for its approval or are we approving our own charter? I'm not giving a value judgment. I just think one or the other. Either this working party has to agree to the charter and forward to the ALAC or this working party agrees to the charter and it is the done deal. So one of the two must be done.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. You beat me to that question, Alan. Thank you. For once, you've gotten ahead of me. I like to try and [inaudible] ahead of you and Olivier normally. Thank you for that question. I would suggest that part of what we need to do as of the end of this meeting is have agreed that

the draft charter [inaudible] which is not minorly modified – and I would think probably very minor modification, really. We need to work around that X Factor from time. I can come to that later. That should in fact then come from our work party and go to the ALAC for [further modifications]. I think it's important that the ALAC own the approval of the charter. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. That would have been my suggestion, as well. I think it is important that ALAC itself buy into this process, and one of the ways you buy into a process is approve of the charter that tells you what you're going to do. Certainly in the GNSO context, all of the charters go up to GNSO Council and are approved. So I would suggest we follow that pattern.

I don't want to spend much time at all looking at the charter itself. While we've got people here, I would like to move onto some discussion about the criteria for the independent examiner and a bit about the process of what we're going to do in the next couple of months. So if we can have maybe five minutes most in terms of the charter and then we can get onto the criteria.

Alan's hand is up. Alan, you're next. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Given the rather poor turnout, I don't think we're in the position to approve the charter in this meeting. I do agree that if anyone has any comments, they should be voiced now. But then we have to set

a relatively near deadline for comments from anyone else before it gets forwarded to the ALAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. In fact, I would like this as an agenda item. We have an ALAC meeting tomorrow. I'm having to talk to this charter as part of tomorrow's meeting and then have allowed others who have the time in which if people have comments, they can make comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest we want comments from the working party before we can go to the ALAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Siranush, do you have your hand up? Go ahead please.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, thank you. My question was actually related to the independent examiner. Is there a list of examiners or are we going just to find out?

HOLLY RAICHE: Let me first interrupt [inaudible] can answer that. I'd imagine there are a number of organizations that do this kind of work. We would know about them and a Request for Proposal will be sent out to known organizations as well as made publicly available. So, it would be open.

Obviously, you're not going to select someone unless you've had a chance to look at their proposals and assess their proposal against the criteria we've established. But there are always organizations you know about. You go to them but you also go out to the public. The rest, however, are not [inaudible].

LARISA GURNICK:

Absolutely right. Through the years of ICANN conducting these types of reviews, there's been a number of companies that have participated in the process. Specific to this review, there will be a Request for Proposal that will go out to ask broad and diverse group and will be as well publicized as we possibly can to result in good and diverse proposals from different people, not just people that have done reviews before, but perhaps others that would be qualified, as well, and that it will be part of the process of reviewing the proposals and evaluating them based on the specific criteria that will move towards the selection of the independent examiner.

Since I have the floor, let me just say that staff is working on coming up with solutions to the question that was raised by Alan and others about the ability of at least ALAC Chair to participate in the process to whatever degree that might be possible to still maintain the independence and objectivity of the selected examiner, so please stay tuned. We're working on a couple of different ideas and we'll get back to you with the answers to those questions. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Larisa. Right now the next task – and this is probably going to take hopefully no more than about five minutes, maybe ten – are there any changes or suggestions or additions or emissions that people would like to make to this charter before it goes to the ALAC meeting tomorrow? People have comments on this particular charter as provided?

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I suggested, I think we need input from the rest of the working party, too, and I do not believe it will be on the agenda tomorrow. The meeting tomorrow is quite full as it is. But that doesn't mean we can't – the ALAC can't – take a decision very soon after the meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted to get to the record, so it's in the transcript for Spanish. I do have proposed a change re: the X Factor popped in on the time commitment at the moment. I would propose that that language is changed to remove any [inaudible] value at all and say that there is an expectation for at least attendance at weekly meetings.

Obviously at those weekly meetings also allocate additional tasks and jobs, so we may want to have a second sentence there that says, "And to undertake whatever tasks established at those meetings," and I think

that would cover it perfectly well. If we do less than weekly meetings, well then so be it, that we can all have weekly meetings of [inaudible] 15 minutes if need be.

Regarding getting after, I hope, that friendly amendment on the X Factor put in, I would suggest that we could push out to the work party list perhaps as much as 48 or perhaps in 72 hours' worth of time for comments to go onto the Wiki and ask each and every one of them to indicate on the Wiki a comment, support, or otherwise. And then we can take that if it's [inaudible] and Alan should then be able to push that forward to the ALAC for any sessional review and assume ratification. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan, is that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's an old one. Sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, okay. Thank you. Alright, thank you, Cheryl. I think the suggestion – and I tend to agree with – in page two, it is the second paragraph and it would read the expected time commitment from members and participants of the At-Large Review Working Party is attendance at weekly meetings and tasks assigned at those meetings between the...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And time committed to undertake the task assigned at those meetings.

HOLLY RAICHE: More words are better than less, right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's have a sentence that [inaudible]. Alan will have it sooner if it doesn't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not agonize over this. Our charters never have time commitments in other teams.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know. I know.

ALAN GREENBERG: So why are we worrying so much about it?

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, I think the point of this one is to say, look, if you sign up for this particular working party, there's going to be a bit of work involved and please expect it's going to be looking to every working party...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That happens with everything, though, Holly. Let's tell them it'll be weekly meeting and assignments. Let's deal with it. Yeah. Why would you have a working party unless you are working?

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is if people have already signed up for it, it's a bit late.

HOLLY RAICHE: Exactly. Are there any other changes that people would like to make at this stage?

Okay, it's a little bit late now. I can do this in 24 hours, just change that sentence briefly. The main task for today – and thank you for the people who are on this call – for independent examiners, the standard qualities that ICANN looks for – and these were the qualities that were discussed in Dublin – includes demonstrated experience in conducting broadly similar examinations, possibly not-for-profit experience.

Now, there is a criteria that was suggested, basic knowledge of ICANN, at our last informal meeting. We questioned whether that's sensible because there are very few organizations that undertake these kinds of reviews that would actually understand the workings of ICANN, and that says a bit about ICANN, but we won't go there. So we have to think of a criteria that would suggest at least a bit of knowledge as to how to manage an organization such as ICANN. So we'll work on that one.

Other suggested criteria could be things like knowledge of geographic approach [with] diversity. Are we looking for multilingualism? What are we looking for? I would actually like to have criteria – it will assist Larisa

and her team in developing the sorts of criteria for the person that we're looking for.

My first suggestion, instead of having a criteria on basic knowledge of ICANN, if I were to have a criteria, it might be basic knowledge of ICANN or similar global multi-stakeholder organizations. Does that assist at all?

Alan, you're first off the mark here. Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Larisa's group has lots of experience in engaging consultants to review parts of ICANN. I really would suggest that we not try to do what they already have lots of experience for, but look at the things that are unique to ALAC and to At-Large and try to identify the criteria. I suspect it's not even really a criteria. It's a list of assets that would help in doing this kind of review compared to one that might be done of the Nominating Committee or the Board or the GNSO or any of the host of other reviews that have been done in the past.

Things like non-profit experience to the extent that it's going to be necessary, that's already one of the established criteria. I'll suggest that, in fact, the groups that do these kinds of reviews, they do them almost exclusively on non-profit groups. For-profit organizations don't tend to do this kind of review, at least not on my experience.

So I would, to a large extent, put a focus on what things are different in this review that might not have shown up in some of the other organization reviews that ICANN has done. And again, I'm not sure they're absolute criteria, but list of assets that the potential examiners...

It will help us to the extent they possess them. Certainly diversity language skills, things like that, are among those. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: So we've got language skills? What do you mean by diversity?

ALAN GREENBERG: Diversity? Knowledge of the concept of diversity, why it is important, how we handle it, how we should be adapting our rules to it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier? Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did you want Olivier first?

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, you've got your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know, but you called on Olivier.

HOLLY RAICHE: He doesn't have his hand up. I'm going to call people that [don't] have their hand up. Your hand is up first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier has a full mouth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And a restaurant behind you by the sound of it. Okay, while you finish chewing that piece up, Olivier, I'll see if I can say most of the things that you'll be wanting to say then.

Alright, I whole-heartedly support Alan in some sort of sentence that indicates to the people looking at the independent examiner that we believe that while diversity is important to ICANN in general, it is an essential aspect of the At-Large Community. We are already the, arguably, most diverse by several different measures group engaged in ICANN at all and that some of the characteristics we would be looking for would be showing that perhaps some understanding, if not experience, in not only recognizing the importance of diversity to an organization like ICANN but working with the diversity that we are would be useful. He could have some sub-bullets which would include, obviously, the cultural diversity, the socio-economic diversity, the diversity and nature of the types of At-Large Structures we already have, the ability to interact and interview in a variety of languages and at a variety of points in time.

And notice I am not asking for language skills because you don't have to have people speaking 19 freaking languages to make you competent. We have to be able to interact perhaps in 19 freaking languages, but not necessarily have people on the payroll who speak them. So I'm less concerned about the curriculum vitae of language skills of those who

become employed as I am the effectiveness and ability of the interaction and interrogatory processes that they'll be undertaking.

And of course, it will mean in my view that probably experience in a wide and multi-cultural, global scene would be useful. That may mean that there's even work for NGO and even governmental organizations and that's fine by me. While language is essential, it is the ability to work with the diversity that we have and understand the diversity that's the most important and critical thing from my point of view.

Have you finished your mouthful, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly have and I have stepped out in order to be able to speak.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Olivier, next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. One of the difficulties of speaking after Cheryl is that of course it takes all the words out of your mouth. She has already covered a lot of things regarding cultural diversity and so on. And as you know, dinner is [inaudible] in France.

Coming back to this, I think that there's perhaps one aspect which I haven't heard about yet and that's volunteer workload overload. I don't know whether any specific skills are needed to analyze this. We keep on

hearing and we've heard in other parts of ICANN that in At-Large is we're all made up of volunteers. So [inaudible].

Holly, you were about to say something.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah. It's a very good point because we really are volunteers and I don't know whether that translates into an actual criteria but it is, as Alan put it, one of the characteristics of us. I don't know how that translates, but it's a very good thought and I hadn't had it before, so thank you. Keep going.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Holly. If I may, this time I'll steal the words from Cheryl. It's about working smarter and not harder. I think that demonstrates through this. If we can demonstrate through this that there is a need for the ability to make the workload on volunteers less heavy by doing some smart things, and this I guess the review will be able to suggest.

At that point, it really stops volunteers from having to run around and do things that are very time-consuming, but not very productive, and actually get them to do things that are both productive but at the same time also that brings them the kind of happiness that they would feel when they have accomplished something. Because, ultimately, they're not getting paid, so I guess one of the things that drives them is the feeling of accomplishment. And that sometimes is difficult to discern in some cases.

I don't know whether there is any aspect of this that needs to be tackled in a certain way or whether we need to have an expert that looks at this and analyze or ask volunteers for suggestions on this. But I do think it's an important topic.

On the rest, everything I've heard so far sounds absolutely fine. Regarding the ALAC having to sign up from the charter, I would highly suggest that this should be the case. I do have a question. Since we're all going to focus on the RALOs – and in fact we should – I'm not quite sure how the relationship between the RALOs and the ALAC will work. Do the RALOs also have to sign in on that or do they sign in through their ALAC [inaudible]? Maybe something we might need to discuss. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Olivier, I think we can discuss that offline. But given that the ALAC has got RALO representatives, and taking up Cheryl's point, which is we would have a limited timeframe in which RALOs would have an opportunity to consult and make suggestions, leaving it up on the Wiki, and if there are no comments, there are no comments. But it gives people an opportunity for the RALOs to comment. I think we do have to leave time for the RALOs to comment.

Before Cheryl, I just want to ask other people. I want to ask Eduardo, Maureen, and Siranush for any other suggestions. Are there things that we left off? Eduardo? I'm going to call on all of you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He's not there. He's gone.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm here. I was muted.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. That's alright. I would like your feedback on what you think we want in an independent examiner.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I was going to say what Alan said. I was hearing. We should look at what the GNSO, for example, did – what kind of requirements. And then use that as a base and then add or take out the things that are peculiar to ALAC and that would run faster.

HOLLY RAICHE: What do you think is peculiar to ALAC aside from the peculiar personnel?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, we are like an Advisory Committee. We don't establish policy. We go out and actually try to recruit more ALSes into the At-Large. So those [inaudible].

Let me think and I will come back to you. But those are the two things that come to my mind right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Siranush and Maureen? What do you think are—
Siranush, go ahead.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: I also agree with what has been said. Related to volunteerism, I think that it is not actually – the meaning of this is completely different not only within At-Large but within the ICANN world itself or independent reviewer. The first thing to know, ICANN and how it works would be really an important criteria for the selection.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Possibly some at least beginning understanding of ICANN and maybe that can be imparted in briefing.
Aida, you had your hand up?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Holly, this is Maureen. Is it my turn?

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen, go for it. Yes, please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, actually, I just wanted to say – I don't have much to add to what's already been said – but I did think about and I guess it's part of the diverse roles that we have in regards to like Outreach and Engagement Group on a local level and how that's supposed to translate towards

ICANN. I don't know how you put that in, but there is supposed to be – what is the impact? What is the impact of At-Large outside of ICANN?

HOLLY RAICHE: Hello? Maureen, you got cut off.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Did we lose her? I think we did.

HOLLY RAICHE: Is Aida available? Oh, Wolf. Wolf, bless you. You're not allowed to just type.

Maureen, go ahead. The line became very bad just in the middle of your sentence.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I just wanted to say – I'm not quite sure where it goes into, but to do with the impact that At-Large has outside of ICANN. I mean, I don't know how they would assess that, but it's one of the really important parts of our role. That's my two cents.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Now, Wolf, you were going to type but do you have anything to add? After that, I want to hear from Aida who put her hand up. Wolf, do you have anything to add?

WOLF LUDWIG:

No. I have nothing to add. Go ahead, please, Aida.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. Aida, you had your hand up. Cheryl, you've had your hand up for some time. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Holly. I put my hand up, first of all, to suggest that I'm absolutely not concerned about the RALOs signing off on our charter. The reason I'm absolutely not concerned about the RALOs signing off on our charter even though we will be focusing on the RALOs and the ALSes in the review is [inaudible] the working party charter.

So, frankly, my dear, they shouldn't give a damn. They have at least two-thirds, if not more, of the membership of the working party are all directly, if not 100% indirectly, because we do have a couple of NomCom appointees, of the working party comes from the RALO. So, let's not worry about that little bit of administrivia.

However, having put my hand up, and listening to the other input from the other members of the working party on today's call, I was particularly struck by the fact that one thing we possibly should do is make sure that the independent examiners in the request for quotations that will go out have access to what are our expectations and requirements of our At-Large Structures and our RALOs, both of which are easily taken off website links.

So I would suggest that it would be reasonable background information. It should give them what our expectations are of At-Large Structures

and what are our expectations of RALOs, and that should include the links to the appropriate bylaw aspects of that as well as the softer stuff that we have in our Rules and Procedure, etc. Just reference materials [inaudible]. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Larisa, I'm going to ask you now. Has that been of any assistance to you?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. Thank you. I made note of all of these items and this is very useful, particularly I would say the volunteerism. Not that no one has thought of the fact that ICANN is a volunteer-based organization, but I think there's definite value in making sure that the independent examiner fully appreciates what that means both in terms of the work that they're going to have to do, but also in the way that they will have to plan and coordinate their work and the impact and the workload of this group, as well as the rest of the community. So, yes, indeed. Very valuable and I appreciate the feedback.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. What I will do – or what maybe Heidi, Ariel can do – is leave a little [space]. If people want to add criteria in the next days, that's terrific. I think the next task in front of us and we can start on it now but we don't necessarily have to [inaudible] – first of all, we need to identify, and we can do this over the next – now we've got a bit more time – weeks. Who are the people and positions who actually

should be interviewed separately one-on-one by the independent examiner and what should we be asking them? What should we be asking of ourselves? So if people have got some initial thoughts, that would be really useful because that will be the next lot of information that Larisa will need.

So are there any initial thoughts? Because we have got 10 minutes to start thinking about that as well.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can I?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Yes, please. Eduardo, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will say that the [inaudible] actual chair of the RALO, and maybe a [vice] chair from one of the RALOs. That will be nice to talk to, [inaudible]. That's just an idea. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's a good start. Thank you very much. Alan, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think pretty much anyone in an officer or quasi-officer position, or perhaps passed for the senior positions, should be

interviewed. Certainly we're looking at the chair, the vice chairs of the ALT, the ALAC. Chairs and secretariats of the RALOs. A selection of the past ones. A selection of ALS representatives. And I think that selection should be done with the support with the help of the people I've already mentioned.

There may be some need for a random selection, but on the other hand, we also know we have a very wide range, and if you want to get good input, you probably want to talk to at least some people who actually have some experience. I think that's going to form the bulk of the interviewees within At-Large proper. Then there's the rest of the community that has to be looked at as well, of course.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think that's right. I would emphasize, too, we have to think, given that this is a focus on the RALOs and the ALSes, we're going to have to make sure that we manage to get input both on the RALO structure itself and then get into somehow the ALSes, what works and what doesn't work, because the ALSes are, in fact, if you will, the bottom rung of the multi-stakeholder model. So we need to hear from that as well, and I hadn't thought through how we [inaudible] do that, but we've got to think about that.

In terms of surveying methodology – and we've got now just about eight minutes – have we started to think about what should be in the surveys that people do as part of the 360 review?

Larisa, I have a question here. Are the 360 review questions standard, or do we input into that?

LARISA GURNICK: Holly, we have a standard template that we work from to ensure that we cover all the criteria for the review, so there is a baseline to work from. Then you will absolutely have input into making those... Expanding on those questions and also ensuring that they're applicable and relevant to your unique organization. So a little bit of both. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. So, in fact, probably the input you want is who do we want to talk to? Well, who does the survey, and will that list of people who do the survey, will that be the same as the list of people who should be interviewed separately?

LARISA GURNICK: If I understood your question correctly, you are asking what the relationship is between the people that the independent examiner will interview in a one-on-one interview format, and how that might impact the survey questions. What I can speak to is that, to a certain extent, that will be driven by the professional expertise and experience that the independent examiner brings to the table.

The way this happened for the GNSO review was that the survey – the online survey – happened first, and the questions were formulated with input from the basic template that I referenced, as well as a great deal of input from the review working party, and of course the independent

examiners' professional guidance, if you will. That happened first before the one-on-one interviews were conducted.

Lessons learned from that experience suggest that, ideally, it would be better to conduct one-on-one interviews because that allows for broader understanding and depth that can then be incorporated in the kinds of questions that are developed and worded for the online survey. So I would propose that that would be the order of activity – the one-on-one interviews first, which will then inform how to conduct an online survey and how to formulate questions, of course with input from this group.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Now, I'm not sure if you've been reading the chat, but there's a very interesting conversation going on in the chat about ALSes. Let me just start with the question from Wolf. "What are the handicapped for little engagement by many ALSes?" And it has to do with the following conversation in the chat about the participation of ALSes that were certified, why they were de-certified, why they were involved, why they were not involved, which says to me that some of the surveys should attempt to talk about ALSes that have been de-certified [inaudible] if we can get a hold of them. And that may be part of the questions we're asking.

Wolf, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Yes. Thanks a lot. Basically, I think it would be theoretically a good question to include or interview those ALSes or representatives who have been after some years or meanwhile de-certified. It will be a very practical problem, because before we asked for de-certification, we tried several times to get in contact with them by informing them about our intent if they are not responding, then unfortunately blah-blah-blah, we have to de-certify them.

The point was that we didn't get in contact with them at all. In my opinion, it will be some kind of a useless endeavor to re-try to get in contact with people. In many cases, it's my impression they are not the ones in the organization in [charge] by now, are not the same who have applied years ago for certification, and half of the ones who have applied at the time are not in the [office]. The successors somehow are not even conscious that their organization has been certified members at EURALO or at any other RALOs.

So I think it would be a waste of time and energy to re-try it because we wouldn't get much info. I think it's most probably the simple reason that there has been a change of personnel in the organization, what [inaudible] sufficient answers why they didn't contribute any longer and were not interested anymore.

But we have to concentrate on those ALSes who are still participating, let's say, or who are still members but who do not contribute a lot or contribute perhaps only once a year when they are almost forced for any [inaudible], etc.

So the lowest level of participation, in my opinion, should be a factor for our research and we should concentrate on the barriers for the low participation and we should not so much concentrate on those who are regularly participating. That's just an observation from my side. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Wolf. We're almost out of time, but Alan, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Part of my hand up was saying I have to leave. Clearly, if someone stormed off and said, "I don't want to belong anymore," they may be a good one to interview. Someone who [inaudible] two years is probably not the best. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And, Larisa, I think there is an interesting interchange there. We are now at the hour. I want to thank everybody. Larisa, I hope you came away with some help in the sorts of information that you needed.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes. Thank you very much. Holly, you suggested that if people have other ideas or come up with additional thoughts that those would be sent our way. I would just like to reiterate that that would be really helpful as we prepare the RFP draft and start incorporating all these items into the document. We still have some time to incorporate additional thoughts and ideas. So thank you very much for that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Thank you, everyone. For those people on ALAC, we'll talk to you tomorrow. Ariel, if you could put some of this information on the wiki, so that if people do want to concentrate – sorry, contribute – that there's a space to do so. Thank you, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Holly, just before you go, are you going to get staff to send out a link to the draft charter so that once that edit has been done with the [inaudible] and ask for comments over the next 72 hours from the work party? That would be an action item. That's all.

HOLLY RAICHE: Ariel? Thank you.

ARIEL LIANG: I have recorded the action item.

HEIDI ULLRICH: One quick question I wasn't clear on. In the charter, in addition to the [inaudible], do we also put in the selection—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No time. We're not putting in time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, I have that. No time. Leave the X there, but do we include the selection...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No X. [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: I will just redo that sentence and send it to you right now, okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you. I also wanted to ask, do we also include the selection criteria and evaluation criteria?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. There's no point in having it in the charter.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, perfect. Then do we add that text to a wiki so they can comment on those as well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That would be really useful. I wouldn't put it in the charter, but some of the comments and suggestions would be really useful because it would then assist people in coming up with additional thoughts.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's what wiki pages are for. Thank you, Heidi, for thinking of that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Adios!

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, all. The meeting has been adjourned and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call. Enjoy the rest of your day!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]