TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party call, taking place on Monday, the 23rd of May, 2016, at 19:00 UTC.
	If I could please remind everyone to please utilize your mute button when not speaking. To mute on the telephone, it's *6 to mute and *7 to unmute, or on the Adobe Connect room you can highlight your name and select the "Mute" button.
	On the call today, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Siranush Vardanyan, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Maureen Hilyard, Ali AlMesahl, and Aida Noblia. We have listed apologies from Alberto Soto and Wolf Ludwig. From the ITEMS Team, we have Tom Mackenzie. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Larisa Gurnick, Silvia Vivanco, Lars Hoffmann, 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 to also allow our Spanish interpreter to identify you on the Spanish channel.
	Thank you very much. I'll hand it back over to you, Holly.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you, and thank you, everybody. Welcome to the first of what's going to be many calls about the ALAC Review. This is the first where we actually have an ITEMS Team person, Tom Mackenzie. We're going to get know and love Tom very well, as well.

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.

Today, our top duty is to identify for Tom the issues that are most important to us, At-Large, what we think the key objectives of the Review are, and any other feedback that we have. I am Chair of this group, but Cheryl is a very worthy co-Chair. She will get back into the room at some point.

I could also say good morning to Lars, who is ICANN staff. You will also get [inaudible] as well. So good morning, Lars, and everybody else.

It says on the agenda, "Introduction of the ITEMS Team" – it is 5:00 this morning – which is Tom. So, Tom, good morning. And do you want to introduce yourself and talk about your team?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. Yes, yes, yes. That would be good. Good morning, and good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. So my name is Tom Mackenzie, and I am part of the ITEMS International Team and part of the consortium which we have set up to carry out this review. It's a big day for us today, and we're very pleased to have got this far, to have been awarded the contract to carry out this review. It's a major deal for us. We know that it's going to be a challenging year ahead. But it's something that we're excited about.

And I think that we have, on the line today, we should all be here. But it's just possible that the fourth member of our team, Nick Thorne, I'm not entirely sure that he's connected yet.

NICK THORNE: I'm here, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Ah, yes, he is. He is.

NICK THORNE: I am here.

TOM MACKENZIE: Right, good. Good. All is well. In that case, we will be able… I'll sort of just say one or two words of introduction, and then I'll hand over to my teammates so that they can present themselves, because this really is – and I should insist, even though we have applied under the name of ITEMS International, we have formed a consortium. And so we are four independent consultants who will be carrying out this Review.

So I think we're going to have a slightly longer slot during the call. So perhaps I won't go into too much detail right now about what it is that we're going to do. But just, if you like, a word from me about my background, if you like. I have been working at ITEMS International, which is a [paraspace] consultancy since 2009, when we were awarded the contract at ICANN to do the review of the ccNSO. So it's basically since then that I entered into the interesting and fascinating world of ICANN. At the time, it seemed like a wonderful and complicated world, but it is one that I have sort of learned to understand. We carried out that review process for a year. And then a year later, we were awarded a second review contract. And this time, it was for the ASO, so a very different community altogether.

EN

Aside from reviews, much of my work has been concerned with issues of Internet governance, the gTLD program. So working with clients in France on those kinds of issues and other issues, like DNSSEC. So as part of ITEMS International, we are very much concerned with the issues that ICANN is concerned with. And so we're very much looking forward to the year ahead, working on this new review.

So I won't say much more now, but just hand over and introduce the team that I am very proud to be working with. So, Nick, if you're there, could you maybe – I might hand it over to you.

NICK THORNE: Yes, sure. My CV speaks for itself. I was a UK Diplomat and ended my career at the time as an Ambassador to the UN in Geneva in 2008, after which I was invited to be the International Relations Advisor to the then-CEO, Paul Twomey, at ICANN. I did that for three years, until shortly after a man called Rod took over the reins when I left.

Since then, I've been working independently as a consultant to various people, mostly on Internet governance issues, but also with Public Interest Registry on their .NGO gTLD initiative. I am delighted to be doing this. It's good to be back among friends at ICANN. And I think perhaps the most important thing, which Tom has already said, is that we're a pretty disparate group, but we insist upon being objective while listening in the first stages of our work, to anybody who wants to talk to us. I think the difficulty is going to be deciding when we stop listening and start doing.

Maybe to the next member.

TOM MACKENZIE: Rosa? Rosa, if you're there, I think maybe just say a few words.

ROSA DELGADO: Hello? Hello, are you listening?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, we can hear you, Rosa.

ROSA DELGADO: Okay, sorry. Anyway, I've been involved quite a lot in the Internet areas, ICANN, from its inception in '98. I'm from the Latin American region but living between Geneva and Peru. Been participating in Internet governance issues and [inaudible] structure, mainly working last year in the field in Africa, Sierra Leone, and [inaudible] India. And also ISOC Trustee, ISOC Trustee. And I've been participating in ICANN, especially integration for New gTLDs .aero and .post. The last one in 2012, .eurovision and then the .radio, which I hope will get it. And now I've been involved also in pushing IPv6, especially in Peru, through the IPv6 [inaudible] Peru, which I am president. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Tim? Tim? Are you able to… We can't hear you. Let me see. Do we have an issue with a mic?

HOLLY RAICHE: Welcome to ICANN call.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, welcome.

TOM MACKENZIE: Well, as soon as Tim comes, we should give him a few minutes to introduce himself. But if there was any kind of question, Tim is a very prominent figure in the Internet governance world. He's someone that I first met while I was doing the review as part of the ASO. He was in Africa, where he was one of the – Tim?

TIM MCGINNIS: Yes, I'm back. I'm here.

TOM MACKENZIE: Ah, good. Good, good, good. Sorry, I was actually starting to introduce you, but I think you would do a much better job. So I'll hand it back to you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you. I guess we had a little TCP/IP hiccup. Thank you for introducing me as prominent. I'm not sure how prominent I am. As Tom was telling you, I did live and work in Africa. I [thrive] in Internet development and Internet governance issues, mostly on the numbers side. But I have worked on the naming side. I've been involved at ICANN for over a decade, mostly from the ASO side, working as staff, where a

regional Internet registry and chairing the policy development working group of another regional registry.

I guess I first met Rosa in Geneva during the WSIS Summit, where I was an ISOC Ambassador. So I have, like most of you, over a decade of experience in the ICANN arena. And many of you are quite familiar to me, and vice versa. And I am also quite pleased to be working on this review for the next year, and we will kick it off very shortly.

TOM MACKENZIE: So that sort of wraps up, if you like, the quick presentation for our team. So there's lots of things that we would like to say just in general, general impressions and thoughts about the review. But we can see that there's an agenda, so we're happy to follow that and to present to you our thoughts as and when appropriate.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And I should have said right up front to do what I didn't do, which is to identify yourself and to speak slowly, because we do have an interpreter and because, like all ICANN calls, it is being transcribed and recorded. So speak slowly please.

We do have [participation] on the screen, and we've got both Larisa and Cheryl on the line. Larisa, do you want to talk a little bit about the revised timeline and a little bit about, to refresh people's memory? And then what we can do after that is go to item number 4 on the agenda, which is really [inaudible] you and everybody else to ask what are the

important questions for us, for the objectives, and to get some feedback.

So, Larisa, do you want to walk through the slides.

LARS HOFFMANN: Holly, if you don't mind, I'll take on the slides, if that's okay with you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Lars, go ahead. Thanks.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Holly, and hello, everyone. We're jumping a little bit forward and back, which is obviously not a problem. I think I'm moving just the five-minute presentation, item 5. I'll run through that right now. I hope that's okay. It will cover the timeline, and other things as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, that's fine.

LARS HOFFMANN: So it's just a quick overview of the scope of work that ITEMS is going to conduct as part of this review. It's taken from the respective contracts. The improvements, they are to assess the effectiveness of the improvements resulting from the previous review, as well as the effectiveness of the components of the At-Large community: ALAC, Regional At-Large Organizations, and At-Large Structures. The last

review, as some of you might remember, focused primarily on ALAC. The current review will cover all components and will focus a lot on the other structures not covered by the last review, such as the RALOs and the ALSes.

Here's the quick roadmap that Holly was referring to. As you can see, we have the little May flag on left here. We're launching the review today, I suppose, officially with you on board. Then over the next couple of months, ITEMS, with the help of the Working Party, will start to develop some interview questions and conduct some interviews. Followed by that, there will be a community survey. In October, more or less, there will be the preliminary reports.

Sorry, the slide's just moving along. If you could just not scroll for the time being, that would be great.

So in October, there will be preliminary findings. And November, roughly, will be a draft report that will then be open for public comment, which should close around January, with a final report hopefully in March presented to the Working Party. And then upon finalization by the Working Party, it should be presented to the community roughly in April next year. So this is where we're looking, timeline-wise.

Here's a quick overview of the roles and responsibilities of – I can hear background. Is there a question? No. I'll just continue then.

Quick overview of the roles and responsibilities of the various parties that take part in this review. The Working Party, obviously, is perform the self-assessment; to assist also with the review methodology. So

working closely in that respect with the independent examiner, with ITEMS. They're there to assist with outreach and engagement, obviously. Help to input into data collection; and provide clarification factual corrections, if and when they might be applicable, to help out the independent examiner there. And of course, a little bit further down the line, prepare the Review Implementation Plan.

ITEMS is the examiner. I'm sure they will be talking about this later on in their presentation. They are assessing the effectiveness of prior review improvements, as I said earlier. In that, they will be reviewing documents and records. They observe proceedings. They will be present at the Helsinki meeting, obviously. Develop and conduct surveys, conduct interviews. And then getting to the media bit, prepare a report. And obviously, their job is to engage with stakeholders for clarification and, if necessary, corrections as well.

The OEC is the ICANN Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee. They are the body that basically oversees this review. They set the scope of it. They were the ones that made the final selection of the independent examiner. They will accept the report when it's published, and then approve the Implementations Plans, once they've been proposed by the community.

And then finally, MSSI staff, the Multi-stakeholder and Strategic Initiatives Department – that is Larisa, Charla, and myself – we're here. We have run the bidding process that led to ITEMS being selected. We had to monitor timelines and resources. That means community time, as well as budget resources for the review. We will support the review, where and if possible. We support, obviously, the outreach and

engagement efforts, and also manage the report and the public comment processes that will follow.

And the Policy staff – so Heidi's team – will then help with the preparation of the Review Implementation Plan once the final report has been published, at some point next year in the spring.

Just one final slide, and then I'm done. It's just a quick overview from staff. And this is our perspective, what worked and what needed a little bit of improvement from GNSO Review that some of you might know has concluded relatively recently. The Board will, in fact, vote on the recommendations in Helsinki.

We felt what worked very well was the Working Party to be seen and act, in fact, as the voice of the community, and thereby providing continuous input in the review process. It was a very well organized and focused approach. The Working Party adopted that work. That worked really well. The public comment format also was something that went down very well and was very effective. The Working Party also wanted the recommendations that were published, they produced a Feasibility Assessment and Prioritization of Recommendations Report, which will be very useful for the Board and the OEC when it comes to the implementation of the various recommendations. And we think that that is something that we maybe can look at as well when the At-Large Review comes around to that at some point next year.

The things that maybe needed a little bit of improvement, I alluded to that just the slide previously. The timeline to reflect community workload, you guys are all very busy. You have a lot of things on your

plate. This is probably not your only conference call with ICANN today. We need to be all aware of our commitments. And, you know, that should be reflected in the way the review is conducted.

I'm not going to read through all of it. The presentation will be posted. But some of the GNSO community, for example, mentioned that the recommendations that were provided for their review, they weren't always very clear, and they weren't always as implementable as maybe they would have thought. So that is definitely something we'll be working on during this review. And also, we will make sure that the community is as engaged and informed at all times, and we hope to work very well with the Working Party to make sure that that happens.

And with that, I'm going to hand it back over to Holly, unless there are any questions. I'm happy to answer them now or at the end, depending on how you want to run this, Holly. Yeah, thank you. Back over to you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Lars. We have got one hour, and I'm looking at the agenda. I'm not sure we're going to fit everything in, but I'm determined we will fit everything within an hour.

Tom, we've got two things. I was going to ask you, what would you prefer? We've got 15 minutes, which looks to be just general discussion about issues that are important to us, what we see as key objectives and general feedback. But we've also got time for a presentation that looks to be 30 minutes on next steps and Q&A. In terms of your work starting now, what would you prefer to come first?

TOM MACKENZIE: A discussion about your priorities for the review. And if you like, we can sort of combine that with our thinking about how we have developed our own vision for what the review should be. And I think we'll find, because we've already had some interaction with ICANN staff, that I think we'll find that we hope and we think that we are on very much the same wavelength as to how this review should be conducted, the requirements of transparency and [inaudible]. I think it's a conversation that we can probably have in a very interactive way. You present to us, or I can present to you, with elements of a short presentation that we've prepared. I think that this section would be good right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. And I'm noticing at the end, we do have to talk about Helsinki and what we're going to do in Helsinki, what you are hoping to achieve in Helsinki, as well as what we're hoping to achieve.

Why don't we start with the first question, what are the issues that are most important to us? I'm happy to open the floor, first of all, to ALAC members. And of course, Cheryl has got her hand up first. So, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. I take it my audio is okay for the interpreter, or someone will ping me.

A couple words first. Most of you have worked with me in the past, and I am very pleased to be working with all of you in the future. But of

course, you do need to recognize that the first ALAC review, which was, of course, only the second review ever conducted – the GNSO one hadn't even been completed when ours has begun – was done under my watch and implemented with one, if any, minor exception under Olivier's reign. So I hope that you all, as the [inaudible] examiner, feel very comfortable of tapping into any or all of the resources that we bring to the Work Party here. Now, I'd like to think that we'll be working fairly closely and fairly regularly with you all, because we've brought the [brains trussed] for you to play with.

We've also brought, with the Work Party, some very important outreach and engagement opportunity by having a regionally balanced set of members, where, whilst not all of them are on today's call, you'll find you have at least two, and in some cases up to three or four, people who are willing, able, and interested to help you engage with the Regional At-Large Organization in their region and, of course, the various At-Large Structures. So I'd like to think that we can pretty much make this a highly efficient and highly effective process.

I just want to make a plea. And this is for some of you perhaps not something they'll want to hear. With the exception of Heidi, none of you were around for the first ALAC review. None of you were around, other than, of course, members – and Olivier and Alan, obviously – were around for our implementation process. And whilst we've learned a great deal out of the GNSO Review, can I just say, this is the last time I want to see a presentation looking at what we've learned from the GNSO Review process? The Work Party and the leadership have taken it into account in our planning. So thank you. Now let's put that to bed.

Let's get on to our review, which is fresh and will grow on the foundations of it. But to be honest, I've had enough of comparison to GNSO, second review, as opposed to building on our third.

Thank you, Holly.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I can always count on Cheryl for a lead-in to what I was going to say, even though we haven't discussed anything ahead of time. I wanted to highlight one of the differences between At-Large and pretty much everything else in ICANN. And it certainly applies to the GNSO and the GNSO Review, but it applies to other parts as well, and it applies to the ASO and the ccNSO, which you have done reviews on.

This is a volunteer organization. Now, we use the term "volunteer" in ICANN very loosely. So we take people who earn hundreds of thousands of dollars a year from their employer, who are sent to ICANN as part of their employment, and are called volunteers.

We are volunteers. Virtually nobody in At-Large has a day job where their employer cares about ICANN, cares about the Internet, for the large part of us. Any time that we put into this meeting, to a large extent, is truly volunteer time. And that means when people go to meetings, they often tend to be taking vacations. It puts us in a different perspective than the GNSO or the other groups, where largely they are here and participating because of what they do in real life.

Now, that doesn't mean some people aren't more passionate than others and don't really care. And there are a few volunteers here and there. But to a large extent, At-Large is unique in that all of us are here because we care, not because we're paid to be here, not because someone is telling us what to do. And I think that's an important thing to consider as we go forward. It really does put a different spin on things. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Cheryl. I'm going to open up the floor. Tom, do you want to start off? What do you see as the most important issues? And then probably I'm looking for some other people who want to comment as to what are the most important issues for us. So go ahead, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay, thank you. Well, just quickly, to respond to what Cheryl Langdon-Orr just said, is thank you for the offer of your institutional memory of the At-Large. That is something which we are going to count on quite heavily during the entire process, especially during the early stages of the review, when we really need to collect as much factual information as we can possibly get so that we can create what we refer to as a snapshot impression of the organization as it is today, and where it's come from. We need to establish that history and have that all clear as quick as possible.

So to the extent that you can provide us that information, and Olivier and others who have been in positions of responsibility during the

different review processes in the past, that is something which is going to be extremely valuable. And in fact, I wonder if we can establish, as a result of this call, some kind of mechanism for listing the resources which we need to refer to, somehow presenting all that information in a very simple e-mail or something, or a list of documents or something, or links maybe, ideally, links to resources that we need to be aware of. That would be wonderful.

One other point I might just mention on that is that it was mentioned in the RFP document that there was an ongoing, internally ordered review process being conducted by the At-Large community, a sort of self-review, as far as I understand. And there was some mention that the results of that internal process would be provided to us in the early stages of the review. So again, that's another document, the results of which we intend to take into account, obviously. And so as soon as that's available, we would like to have that too.

Oh yes, perhaps I should just mention very quickly about what Alan said, about the At-Large being a volunteer organization. I think we mentioned quickly in the introductory minutes of this call that we are, ourselves, a multidisciplinary team who are used to working with volunteer organizations. We understand the mechanics, the mechanisms, the difficulties, the politics of different kinds of volunteer organizations that we have worked with in our respective careers. And so the one thing we definitely are not going to do, in approaching this review, is to apply a set of magic formulas, management formulas, for addressing the problems that the At-Large community may have.

Our entire process is based on, in the first stages, listening. That's the word that we have all agreed is the key which defines the early stages of our review work. We're going to listen. We're going to listen to all the different constituent parties which make up the At-Large community. We're going to listen to you, the key representatives. We're going to go and find you in the different regions of the world where you are. One of us is going to attend a meeting per region. We will all be, or I think most of us will be, attending most of the ICANN meetings that take place during the review. If we can all be at all the ICANN meetings, we think that is optimal. And then one of us will be attending a meeting in Africa, the Asia region, the Latin American region, the North American region, and Europe. And if we can also attend sub-regions within those vast regions, well, then that might be a good idea too.

So in the first stages, we're collecting data, we're listening, and we're not particularly expressing our views. Not, at least, initially. We're just collecting, collecting, collecting. And we're perfectly aware that what we're going to hear is sometimes very contrasting views about the achievements of the At-Large. We know, having read the previous review, the Westlake review, that there are very polarized views sometimes that have been expressed, will no doubt be expressed, about this community. That's fine. That's entirely to be expected. And so we're going to just be listening and recording what we hear. Maybe we'll come to milestones a little bit later. But in the Helsinki meeting, we're hoping to, all of us, meet, quite a large number of people as part of that process.

So in the second phase, once we've collected all the data, we're going to start analyzing it. And that's when our role, as reviewers, really comes

in. we're going to assess all the different views and start working out how certain situations, certain conflicts, certain pain points within the system can be addressed. And we're going to start. It'll be the early stages of formulating recommendations, which is part of the review.

So that's the second phase. And that second phase is going to take us through to, well, pretty much towards the end of the year. And then, as we get towards the end of the year, we're going to start having our report, will start shaping up. And at that point, we're going to have real conclusions that are going to start to emerge, and recommendations that we're going to start making about ways that the At-Large community can be strengthened and improved.

I'll stop now, but only just to say, finally, before I hand the floor back, is that as we enter this review process, I think I can speak for all of us, all our team, when I say that we come as friends of the ICANN system, not as a hostile force coming in to give you a lesson or to correct things in a brutal kind of way, and to tell you to reinvent the wheel. That is not our intention at all.

What we appreciate, having worked in our different areas, the effort, the work, the time, the volunteer time, the incredibly amount of effort that has gone into building these systems and these organizations which maybe are imperfect, no doubt. But it's a miracle that they are there. What we intend to do, as reviewers, is to identify what's going right and what is not going right, and to do our best to figure out how we can help you identify solutions to strengthen yourselves as an organization, institutionally, and envisage the next five or six years before your next review.

And with that, I'll hand it back.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tom. First, I would note the action item on At-Large Review Leadership Team, but also to note we have a wiki, and a lot of documents are on the wiki already. I would say there's probably an action on you maybe to talk specifically to Cheryl, possibly Alan, and Olivier for anything else that needs to be found or needs to be paid more attention to.

The other point that Alan's making in the [group one], we have been involved in actually trying to reform ourselves, reform our Rules of Procedure, our structures. So aside from Alan and Cheryl, I would also say Maureen has done a lot of work. And, Maureen, probably you need to talk to Tom specifically about the work that you've done. So there's a lot that's happened that probably you need to get up to speed with, and I'm sure we're happy to help.

Next item, I think I would like to hear from Ali, from Siranush, from Le-Marie about item 4, and to hear from maybe us as to what we hope to get out of the review. And spend a little bit of time – we've got about 15 minutes left to talk to that. Have you actually got a presentation Tom? It's item 6.

TOM MACKENZIE: If you want. We can either go through the presentation – yeah, sure, I have. But I can talk you through a presentation if you want and if there's time.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm just questioning, is there time for anybody to talk? Because we've got about 45 minutes, and we've got 30 minutes for your presentation. And we do have to talk about Helsinki. So your call.

TOM MACKENZIE: So if we were to go through the presentation, would it be now?

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, if we [inaudible] –

NICK THORNE: Tom, could I suggest we talk about Helsinki?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yeah, I think, to be honest, our presentation covers much of what I've summed up just now. So there are a few things about the Helsinki meeting that we would discuss with you. So, yes, I agree with Nick that perhaps we should.

HOLLY RAICHE: Let's do that now and get some feedback, as well, from other people on this call about their own expectations about the review. So if you want to talk about Helsinki, what we want out of it, and then we can talk to you about what we want out of it.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. I notice Olivier has his hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, would you like to talk?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Holly. I just want to jump in while we're still on agenda item number 4, since afterwards we'll move to Helsinki and so on. I was going to share my – I can't call them expectations, because in this community, you don't have expectations. You just try to do as well as you can, and you hope for the best and you hope that everyone's on board and that things will go well.

I'm just hoping that, through this review, the real goal here is to actually enable the whole At-Large community. We have a 15-member At-Large Advisory Committee, we've got two or three leaders per region, and then we've got our At-Large Structures. And the whole pyramid, if you want, was designed specifically with the idea of stability in mind, because as some of you might remember, version 1 of the At-Large, which was actually version 1 of ICANN, ended up in a terrible mess due to capture. So the whole structure is actually there to provide some stability and certainly stop any kind of capture from happening, while still enabling the end users and being able to bring a raincoat into the ICANN policy processes.

Unfortunately, this whole stability also meant that the At-Large Structures, the end users, were put a little bit further, I would think, from the center of ICANN. Since we've got these various tiers of the ALS,

the RALO, the ALAC, the Chair of the ALAC. And then the fact that the ALAC is just an advisory committee, it's not actually designing policy, etc.

My concern over the years, when I was ALAC Chair, was that sometimes these At-Large Structures really felt a little bit too far away from where the action really was. And with the natural barrier that we have – Alan has mentioned earlier, and I think Cheryl mentioned that earlier as well – that many of our At-Large Structures don't really have any skin in the game of domain names and the business of domain names. They are just there because they care. They care about the multi-stakeholder model. They care about the Internet. They care about ICANN. My concern is that this distance is one which is somehow a bit of a barrier for them to be involved actively in policies.

And I really would like to see – I guess I've been in ICANN for too long, and many of us have been for a while. Sometimes it's good to get a fresh mind looking at this and to tell us, in a way, how can we improve the involvement of At-Large Structures? Not only just improve them in participating in ICANN, which I think often Global Stakeholder Engagement says, "We need to get more people participating in ICANN." Well, if ICANN was a social club, I would say, "Right, okay, we just have to get more people and get them to join." But ICANN is not a social club. It's an organization where policy gets developed, policy gets made. And therefore, I have the concern that we need to enable our At-Large Structures in participating in policy, not just participating at in coming to meetings, doing capacity building, etc. We need that policy to go from the ALAC Chair all the way down, and all the way up to the ALSes. And I've said down and up because we are talking, of course,

bottom up. But information flows towards the edge, and then from the edge back into the center.

And so that's my big concern. How do we get them to be more involved? How do we get At-Large to have more of a voice, to be listened to more? Because another concern I have is that ICANN sometimes behaves like a domain name association, like an industry association. And we end up with policies being made that, I would say, sometimes are very fringe policies. Do they really serve the public interest? That has been one of the big concerns in our community, seeing some policies being developed, some things being rolled out that don't really appear to be serving anyone but the pockets of applicants, the pockets of people that are involved in domain names, but not really the end users. And here, I'm not even talking about registrants of domain names. I'm talking here about Internet users, people whose only link to domain names is the DNS, is them typing a domain name in their browsers, sending an e-mail out, and then finding out if that works or not.

So that's the sort of angle that I hope the review will be able to look at. And I guess I've rambled enough, so I'll stop. But I hope I've shared with you the concerns that I have. And if you have any other questions, obviously, I'm glad to expand on any. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. Does anybody have anything else to say?

What I was going to add to Olivier is what we're hoping to do, if we're talking about policy, is not only to involve the end user, because that's a

little bit difficult. Everybody who's been involved in ICANN knows, getting people involved is a little bit difficult. We should be acting, at times… As we've got the knowledge about end users, getting them involved may be more difficult, but we should be acting for them and seeing them as not only constituents, but recipients of the policy that takes them into account. So a multi-stakeholder model includes not only the voices of the end user, but the voices for the end user, because involvement in ICANN, I've got to say, is not easy. It takes you a year just to learn the language, and that's no fun.

Maureen, I'm going to call on you, because I'm mean. Could you, just a couple words to Tom and Tim about what you've been doing, in terms of looking at the actual structures?

Are you awake?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, sorry. Holly, I was actually going to mention my views from the Pacific sub-region.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, yeah, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I just [am very keen] in this through this part of the review, the Working Party. The issue for me is I'm from the Pacific. The Pacific consists of over 20 separate countries, each with their own issues related to Internet connectivity and governance. And only a small

percentage of those countries are actually involved in ICANN at the moment. And I sort of see the Pacific as a bit of a black hole with regards to its interaction, as others have mentioned, by end users.

But the response from the communities and relations, especially to important Internet-related, domain name, DNS-related issues… And we have worked within the Pacific, those of us who have worked hard over the years to get some engagement from the communities, our end-user communities within each of these countries. And it's starting. We're starting to get some traction. But the Pacific isn't like China, or a large country where everyone's under one government system. Each country has their own political and socioeconomic agendas. So there's a mixed response to what ICANN views as important and what we, within At-Large, view as important.

And I'm sort of just hoping that from the review, we can actually find out how we, as ICANN representatives, can improve our outreach to some of these currently distant end users, and even more so the potential end users within the Pacific. And I think, as Olivier mentioned, to get them involved in ICANN policy development activities and get them engaged. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Maureen. Aida, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

Hello?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She'll be coming in via the Spanish interpreter.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep, I'm just waiting. I'm very patient.

AIDA NOBLIA: Can you hear me now?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

AIDA NOBLIA: Hello. Checking audio, can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, we can. Thank you.

AIDA NOBLIA: Thank you. Thank you very much. What I wanted to say is that I agree
                         with Olivier's comment, and other participants' comments regarding
                         end users' organizations. I am a rookie compared to all of you, and this
                         is the problem that I face where I am based, in my own organization. I
                         find it hard to spread the word about ICANN and to engage new
                         participants because everybody is busy, is fully booked. We are engaged
                         in topics that have to do with the Internet, with Internet users in our
                         region. However, participation in working groups shows that we have –
                         or I myself have – quite a workload.

We are focusing now on showcasing an event in LACRALO in Uruguay. We are the only ALS in Uruguay, so idea is that perhaps if we hold the event in Uruguay, we can get a higher level of engagement. On the one hand, people are short of time. And on the other hand, we want them to get involved by bringing a meeting or an event to their own place, to where they are based, and showing them the need of end user participation. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much, Aida. I haven't heard from Siranush. Are you on the call?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. What [inaudible] –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Inaudible] APRALO.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, I have problem with my voice. I don't want to speak too much.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, okay, type in. Type in. Type in.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: No, but I'll just say a couple of words. I am completely sharing the point Olivier mentioned, because we have a lot of engagement from ALSes in the sense that they are interested to become as an ALS. But when it comes to their policy level, we have a problem. So my expectation, to some extent, will be to understand what is the problem of making ALSes more active in policy level and we, as RALO leadership, can do to make this happen. So that's all for now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. You're breaking up, and your throat sounds terrible. Don't talk anymore. Thank you, Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yeah, I'm sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no, you've got an awful sore throat. I can hear it.

Okay. I think we'll ask, Tom, have you got some comments? And we can get on to Helsinki next and make sure that… Actually, do you want to do a bit of a presentation, but let's leave time or Helsinki? Because you've got –

TOM MACKENZIE: In a way, I can just respond very quickly to these very interesting remarks that have just been made, starting with Olivier. There's a

temptation, I think, when hearing this kind of thing, to want to jump into the discussion and to start thinking aloud the solutions that could be brought, and to why participation isn't what it should be, or what we would like it to be, that kind of thing. But I think it's our responsibility to hold back from making any precipitated remarks and just to say, really, that we know these are the issues that you're facing.

And our first priority is going to be to try and figure out what's going on. Why there are, as the second speaker – whose name I am afraid I've forgot, from the Pacific region –

HOLLY RAICHE: That was Maureen Hilyard.

TOM MACKENZIE: Marie. Marie.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen.

TOM MACKENZIE: Why there are regions of the world like yours, that are, as you said, black holes in the system. These are fascinating things to try and understand. We probably have inklings as to why it may be the case. We're going to try and, as I say, figure it out by going to meet you. So just to repeat in sort of two seconds, we're going to go to the regions. We're going to try and meet the ALSes and the people who maybe

should be ALSes, to try and get feedback from them as to why the situation is what it is today. That's what we're going to do through our entire process. So that's really, I think, all I will say at this point. And it's only, just to conclude on that point, later on in the review process that we will come back to you with constructed ideas about what we think is going on.

If you'd like, maybe we should go now to Helsinki, because there are one or two things we would like to say about how…

HOLLY RAICHE: Tom, first of all, Fatimata had her hand up. Did you want to speak? And we've got Aida again. So let's first hear from Aida and then Fatimata. And then, Tom, I'll go to you. But Aida first, please. We're waiting for the translation.

AIDA NOBLIA: Thank you. In connection to what you were saying before, if you're interested in visiting the regions, we are planning to hold an event on August the 30th and 31st. Maybe this is a good opportunity for you to visit our region. It is just a suggestion. But since you're now bringing that up, I am inviting you to visit us. Maybe you can come over to our region, and this may be a good opportunity for you to engage with us in Uruguay, in Montevideo, both the 30th and 31st. That's the aim of our event. And I just wanted to offer this invitation. Thank you so much.

TOM MACKENZIE: Well, that potentially can lead to a very interesting discussion that we would like to have with you, the At-Large community, the representatives of the At-Large community. The events, the regions of the world which we need to visit in order to be able to say at the end of the review process that we really have covered all the necessary bases, to be able to collect views from people on the ground in all the different regions of the world.

Now, Aida, you've just mentioned Uruguay. Of course, if we can manage, if we can get to Uruguay, if one of us can get to Uruguay to attend your meeting, that is a very interesting idea and one that we would like to consider but take very seriously, as we would also like to consider seriously attending one, or perhaps more, events in the different regions of the world.

Sometimes, in our own internal discussions, we have talked about Asia. And the definition of the Asia-Pacific region is so vast, it's impossible. It seems such a complicated thing to decide where you're going to land, you're going to meet the representatives of the Asia-Pacific continent, representatives of the Internet ecosystem.

Perhaps I should just say simply that we would like to put it to you that it's important for us to attend meetings in different parts of the world. If you think it's important that we should attend various meetings, we very quickly need to establish a list of the important meetings that are going to be taking place, a calendar of the key meetings that are taking place in the next 12 months. And then we have a difficult discussion – well, I don't know how difficult it's going to be, but we definitely have to have a discussion with ICANN as to whether there's going to be a

budget to attend these meetings. Because without a budget, obviously we can't do that.

At the moment, just so that you're clear, what we have agreed is that we will participate in ICANN meetings, the first of which obviously is Helsinki. And during those ICANN meetings, we will meet with as many people who are actually there as we can possibly meet. Obviously, the objective is to meet 100% of the At-Large community who's at the ICANN meetings. And so in addition to the ICANN meetings, we will also be attending one meeting per global region. So that's five additional global meetings. But, as I say, there could be many more. But if there are more, we'll have to negotiate an extension on the travel budget.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that is something that we will have to take on board, in terms of just being probably two or three of us, as well you, and as well as ICANN staff. But I think the idea of coming up with a calendar is a good one.

Fatimata, you've got your hand up.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could you speak up a little bit, please?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: [Inaudible] –

HOLLY RAICHE: I can't hear her.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: [Inaudible] the bottom-up process is not really assumed [inaudible] At-Large [inaudible] –

LARS HOFFMANN: Sorry, I actually can't hear very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Neither can I.

LARS HOFFMANN: Is that true for everybody?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: You can't hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Fatimata, if you can type into the chat what you want to say.

No, Aida, about two more minutes, but we've got a bit to go. So, Aida, briefly, if you can go ahead, please.

AIDA NOBLIA: Can you hear me? Checking audio.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Yes.

AIDA NOBLIA: Thank you. I wanted to say that next week, I should submit an application to the CROPP Program. And if you think it's suitable or appropriate, maybe you can give me further information, if you want to attend the event in my region, so that I can include you in my request within the CROPP Program. Let me say that I have no experience, but I am working on organizing this event. And if somebody needs any funding, maybe I can include you in the CROPP Request. This is what I wanted to volunteer. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Aida. I think we can take that offline. And, Heidi, can you liaise with Aida on Tom on that one, just to sort out what is or is not

possible? But I think the idea of a calendar of events is an important one, and we can work on that.

Moving right along, because we're going to run out of time if we're not careful –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, you didn't put your hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Now I've left my computer, so unfortunately I can't put my hand up. I was just going to add, there's already a calendar of events out there that's done by Global Stakeholder Engagement, by GSE, and by the different RALOs. So we've got this already well underway. And maybe we should share this with the team. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Excellent to hear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev Anand Teelucksingh also does an outreach calendar of events within regions that you might want to consult. But we are running out of time. Perhaps we should give the floor back to our guests.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: I was about to, yes. Okay, there are a couple of action items there for you, Tom. There are calendars that will help you out or that won't.

You were saying that it is important that we talk about Helsinki. Let's do that right now to make sure that we can get the Helsinki discussion in. So go ahead, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Well, okay. So the Helsinki meeting, there are several things, really, that we would like, before the Helsinki meeting to ask you, the community. I know that you've already made announcements, that ITEMS has been selected to be the reviewer for the At-Large. But to let it be known even deeper in the community, through the various mailing lists that you have, maybe through social media, all the different communication channels that you have that this is going on and that if you get a call or request for an interview or to respond to a survey from us, our team, then it would be nice if they could actually do so. In other words, really to push the message out as actively as you possibly can so that people start to know, even more so, who we are and what we're doing.

And also, related to that – and I think it's the last slide. We could just jump right to the last slide of this little presentation, which is that we have built a fairly comprehensive contact database, which we can share with you, if you like, and which we would like you to check and to add any names that we may have left off. And this list includes several categories of contacts. On one hand, it includes the 200 or so ALSes. And those groups, the 200 of them, we essentially consider to be targets for our survey. We want 100% of those ALSes should get e-mails and e-

mail reminders that the survey is going on. So to do that, we need all the contact information for those ALSes as soon as possible. We've got a database. It's a shared database. We can share it with you. And we need to get into that database. We feed into it all the e-mails and any other contact information you have to get in contact with them.

Just to finish with the ALSes, they are basically our targets for the survey. But we also plan to face-to-face interview at least five or six – we don't know; it's sort of hard to tell at this stage – representatives from all the different regions, from the ALSes in all the different regions. And then even finer than that, we want to have representatives of the different categories of ALS in the different regions. So for example, if we were to have five, it would be one ISOC chapter, one NGO interested in cyber-security, one consumer association, etc. We've already started categorizing the ALSes, and we're going to target at least one per category.

So that's as far as the ALSes are concerned. We need to have all their contact details. We've then got a second category of targets, which are the regular participants within ALAC and the At-Large RALOs, etc., that participate in ICANN meetings. In that list, we have about 70 names. And we intend to meet as many of those face-to-face as we possibly can over the course of the next year. And so again, all of those people need to be informed of what we're doing and to be strongly encouraged to agree to interviews and take part in the survey.

So that's as far as contacts are concerned. We needed to get that said, as far as preparations for Helsinki are concerned.

NICK THORNE: Tom, before you leave that issue, because I just have one thing.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes? Yeah, yeah.

NICK THORNE: Tom, you've covered the bottom-up business and the different sectors business very well. What we've heard during this call, one, I think, fairly consistent them from those who have lots of experience at ALAC, and that is that there are various, if not a lot of, sectors who are not making their voices as well as those with experience at the ALAC system feel they should be. So also to Helsinki, could I just say that it seems to me, with my background, that this is an ideal opportunity for those with great experience of how the system works and where the problems lie, to get us into a corner and use us – this Review Team – as a potential vehicle to address some of the issues about which you care. Back to you, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Well, thank you. Yeah, that… Well, I'm lost for words. No, those are the two things that I would say our priorities are for Helsinki. I don't have much more, really, to add at this stage. It's not actually directly Helsinki, but it's to do with the fact that Tim, who's probably still there somewhere, is attending the first of our regional meetings in Botswana, the African Internet Summit in Botswana in early June. And again, that's another event, another major event, probably the biggest event in

Africa, where we've got a chance of meeting very large numbers of representatives of the ecosystem over there. And again, we need to rely on the AFRALO to really plug the communication channels, let it be known that Tim is going to be there, and to approach him in order to share the thoughts that they have about what's going on.

TIM MCGINNIS: Right. It's critical, from my perspective.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, I can see some action items. There are a couple of action items that will go ahead, which is, first of all, to share the outreach calendar and, secondly, to share the contact information. So that will happen. I can promise you that Heidi and Ariel will make sure that does happen.

Now, is there anything else about Helsinki? Because clearly, you're going to be there, and we're going to be there. And I'm sure that there is a meeting scheduled with you. It will also be an opportunity for you to do individual interviews, which is something that I suggest you're planning.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, it is, absolutely. We're planning interviews. And, in fact, there is one important point still to mention about the interviews, which is that we prepared a list of questions. It's still a draft list of questions that we're going to be asking during the interviews. There are 26 questions, which is rather a lot, more questions than probably we'll be able to get through in an average interview. But nonetheless, we want to make

sure the questions are worded, are properly targeted, that we're really unearthing the information that we need to be, getting at the sources of information that we need to be getting at.

And so to the extent that we can have a little exchange with you about that, we're happy to share that list with you if you want. There was a requirement that was made to prepare this list. And so that's something which we need to get validated as soon as possible, because that's what's going to be the basis of our interview process.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, may I suggest that you do share that with the Working Party? And at least some of us – particularly, say, Olivier, Alan, Maureen, everybody else – can have a quick look and see, and come back to you with suggestions as to, "These are the most important questions." And if you've got too many, from our point of view, what are the most important? Would that be something that would be helpful?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. That could be very helpful.

HEIDI ULRICH: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Heidi, yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULRICH:	Just a question. I'm wondering if there could be a small group, consisting of, obviously, ITEMS as well as a smaller group within the Working Party, that could work with staff on the logistics, etc., of the interviews for Helsinki. I know that there are certain issues related to the way the venue was set up, etc. And if we can just do that on a call, etc., that would be really useful. Thank you.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you, Heidi. I was coming to item number 8, which is operational issues: meeting frequency and next meeting. I would suggest that probably a meeting of a small group to look at meeting – well, no, there's two issues. There's one for the Working Party itself and how often we meet. And, Tom, that's going to be your suggestion as well. But then a smaller group to work through the logistics of Helsinki. And I would suggest, if Cheryl's not on at least two other calls, she would be part of that. Olivier, you want to be part of that? And Alan? All right, they've just volunteered. They don't know it, but they volunteered. Excellent.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I'll participate in a passive way.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Alan [inaudible] –
ALAN GREENBERG:	Moderately passive.

HOLLY RAICHE: Allan's hand up means he agrees. Would you like to speak?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, my hand was up for something else. You just haven't responded
                          to it yet.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I was just going to reiterate what Heidi was saying. Helsinki is
                          going to be a meeting from hell. Excuse the expression. The timing is
                          going to be really bad. The hotels are not adjacent to the conference
                          center. It would be really, really useful if we can get a small room
                          assigned for the review so that interviews can be held there. Trying to
                          do it out in corridors and capture people is going to be really, really
                          difficult. So if Heidi and staff can arrange that, that, I think, will make
                          our lives a lot easier. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll leave that as an action item on Heidi. And Cheryl thinks that's an
                          excellent idea as well. Excellent.

                          And we have got another action item. A small group, probably to
                          organize logistics. But also, given the time frame, it may be that we go
                          out to the Working Party and ask if they want to participate in feedback

from your questionnaire, Tom, if that's what you want. I'd be happy to do that.

TOM MACKENZIE: Actually, to be honest, I don't think this questionnaire needs to be… What we don't want to do is we don't want to embark on a huge validation process. But we think we've covered all the main issues which need to be covered. If there are one or two people – maybe Olivier or somebody on your side – who can just say, "Yeah, that's fine, but maybe there's just one or two issues that you've left off," then that kind of feedback would be useful. But we don't think that it's necessary to have a full-on validation.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think I was suggesting, amongst the many questions, there may be some that those of us think, "These are more important than others." And if you have enough time [inaudible] ask questions 1, 7, and 13, whatever, because those are the most important. And maybe that can be done by a small group. That would be fine.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay, that would be good. By a small group, yeah.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Okay. Why don't you –

NICK THORNE: I'm sorry that I can't raise my hand. I'm not on Adobe. But I agree with that last suggestion, that some priorities might be added. We're already running a month late. We mustn't get into a long-lasting review of these questions. By all means, if there are horror stories in there, tell us. But we need to get on with it.

And the other thing is, having personally lived in Helsinki, lovely Northern city that it is – and by the way, June is lovely in Helsinki – but the hotels are a nightmare. So if staff who are listening can do anything to get us into adjacent hotels so that we, at least, can meet, that would be really helpful.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to leave that in the capable hands of Gisella and Heidi. Thank you. There's an action item for you.

NICK THORNE: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. A couple of administrivia things. The first one is I am assuming – and if not, I'm assuming it will be done by the time I finish saying it – that the ITEMS team are subscribed to our Working Party mailing list so that they can at least have a watching brief on anything that goes on there, if not directly post. I think it's silly for anything they want to post to get to our Working Party, to have to go through some [moderational] filter.

But it might also be useful if we have a sub-list as well, basically just the Leadership Team and the independent examiners. So things like a quick – and I'm thinking less than 24-36 hours' turnaround – and minor comments on these questions that we were discussing could be done quickly in that way, rather than belabor any points. Because you might have heard from my tone earlier, I'm pretty keen to get this started as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that's excellent. And that is becoming an action item, Tom, [inaudible] creating a sub mailing list for the Working Party. And it will be probably three or four of us, to have a quick look at the questions and identify those that are most critical for you.

Now, operational issues, we haven't got to, in terms of the Working Party, but we have got four minutes left. Could we have a quick – when do we want to meet next? And do we need to meet as a whole Working Party before Helsinki, as opposed to the Executive Team?

Tom, your thoughts, and, Heidi, your thoughts?

TOM MACKENZIE: To be honest, I feel that we have had an excellent exchange with ICANN staff. We've now had a very good introduction with you. I'm pretty sure I can speak on behalf of the team to say that that is really what we hoped that we would have. This is very much exactly the idea of the kickoff meeting that we had. And that gives us the information that we now need to start, which is sufficient until we meet again in person in Helsinki. And I think I can say that. So that's fine, really. And there are action items that you have listed, and so there are things that will keep us busy for the next few weeks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Well, look, I think I will leave question 8. We've got not enough time to discuss that. But the small Executive Team will see if – I'm not sure that the Working Party as a whole needs to meet again. I think it may be a small Executive Team probably needs to meet. And, Heidi, why don't we take that up after this call?

HEIDI ULRICH: Yes, thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Okay, now that we've got two spare minutes, I'm pretty proud of that. Thank you, everybody. And we will meet in Helsinki, and a few of us will actually beforehand. But thank you, Tom. Thank you, Tim. I keep saying Tom and Tim. And Nick, and Rosa, and everybody

else. And have a rest of a lovely morning, afternoon, or evening. And thank you for your time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]