

---

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party call, taking place on Wednesday, 27<sup>th</sup> of July, 2016, at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Kaili Kan, Wolf Ludwig, Alberto Soto, Aida Noblia.

We have apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Sandra Hoferichter, Ali Almeshal, and Maureen Hilyard.

From the ITEMS team, we have Tom Mackenzie, Tim McGinnis, Rosa Delgado, and Nick Thorne. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Larisa Gurnick, Charla Shambley, Lars Hoffmann, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Veronica.

And finally, I'd like to remind everyone to state their names while speaking, not only for the transcript purposes, but for the interpretation purposes, as well. Over to you, Holly. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you very much. Now, this first item [on the rope] – excuse me – is to go back and have a look at Helsinki. And really, there are two speakers on that one. I think the first speaker I'm going ask, Tom, are you ready to talk about – and Nick, obviously, too as well. If we can go back over what we were up to, starting with Helsinki and the team.

---

*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.*

---

So over to you, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Thank you, Holly. Now, I think the main thing that we would like to say at this stage regarding the Helsinki meeting was that it really went as well as we could have possibly hoped in the circumstances, because it was a somewhat shorter ICANN meeting. We had initial concerns that it was going to be difficult to meet all the people that we hoped to meet during the meeting, during the few days that we were there. However, between us, we spoke to around 60 people from the At-Large community, representing not only the ALSes, but also from the ICANN side we spoke to Board members. We spoke to the representatives of the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, quite a large number of representatives in each case. We spoke to liaisons between At-Large and the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. And we really felt that we covered the ground in a reasonably satisfactory way at what was still an early stage in the review process.

I might just add in parentheses that we have since spoken to around 20 other people. So that brings our total, to date, of people that we have spoken to, to 83.

So if you like, sort of general remarks from the Helsinki meeting was that we were grateful for the time that people were willing to give to us. The At-Large people that we approached during the meeting always, generally speaking, found the three-quarters of an hour to often an hour, or sometimes an hour and a half, conversations. So they were

---

available, and they were willing to talk in what I described the other day in my e-mail, in open and very frank conversations about what they perceived to be going right with the At-Large structure, and obviously what they perceived to be going less right. And they were very forthright in that regard.

And we invited people, we tried to conduct the conversations in such a way to encourage the people that we spoke to, to provide us with their own recommendations, thoughts for improvements. And those kinds of remarks covered a very wide range of issues, from voting procedures to the very essence of what it means to have an At-Large community. So we had conversations on a wide range of issues, some of them quite philosophical on the actual purpose and mandate of a structure like At-Large within ICANN. Others' recommendations and conversations were much more practical on how the organization is run, procedures within the At-Large as a whole, and different procedures within the different RALOs, and how those are perceived to be working.

I'm just sort of giving you examples, but we also noted that people in different RALOs have opinions about other RALOs. So they said that things were functioning in such-and-such way for them, but they felt that maybe things weren't so quite so clear as far as another group was concerned. So there were issues like this that came up, as well.

I might add, there were issues that arose about community and staff. This is another area that we're going to be looking at, to a certain extent. In some ways, it's a funny kind of relationship. It's a relationship where there's a lot of respect, it seems, and a lot of appreciation on both sides for the voluntary work that is being contributed by the

---

community, and the work that's provide by staff on the other hand. But it appears that is an area where there's maybe areas of misunderstanding and perhaps even tension. There are a few points that we have identified, that we have started to identify where there may be issues to look at.

So all in all, without wanting to go on for too long, I think I would just summarize by saying that it was a very positive meeting, and that people from both sides of the community – the staff and the community – and all the different sections of the community were clearly interested in this whole review process. I think that is the other thing that I would add, is that there's clearly a shared feeling that the review process is an important part of the whole process of this community, the whole – what's the word – existence of this At-Large community. And it's important to participate in this review process in order to have all the individuals, all the different stakeholders, to make sure that their reviews have been heard.

So I think as reviewers, we were very satisfied. And I think that's where I will stop. And I will just hand over to my teammates, if they have anything that they would like to add. Nick, should I perhaps pass over straight to you?

NICK THORNE:

Yeah, sure, Tom. Thanks for that summary. I think it was pretty complete, really. Since then, the only thing of any substance that I've been doing, apart from carrying out a lot of those conversations and talking to some very interesting people, many of whom have quite

---

strong views. But that will be no surprise to people on this call. I've also attended now two RALO monthly calls – APRALO and, yesterday evening, EURALO – both of which were instructive for me. And I hope it helped to advertise what we're doing a little bit more than we've done in the past. And I, with Alan's kind help, will be seeking to be at least a fly on the wall at the other RALO meetings, if I can fit in their schedules. So that will be my next step.

In terms of a meeting in Asia-Pacific to collect some grassroots input, I'm focusing more and more on the SIG meeting, which will immediately precede the ICANN Hyderabad meeting. But I'll come back with more news of that later. Nothing else to add. Thanks.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Rosa, do you want to – if you've got anything to add regarding the Helsinki meeting? Or, Tim, if you're there? Tim, regarding the Helsinki meeting?

TIM MCGINNIS:

No, I thought your summary was spot on. It was a very productive meeting. Lots of folks were eager to share their opinions. I'm actually still following up with a few people here in the Washington, DC, region regarding meetings, because we weren't able to schedule a time. So we are getting excellent participation, but I think Nick is correct that we will need to advertise what we're doing before we send out our survey to the larger community.

---

TOM MACKENZIE:

Right. Rosa, I'm not sure if you're there, if you're able to say a word or two about Helsinki?

Okay. Okay. Well, if Rosa is unable, for whatever reason, to say anything at this point, we have obviously been working with Rosa, and she has provided some... I might just use this minute just to say that what we have done since Helsinki is, as a group, we have pooled together all the notes that we took during the meeting. And just for your information, we took notes in two ways, with two principle methods for taking notes. As many of you would have seen, we were either using a form which we created, a Google form, which we used to type in our notes during the interviews or which we filled in after interviews. So we used that. And we also, in some of the conversations which didn't necessarily fit within the very strict format – for example, with other outsiders or different kinds of people that we were talking to – we wrote down notes in a very traditional format.

So what we've been doing since is pooling all of these notes, centralizing them all into a single document, out of which we have started to see emerge some of the main issues, which are no doubt going to grow as we go along, and certainly will inform the way that we build [the further] questionnaire.

Sorry, hello? Rosa, are you there? Okay, sounds like there's an echo somewhere. But should I carry on, or do you want to move on to the next item on the agenda?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we can move on. I'm not sure what's going on except someone's trying to talk in the background. I guess apparently it's Rosa and she's here, but I can't hear here, and I can only hear an echo of myself [inaudible]. Can we deal with the echo first, please?

Excellent, thank you. I think probably, Tom, you've covered everything I was going to say about the Helsinki meeting. I was actually quite pleased with it. I was glad we had the opportunity to get the time with you. And I think it was a very productive meeting.

Cheryl, do you have any words that you want to add from our point of view as to the Helsinki meeting itself? And I note that Larisa is on the call, and I might ask if she would like to add anything as to Helsinki. And then we'll move on to where we're up to and next steps for Hyderabad. So, Cheryl, if you –

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps you can also move on to people with their hands up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm apparently confused as who you want to do what with. I think you've got Rosa with her hand up, Alan with a hand up, and then, yes, I'll be very happy to make a comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fine. Let's listen to Rosa first, if we can hear her.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure if Rosa can speak.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know she's tried, and I haven't heard her. Rosa, you can type into the chat, if you want to make a comment, because we're not hearing you.

Otherwise, Alan, go ahead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two points, or a statement and question. Nick had asked me whether he could attend other RALO meetings, and I told him that all of our meetings – virtually all of our meetings, with very few exceptions – are completely open, and any of the reviewers should feel free to drop in, should they choose. On the other hand, if you would like a formal introduction and perhaps an opportunity to speak, I would be glad to ask any Chairs of either RALOs or any other working group meetings that you would like to be present at, to essentially introduce you and give you an opportunity to speak. But barring that, anyone can drop into any meetings. Our meetings are open. They're all published, and you're welcome to join. But if there's anything I can do to streamline it, I'd be glad to.

I have a question, though, regarding all the interviews. And I'm just curious to what extent – and I don't want to know the details – to what extent you have things said to you which were in direct conflict with each other, and to what extent do you see that that is a problem that you're going to have to be addressing?



---

HOLLY RAICHE: Tom?

ALAN GREENBERG: Tom, Nick, anybody.

TIM MCGINNIS: I think that we did have some folks who contradicted others.

ALAN GREENBERG: Rosa has her microphone on and is causing echo.

ROSA DELGADO: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, she's muted now. Go ahead, Tim.

TIM MCGINNIS: We did get some folks who contradicted others. It was a minority of folks, but still a significant number. So I don't know how we're going to deal with that, but I think these were initial findings that we're getting with these face-to-face interviews. Our quantitative numbers will come from the survey we send out.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, does that answer –

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yeah. It was just a little bit of my voyeurism and curiosity. Thank you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Sure. I just don't know what that means.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we'll let that be settled offline. And Larisa, thank you for letting us know that you don't have anything to add, but thank you for saying so.

Cheryl, do you have anything to add [crosstalk]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do, Holly, yes. And to some extent, it's [linkage] between the review in Helsinki and some of the questions that have been raised, the one by Alan and [inaudible] Tim and Nick on their review of the Helsinki interactions, and take us into the interview section, but probably not limited to the interview section, also the online survey, which is our next agenda item.

I'm interested in finding out how – and if there isn't a how yet, to [alerting] us in my concern, and I may not be alone in my concern, as to the confidence level we can have throughout this process, with your ability to not just deal with these conflicting statements, as Tim just responded to and Alan spoke to, but to sort out the hyperbole from the

---

strongly held but totally unfounded, in terms of actual facts used, as opposed to the highly, highly informed and experienced opinion, as opposed to the third generation, “I thought I heard someone say something ten years ago; you mean it might have changed” type views.

Is there some sort of nonparametric analysis that’s going to be applied to this things? It might be easier to sort out, I guess, once you’ve got all your data in. But I do note that one of the very untidy, but very productive and reassuring things, I suppose, from this particular topic that happened in the first review was the rather public forum meetings that we held, where if Maryjane said, “ALAC did this, that, and the other,” representatives of the ALAC or the staff had the right to rebuttal and, indeed, bring in some evidence if that was needed.

I’m not suggesting we go into that we go into free-for-all mode, and I think your design is perfectly fine. I just want to know how you’re going to manage what may be informed versus ill-informed information versus total hearsay.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Tom, I think that’s over to you, or Nick, or Tim, or Rosa, if Rosa wants to type anything.

Silence. Right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It might be a weighting system. It might be you score, if six people say something or make a comment on a particular issue, then it becomes a

---

higher-value issue. I don't particularly care how it's done. I'm just hoping that at some point it will be somehow done.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Tom, anything? Or should we just move on to the next item in an update? Also, I think my question, Tom, from your experiences and your team's experiences on Helsinki, is there something or things that we can do more of or better at the Hyderabad meeting? I realize that Helsinki was very short, and I think we would like to be able to get the attendance we did at a one-hour meeting. But there's a bit more time for this meeting, and I think now is the time to schedule meetings additional. I know those schedules are being drawn up.

Would you like more time? Would you like another meeting? What was missing in Helsinki that you would like in Hyderabad? Thanks.

TIM MCGINNIS:

I have a logistics question for the staff. They probably don't know the answer now. But I've looked at hotels in Hyderabad, and the one close to the conference center is fully booked. I assume it's been booked by ICANN. Have they included us in that block of room? Just in terms of logistics, it will be easier and give us more time if we are in that hotel, rather than someplace that's an hour away through clogged traffic.

But, yeah, my impression of the Helsinki meeting was you wanted to know what was going on, and we were busy getting on with it, interviewing people. So I would caution against having too many

---

meetings in Hyderabad. We can certainly meet with you, but I'm not sure what we will have to report at that point.

NICK THORNE: Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, Nick, go ahead.

NICK THORNE: Okay. Sorry, I went offline there for a few minutes. Let me try and answer first Cheryl's point and then Holly's, if I may. Cheryl, your concerns are noted. You're not the only one to have ask how we're going to sort the wheat from the chaff, as it were. Last time anybody mentioned weighting was, I think, in our last meeting in Helsinki, when somebody – I vaguely recall it was me – got dumped on from several thousand feed for even suggesting it. But we will, in the real world, have to sit down and look at the information we've gathered, and give it some sort of waiting internally before we decide which issues we're going to pursue in greater depth. And that is something which I would envisage happening between now and Hyderabad, when we ITEMS four will need to get together and compare what we've picked up so far. So noted, and we're very aware of that. How did you put it, Cheryl? The third-hand auntie-removed comments, which we've got a few of. But most people are taking this exercise quite seriously.

On meetings in Hyderabad, could we do better than Helsinki, I think the access we got in Helsinki was terrific. And I, for one, am very grateful to

---

you all very busy volunteers giving us your time. I think it's important that we have another meeting with this group in Hyderabad. And I would like to organize meetings with the representatives on site for the individual RALOs. I think initially individually, and then perhaps one collective, focusing on RALO leadership. But beyond that, I haven't got any other requests for meetings.

I do, by the way, feel... I hope that Tim's point can be covered and that we're not – I've been to Hyderabad. No comment on the place. It was some years since I've been there. But I hope we're not stuck out in the middle of nowhere.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Nick. I'm assuming that staff has taken note of those requests, that we are looking for another meeting. So just to clarify, Nick, certainly another meeting of the working party; a meeting with RALO Chairs, if you can. Do you think you will be needing individual interviews as well, or are you happy that you have covered, or will have covered, by Hyderabad the sort of people you feel that you need to talk to? Thank you.

NICK THORNE:

There will still be some people who I, for one, will want to get alongside in Hyderabad, from as wide a range of the ICANN community as possible, because I personally feel that's very important that we spread our wings a little bit. But we can deal with that.

---

I guess one request to staff, I lost a day, I think, in Helsinki chasing around, trying to work out where ALAC was meeting and when. It will be good if we can be copied in and included in that process before we actually get to Hyderabad. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Now I've got three hands up. Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. On a number of points that have been raised. On hotels in Hyderabad, everyone is vying for about the 120 beds in the conference hotel. Don't count on it. So just to be quite candid.

Number 2, in terms of meetings, so, Nick, you said you would like to meet with RALO leaders. Do you mean each of the leaders individually, or the Chair and the Secretary together?

NICK THORNE: To answer that one quick –

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we talking about ten meetings or five meetings?

NICK THORNE: I'm talking about five meetings. And when I say, "RALO leadership," I mean any RALO leader from APRALO, for examples, those of the

---

APRALO leadership present in Hyderabad, it would be good for us to sit down with them. And the same for the other RALOs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So you want some scheduling to allow time for five meetings, with each of the RALO leader groups, and then perhaps a slot where all of the RALO leaders are available, where you can meet with them together. I'm just looking at in terms of the scheduling. All right.

Sorry?

NICK THORNE: Yes, to both.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, good. In terms of Cheryl's concern, I have it also, I'm less worried because all of you have said encouraging things about an iterative approach and clearing things with people, to make sure you're not going forward on, to be blunt, acting on some of the yahoo-type comments, which we know are gotten.

I'm less worried about the third-hand comments, which are perhaps recognizable, compared to the absolutely, firmly held, determined views of some people who state things as facts when, in fact, they're their opinions. Those, I think, are of more concern. But again, I think the process you're looking at should help filter them out, or at least negate them early enough in the process so they don't end up in final recommendations. Thank you.



---

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Tijani, and then Lars. Tijani? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Holly. Thank you for ITEMS team. I can tell you that the pleasure was shared in Helsinki. I personally really appreciate the talk we had with you. I personally spoke with three of you and really thank you for your functional way to work.

I think it is too early now to make any assumption. And I think that the interviews you made, and are making perhaps now, will help you to prepare a very good survey that will be widely, how to say, taken by all the At-Large people. And that will give you a good idea how you will perhaps make the assumptions and how you will, how to say, proceed, the manner in which you will conduct your work in the future.

So I don't think that the interviews were enough. They gave you a very good idea to prepare the survey. And the survey will give you the real impression that you will use to go ahead with your work. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tijani. Lars, go ahead.

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Holly. I just thought it'd bust in with a little spoiler alert to my item 5 on the agenda. And I'd just like to [inaudible] about

---

Hyderabad [visible] as soon as we have travel requests and we have exact dates of when people can and want to arrive and depart. And [inaudible] activity as we did in Helsinki, [inaudible] etc. Alan pointed out there might not be the most convenient locations of hotels, but I think that will be a burden to carry by all of us.

And, now one other thing – and this is where the sneak preview comes in – about Hyderabad I'd like to remind everybody, you have probably seen already some preliminary recommendations. And ITEMS will probably be in the phases of preparing its initial report. So I think Hyderabad should also be seen as something where the community can provide feedback and make sure that the thinking that ITEMS is showing in their recommendations, or preliminary recommendations, track and reflect the work and the feedback they received from the community.

And so I think the scheduling of meetings, etc., should take into account that I feel that this is slightly premature, as they're not entirely sure where exactly we're going to be in the process. But staff will make their best to help assure that the meetings will go as smoothly as possible. And I think we tried our best in Helsinki and will do the same for Hyderabad. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Lars. The next item – and, Tom, perhaps you can update us. And you've already sent an e-mail out, which was very useful, for an update. But maybe we can just go over where you're up to, in terms of both interviews and online survey. And just picking up the point that

---

Lars said, maybe what, in terms of substance, you expect to be doing in Hyderabad.

So over to you, Tom, Nick, and whomever. Thank you. Over to you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Hello, can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Yes, I can now. Thank you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Great. Yeah, the audio is quite faint. Well, according to our milestones and deliverable, we are to give you our draft report on 3 October. So on 3 October, we are to deliver preliminary findings for discussion with Review Working Party. On 30 November, we are to deliver a draft report for Review Working Party consideration. And we had planned, post-Hyderabad, to sit together for a week somewhere in India and do our draft report. So that's the timeline that we are working on, as far as vis-à-vis what Lars was saying. So he was suggesting that we will be giving you our preliminary findings, I think, before Hyderabad.

HOLLY RAICHE: Certainly. Thank you very much. And I think staff, we can note that by 3 October, I'm assuming that somewhere around the 3 October date, you will be hoping for a meeting. We should be scheduling a meeting of the working group. Is that what you suggesting?

TIM MCGINNIS: I'm not suggesting anything. I'm just giving you the details of our timeline that we're working on. Yeah, I'm happy to go along with whatever suggestions reach consensus.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Nick, you wanted to add something?

NICK THORNE: Yeah, thanks, Holly. Two things. One, I subscribe to what Tim has just said. I would not expect us to be in the position to give you anything firm before Hyderabad. As Tim said, it is our intention to sit down immediately after what will in effect be our second round of intensive consultation, to put together the bones of our report. Point 1.

Point 2, on the survey, Tom – who I think has dropped off. He's sitting on a Greek island at the moment, and when I spoke to him earlier, he was having some problems. I think it's something to do with ouzo. But he is holding the pen to do the first draft of the survey, and we're hoping to get something pretty near to final draft on that by the end of next week.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you. Thank you, Nick. Do we need to say anything more that is different from – not different from, but additional to the e-mail that Tom sent out, in terms of where you're up to? Because we all have

---

that e-mail. We can all read. I'm not sure we need to go through that again, unless anybody has not read the e-mail and wants an update.

I don't see any hands up. Lars, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand?

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Holly. No, it's a new hand. I'm just wondering whether it can be tricky, let's say. And just briefly moving my agenda item up, I hear there was some confusion about dates and timelines. And I will take about two minutes, if that's okay, item number 5 now, and we can talk about the timeline, as many of use, including myself, [inaudible] before.

Holly, do you agree? I'll just put up a quick slide. It'll just take two minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's fine. Go right ahead. We are the next item. Item 5 is review of overall timeline. So by all means.

LARS HOFFMANN: All right, I'm busting in.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know.

LARS HOFFMANN: Tim, what you mentioned, I think we were just misunderstanding each other, in [type] of terms that were used. The timeline has not changed.

---

So you said 3<sup>rd</sup> of October and [inaudible] October preliminary findings. And I think what we have found was very... This is not a full-blown report in any [means], as you already pointed out, that it's due in late November. But I think what would help for the Hyderabad meeting is if we agree on some general directions of where these findings are going and what kind of potential recommendations may flow from them.

So as you can see here, and a few people have just pointed out the survey is going to be forthcoming. And as others pointed out as well, that it's, from our past experience, the tool that's usually the one that has the most outreach and will be able to gather the most usable and quantifiable data as well, for obvious reasons.

TOM MACKENZIE: Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, we hear you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Gosh, I'm sorry. I didn't drop out as far as hearing you is concerned. It's just that apparently I was completely muted out. So sorry about that. Maybe that was a deliberate something going on. But anyway, sorry about that. But I'm back.

The one thing I just wanted to add about the survey was that that is definitely, as far as the survey questionnaire is concerned and the survey tool is concerned, that is something that is very much an active

---

thing that we're working on right now. And that will be ready during the month of August.

We will have an exchange with you. We will keep you informed as to the progress with that. And we will be ready to launch the international survey last week of August, first week of September kind of thing. And so then that will give the survey time to run all the way through the month of September. And actually, to be honest, from experience, we think that the survey should be kept open for at least two or three months, if necessary, until we really feel satisfied that we have received enough responses to it.

So if by the 3<sup>rd</sup> of October we feel that we haven't got a sufficient number of responses to have a representative sample of opinion, then we'll keep it open for longer, and possibly until the end of the year, perhaps even beyond. It can be kept open for quite a long time. But what's for sure is that by the Hyderabad meeting, we will be able to present to you during one of the meetings, the review meetings, during the ICANN meeting, the preliminary findings from that review. And so what that will be, just to give you the general picture, is a slide presentation showing you graphs, pie charts, that kind of thing, representing what it is that people are saying or thinking about the At-Large. So I just wanted to throw that in. Basically, our milestone is to get the questionnaire and the tool worked on and finalized by the end of August.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tom. Lars, you sort of cut off [inaudible]. Do you want to finish talking?

LARS HOFFMANN: Thank you, Holly. Yeah, I was just in line here with what [inaudible] for clarifying this. I think I've got two other things that I just want to briefly mention, and then I'll be all done with my agenda point.

The first is, as Tom and others have pointed out, and there was an update on the wiki link. I'm going to post it in the chat quickly. That way you can see the interviews that were done, [especially] during EuroDIG and at the African Summit in Botswana. And I saw that the other [inaudible] that was already filling this in with people from the interviews in Helsinki. But I think this is very helpful for the working party to look at and to be reassured that there's accountability and transparency there.

And then there's one other issue that is actually [relevant] to [inaudible] as well, which I think, from a staff perspective, it might be useful to maybe make this working party meeting a biweekly standing call. We could always agree to not have it if nothing is on the agenda. But because this group is so diverse, and I'm sure that, especially At-Large people on this call and staff included in there, know how difficult it is to get people from all over the world into one phone call, with people in Europe and some of us here on the West Coast. I think it would be really helpful to have just a standing call every two weeks, especially with the survey coming up. There's bound to be feedback requests and input that the At-Large working party would like to give. And so maybe we



---

can reach out with staff after this to make this happen, if everybody agrees.

And that is it for me, if you have any further questions [crosstalk].

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Lars. So I think staff can do the Doodle poll. And if we can have agreed biweekly call time, that would be terrific. I don't think there's – yes, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that, that's why I raised my hand. Lars's point about getting the diversity within our working party on the call is important. But if you set biweekly calls at midnight Australian time, I can assure you that you're not going to get some of the other Asia-Pacific participants either. So when you say Doodle poll, why don't we just let staff pick the most frequently attended time and we do a call rotation? I'm happy to have standardized fortnightly calls, but I would strongly suggest that we also do a call time rotation to share the pain, but more importantly, give the opportunity for everybody who are in different times from UTC to also attend. Thanks. And staff know those knows all by heart.

HOLLY RAICHE: Splendid idea. Absolutely marvelous. Those of us in the Asia-Pacific, I'm sure, have already talked to Nick about the wonderful times that we are on phone calls and conferences.

---

So first of all, thank you, Tom, for the update. We've talked about interviews and surveys. We've had a look at the overall timetable. We've certainly – I think the timelines that Lars talked about, when we're going to have this information, we should have a meeting scheduled around those times. And I think that would be the best – so that even though if it's biweekly, can we try to meet the output dates as well, which would be very useful. And thank you, Lars. You're on it.

Is there anything else that we need to talk about? I have to say, I think we've gotten through a quite a bit of material. Larisa, you did have your hand up at one point. Is there anything else you'd like to add at this stage?

In that case, everybody has an additional [inaudible] free ten minutes.

TOM MACKENZIE:

If you'd like, if I could take one extra minute, it was just to say that as you're probably aware, we organized a data-collection exercise, or what we call a data-collection exercise, in the different RALOs, just to see how much knowledge we could draw out from the different communities regarding ALS membership and how active the different ALSes are. And that has proved to be a very enriching, enlightening kind of exercise, which people in the different regions responded to in different ways. So we haven't gotten a complete picture of what's going on exactly homogeneously across the RALOs, but it does provide us with a lot of interesting information. We will be completing that process by asking ICANN staff to fill in any of the gaps. But, yeah, I just wanted to throw

---

that in as an additional little exercise we conducted over the past two or three weeks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tom. Is there any information that you would like us to – “us” being ALAC – or the RALOs to come prepared to the next meeting? Are there additional things we can do to add to your body of knowledge before the next meeting?

TOM MACKENZIE: I will ask the others if they have any thoughts, but my own feeling is that I don’t have any ideas at this stage. But I will put in writing any suggestions for other things that you could provide or organize for the next meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: That would be excellent. Thank you very much. Now, is there any other business that people – oh, Nick, you’ve got your hand up. Thank you.

NICK THORNE: Holly, thank you for asking if we needed any further information. I think one thing I should mention now that we’re focusing in on a little bit is the way in which Atlas II recommendations have been followed up and implemented. I imagine there’s some sort of monitoring process which staff control on this. And I think it would be useful if that could be shared with us before Hyderabad, indeed as soon as possible, so that

---

we can then see whether there are issues there which we need to pursue.

I mention this because I've already come across one recommendation which is important but doesn't seem to have moved forward perhaps as much as it might have done, and I'd like to see what happened to the other recommendations from what is, after all, an important meeting. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Nick. And I was waiting for Olivier's hand to go up. Olivier, go ahead. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Holly. And we've got a fair follow-up of all of the recommendations. And Ariel and I have been working on an update document, which should soon, I guess, be available. We'll have a fair snapshot of where we are. And I'd say that the great majority of these recommendations are either on their way to being implemented or actually implemented at the moment. So what's on the wiki pages, we've got a set of wiki pages and so on, is in the process of being updated. But Ariel would know more, and perhaps it would be a good thing for her to point you to the right set of pages, because I do recognize that they're not easily found.

That's always one of the problems here. Work sometimes gets done, but it's not reflected in the wiki pages as they currently are, and the

---

pages are a bit of a maze of information. So it's hard to find the actual information.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And I've got in the chat, Fatimata, do you have a question or comment that you'd like to make?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Not really, because the question I was going to ask, I read in the chat that [thoughts] would be made [inaudible] because I know that somethings can just take for granted to have people take surveys in the time frame. That was why [inaudible]. And I tried to collect the link, and that is the same messages. So I'm waiting for permission to access.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fatimata, check with Heidi so if you're not getting information, just make sure that you can get that link. [That'll be fine]. Thank you.

Now, I don't see any hands or anyone in the chat. Does anybody have any other business at this moment? Otherwise, we look forward to talking to you in a fortnight or so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everybody. From my point of view, I think this is all progressing well, and I think that regular touchpoints will be an important, but no doubt still rewarding, thing for us to do. And obviously, the regional representatives on this working party will have a more important role,

---

in terms of outreach and encouragement of engagement once the survey is ready to roll. And I think that's a point that Fatimata was trying to make, as well. So thanks, everyone. And, yeah, so chat in 14-plus days or so.

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

You will now be disconnected. Thanks very much for your participation and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]