YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force call taking place on Thursday, 29th of September in 2016 at 17:00 UTC.
	On the call today on the English Channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Murray McKercher, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Alan Greenberg.
	Currently we don't have anyone on the Spanish Channel, neither on the French Channel.
	We have received apologies from Gunela Astbrink, Roberto Gaetano, Glenn McKnight, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, and Maureen Hilyard.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.
	Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David. And our French interpreters are Claire and Isabelle.
	Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking not only for the transcript purposes but also for the interpretation purposes as well.
	Over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Yesim. Today's call is going to be focusing primarily on the few loose ends that we have to tie before we end up sending a long-ish Implementation Report to the ICANN Board. As you

all know, the At-Large community met in London in 2014, just over two years ago, and came up with a large number of recommendations and also a number of observations. Recommendations were to be implemented or aimed both at the At-Large community but also aimed at the Board, aimed at other parts of ICANN, etc. There's 43 recommendations altogether. These were put in a table, and this group – Implementation Task Force – was put together to see what they could do with them and whether they would have to be implemented, whether they could just be sent to the Board, whether there was some more work to be done to expand on those.

Thanks to the expert help of Ariel Liang, we managed to put the status of where we are in a table, and the table is only a few pages long, and an expansion of each one of the recommendations and the work that was done and the next steps [inaudible] detail what next steps, it's shown in Appendix 2 of this document. This was all derived from the expensive set of implementation wiki pages. Indeed, as you are all well aware, each recommendation has its one page and various groups worked on this including many of the At-Large working groups – so the Cross-Community, Committee on Accessibility, the ALAC Leadership Team, all of course various ALAC liaisons, of course ALAC members, the ALS Criteria and Expectations Task Force, the Capacity Building Working Group, the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, the ICANN Evolution Working Group (which used to be the ICANN IANA Issues and deals with both IANA issues and ICANN Accountability), the Outreach and Engagement Working Group, the RALO Chairs which therefore brought in the different RALOs, the Social Media Working Group, and the At-Large Technology Task Force.

It really is a huge, huge group effort that has yielded this document and we are, I guess, in the last line to move forward with. So as to have a target date of the ICANN meeting in Hyderabad, which is just about a month away, to be able to pass this on over to the Board.

The aim of the call today is to look at a few recommendations that are still in progress, and then clarify the assignees of the next steps for each recommendation and discuss the structure and content of the Executive Summary which you will notice at the moment is not drafted. So that's what we are here for.

Are there any questions at this stage or comments at this stage before we get going? I see a hand up from Murray McKercher. Murray, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Olivier. Just, Olivier, wondering if you could speak to the process since London was… I know there was a number of meetings with the Board over the various ICANN meetings that have happened since then and I was just wondering whether there was any feedback there or what they are expecting exactly from us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Murray. A couple of things – first, not all recommendations are aimed at the Board, so this whole report will contain all of the recommendations but all of them are not aimed at having Board action or Board response. It is correct that we have had some recommendations that we have passed on to the Board in the

past. One of them that I can just remember off the top of my head is the one that was asking the advice from Advisory Committees would have to be considered by the Board and responded to with reason or rationale as to why the recommendation from the ALAC or from the Advisory Committee concerned was taken or not taken. It was something that had been put together during the second Accountability and Transparency Review Team. The Board had not acted upon it a year later – or six months, seven months later – which was when the community met and the community asked for that to be implemented. So we reiterated this to the Board and in fact it was done in the last rewrite of the Bylaws, the one which came up with the ICANN Accountability Empowered Community which needed the rewrite of the Bylaws. This recommendation was indeed carried out and so the text that was suggested was incorporated in there.

I don't have off the top of my head feedback on all the ones that we have passed to the Board. I think we had just looked at a subset of them that needed to have Board action. I do not think that they required feedback at that time. It was more of a case to let the Board know that we were continuing the work and that we hadn't just cast aside or spent over half a million dollars – or was it half a million pounds, I can't remember what the amount was – but a large amount of money to send people to write a vacuous document that didn't go anywhere afterwards. We wanted to show them that we are continuing the work in that. So the process since then was to pass on these recommendations from the Implementation Task Force to various assignees – as I mentioned earlier, the Outreach and Engagement Working Group, the Capacity Building Working Group, the Finance and

Budget Subcommittee, etc. – and get those assignees to work on it during their monthly or yearly for some of them or even less than that conference calls, both on a conference call level but also using their mailing lists. They are the ones that then filled the details under each one of those recommendations.

I don't know whether, Ariel, can you show just I know that you're sharing your screen. Is it possible for you to show an example of a Recommendation page, just a single Recommendation page to show what was effectively filled in? Which I think is worthy of mentioning.

So there you are. Here is an example – Recommendation #26. So you've got the top of the recommendation which has got the recommendation, etc. and then if you scroll down slowly you'll see a summary, and scrolling down slowly – and Ariel, you're going to have to do the scrolling – then we've got the implementation details. But under that you've got the actions that were taken at various moments, so you can see some of them are time stamped and notes also are underneath which are time stamped. So it's absolutely possible to look at the chronology of the work that has taken place and you can see that sometimes some work took place, and here you can see September, 2015, and then October, 2015, which is a long time ago. And then May, 2016 – this one you can see you have several pages worth of work that has taken place.

And this is of course all set to remain as an archive of the amount of work that was done by the community to reach the report that we have today. It's also interesting in that if one is interested by a specific recommendation, you can click on these things and they will ultimately

take you to those wiki pages where you have further access to all of the background to it.

I don't think we should expect the Board members to have enough time to dig deeply into our recommendations, but I did ask Ariel if we could have the ability for Board members to dig deeper if some of them are interested because I certainly am particularly intrigued. I can't pertain to know the contents of all of the work that was done for each of the recommendations but certainly it's very interesting to dig sometimes into those and see how much volunteer time has been spent on some real golden nuggets that we have here. And this one #26 is a particularly good example.

Does that help you understand the context, Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, sir. I was muted. This is Murray. That's [inaudible]. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Murray. And just to add, from this Heidi, Ariel, and I and a couple of other people also – I can certainly think of Dev as well – have spent a lot of work since he is one of the Chairs of several of the working groups that had to do the work, started focusing more and more on each one of those recommendations and to focus on some text that could summarize the work that was done, and that's how we have this document that now in front of us.

So let's get going, and what I suggest is that we first look at the recommendations. If you scroll through the document, you can see that the first six recommendations are marked as "completed," and there are some recommendations which were marked as "in progress." There is one that is "discarded." These are the three categories that we have. So the discarded recommendation, just quickly, was discarded – if you do click on it you'll see the rationale… Actually not from this, you can't see the rationale here, but on the wiki you can certainly see the rationale by which it was discarded, and that, "Encouraging public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment," is not something that is within ICANN's mandate so that was put to the side.

The ones that are completed are either finished from the ALAC perspective, as in another process has taken them over and therefore as far as we are concerned, we as in the At-Large community there is nothing else more that we can do about it, or in 99% of the case I would say that it was implemented, there is a program that is in charge of carrying this out, there might be an At-Large working group that has a mandate to carry this out, or a sub-committee that needs to push forward with it, or indeed the recommendation itself was implemented in full and the details are then given in this document.

Let's focus first on the ones which are still in progress and which we didn't deem to be complete as such. The first one is #7, and Recommendation #7 is one which says, "A periodic review of ICANN's multistakeholder model should be performed to ensure that the processes and the composition of ICANN's constituent parts adequately address the relevant decision-making requirements in the corporation."

And there we have, well the whole background to this is that of course there are various reviews which are undertaken, performed by both Independent Examiners and also the ICANN community. This is all the whole process of organization reviews, but it appears that between the Accountability and Transparency Review Team, between the ALAC Review, the GNSO Review, the different reviews of the different parts of ICANN, there does not appear to be an overall review of the structure of ICANN itself and certainly an overall review of the overall composition and balance of ICANN stakeholder groups.

The question really here is what should we do as next steps for this? How should we ask for it, etc.? The suggestion that we have here is that "The ALAC will advise the ICANN Board to initiate a process, whether through an existing review process in ICANN" – for example, the third Accountability and Transparency Review – "or through a new periodic review process," – and God forbid what kind of answer we would get if we asked for another review in addition to all the ones that are in place as we know that there are so many reviews that are going on and a lot of people have complained there are too many reviews, but one or the other – "to evaluate the overall composition and balance of stakeholder representation in relation to their decision-making requirements in ICANN."

I'm opening the floor for comments because this is a suggestion for next steps. It's quite a significant suggestion. I was going to turn specifically actually to Alan Greenberg as the Chair of the ALAC since this would be something that the ALAC would be asking, and certainly we're open to suggestions. This is quite a significant request. But it is true, or it appears from the knowledge that we have, that there isn't an overall

review of the balance of stakeholder participation. The current accountability thread Work Stream 2, there were some thoughts that there could be something like that happening and it doesn't appear as though there is any.

The floor is open.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did you want my comment?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan. Please. Yes, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, I was in the midst of responding to another crucial e-mail regarding the transition and ICANN Accountability. I think, however, you're talking about the recommendation that is on the screen at the bottom of the window right now saying, "We recommend to the Board that a," – hold on a second, just one second – "that the ALAC recommend to the Board to re-evaluate the balance of power." Are we at the same place?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Yes, we're looking at… There doesn't appear at the moment to be any kind of review of the balance of power of the different stakeholders in the ICANN SO/AC SGC model.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. This has been discussed a number of times. The – what was it called? Not Future Directions, whatever –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Future Challenges.

ALAN GREENBERG: Future Challenges group suggested something similar. Sebastien when he was on the Board and since then has suggested a number of times that we look at the overall organization of ICANN and not just tweak each part individually but look at whether it makes sense.

Given what we have just gone through on Accountability and effectively locked in the current structure, I think the chances of doing that are zero. I think we would have no credibility to ask for it at this point without at least waiting a little bit and seeing how the dust settles on the current accountability changes. And I think we would hurt our credibility significantly by doing this. So it may have made sense in the summer of 2014. I think in today's context with everything that's happened since then, I believe we would be ill advised to do that. I'm the Chair and don't make decisions purely on behalf of the ALAC but that would certainly be my recommendation to the ALAC to not act on this given the significantly changed environment since that time.

It still may make sense, but I think the timing is just so far off that it's not appropriate at this point. That's my call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. So what do we put as next steps then is a big question mark. I understand you said it's something that's worth doing but not now. Is that in effect what you're saying? We've just been through the Accountability Work Stream 1 recommendation and so on. It's not the right time to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there's no chance of getting the community to participate in such an activity right now. If we want to go on record of saying, "We told you so," we can. I would suggest we defer this indefinitely or say it's no longer appropriate given the current environment and it can be raised again of course in a future ATLAS. So, it's your call. If you want to bring it to the ALAC for a decision since the ALAC did vote on approving these recommendations, I would have no problem with that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Any other comments? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So we've got the comments from Ariel on this. And so I'm just trying to see what you have written here… "Should not act on this due to bad timing." Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if you feel uncomfortable with that, bring it to the ALAC and we'll put an agenda item on it in Hyderabad.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: In Hyderabad, okay. So let's do that then as a next step. But since this report is going to be given to the Board by then, maybe what we should do then in the next steps is to say the ALAC will decide on whether to bring this formally to the Board or not. Because I don't think that the report itself is asking for action by the Board. What we have to do here is to basically… Because obviously there was a request from the ALAC, this would have to come officially from the ALAC as a statement [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I need to step away for a minute so if I may get in for a moment. If you're going to put something in to the Board, you say that the general feeling in the ATLAS Recommendation Task Force is that this is not appropriate at this point but it'll be referred to the ALAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. [implement] at this point, but it will be referred to the ALAC. Excellent.

Okay, good. So then let's move on. Let's go to the next one. Thank you for this, Alan. Let's go to – I'm conscious of the time, so we have a limited amount of time for these things – what's the next one that is in progress?

The next one in progress is #13. "ICANN should review the overall balance of stakeholder representation to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to all views proportionally to their scope and relevance." So that's very similar to #7. They actually go hand in hand.

One is looking at the balance of stakeholder representation. The other one is looking at the balance of the review of the multistakeholder model itself. I gather, Alan, and please confirm that the response is going to be the same for both.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, [inaudible] stated he had to step away for a moment which is why he made his last intervention before you'd finished what you were saying. My guess is yes, but certainly my opinion is yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So we'll put them in the same bag and we'll have the same next steps then for #13 as we had in #7. I think, Ariel, we had treated both of them similarly, hadn't we?

ARIEL LIANG: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Use the same text as #7. Okay, excellent. Let's then move on swiftly to #26: "Current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable policy management process system available for use across the SO/AC s in order to do a whole lot of wonderful, great, things." Now, this is not a short-term project as you know. It's the building of a tool.

We in the community have had some discussion with Ashwin Rangan who is the Chief Information Officer. I think now his title has changed but still in the same or even an expanded set of responsibilities. And so there's been a lot of work being done here and more work will have to be done in the future.

The next step is quite, I would say, standard. It basically says, "The At-Large community will continue collaborating with relevant ICANN staff departments in the search for and development of the policy management process system. ICANN staff are encouraged to actively reach out to At-Large members to solicit input on existing projects and efforts that tackle this recommendation."

We know that there's a lot of work going on in this. Certainly the various ICANN departments are working on some things to improve websites, tools, etc., public comment pages being reworked. We've seen on our side since the recommendation, we've seen some extraordinary improvements in our own website, in our own policy processes, things are really becoming more and more palatable to the average end user and certainly a lot more efficient than they used to be in the very early days.

Are there any comments or questions on this? The next step seems to just be saying, "Keep on doing what you're doing and maybe one day we'll end up with enough time and enough of finance or enough money to be able to implement something really complex but first we need to have a plan." And drawing up that plan is really the next steps forward.

I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a brief note. There is discussion within ICANN of a new communication plan which would try to present ICANN in more understandable ways to the novice, and obviously once you catch them, the things like making the website understandable are an immediate requirement after that. Otherwise yes, they'll understand what you do and then walk away in utter confusion. It will likely be discussed at Hyderabad. There's nothing formal right now. It's just being talked about with waving hands. So you will likely see some action from ICANN.

There is an understanding at this point certainly with the new CEO that we have not done a really good job of presenting ourselves to the public.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Do we need to amend anything in this recommendation because of that?

ALAN GREENBERG: The "that" you're talking about is just hand waving at this point. I think we need to hear something formally. I've heard it very informally. And then see how it actually is embodied. I think that's going to stretch out over the next months, maybe years, I'm not sure. There's a limit as to how much ICANN is going to invest in fixing the website when there's other real issues that have to be addressed, too.

We could say we won't travel to the next few meetings so ICANN can devote the money to their website. I'm not sure we'll have a lot of volunteers to agree to that. I think work is progress. There's certainly an acknowledgement on all levels at this point. We have had discussions within ICANN of how to navigate the website and how to find things which no one can find. That's been going on for close to two years now, and I think that will continue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this information, Alan. And Ariel has put a note on the slide to that effect.

Let's move on. Let's go to #28: "The ALAC should work with all Regional At-large Organizations and At-Large Structures to map the current expertise and interests in their membership to identify subject matter experts and facilitate policy communication." This is a task which some RALOs have started. At the moment we are seeing, "RALO leaders will work with ICANN staff to develop a specific questionnaire regarding ALS expertise and interests to ask each ALS. Information gathered will be included in the ALS database." This is the next steps. We haven't quite moved forward with this, but some RALOs are now asking their ALS representatives what knowledge, what skills they have within the At-Large Structure.

That's why, because it's not completed, we felt that it would be kept as "in progress" and hopefully in a few weeks, months, years – I'm not quite sure what the overall timeline is – we would be able to have this

and mark this as being "complete," when we have a full database of knowledge or knowledge base of our ALSes.

Are there any comments? Do we need to change this? Is this a suitable next step?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up or shouting out, so I guess we are fine. Yes, LANIC should be LACNIC indeed. I wrote it down. Ariel said yes in her comment that the change hasn't been made. But that will be done. Don't worry.

ARIEL LIANG: [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Have you changed it now?

ARIEL LIANG: [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: On the spot. Okay. Next let's go on then and #29: "The ALAC should implement an automated system for tracking topics of interest currently being discussed among the various Regional At-Large Organizations and accessible by everyone." That's a very interesting recommendation. The next step is, "for the RALOs to develop an appropriate tool and mechanism to report and share their activities related to their topics of interest."

We are seeing some action with this moving forward. If only they could just be a simple wiki page or something to get the RALOs to look at this. We certainly, speaking for my own RALO, EURALO, we are now putting together a page of hot topics that would show the topics of interest that we have and the topics of the month, of the next few months. And I think that there are plans – is this during the next RALO meeting in Hyderabad – there are plans to share this with other RALOs. I might be wrong. It might just be wishful thinking from me, but I'm hoping that will be planned for the RALOs to discuss this and share this information.

Once each RALO has their own wiki page about their hot topics, then of course it's very simple to put all of the information onto one page and bingo, you've got your platform for sharing the current topics being discussed among the different RALOs. So we're not that far from completion but we're not quite there yet. Thus, the "in progress."

Any comments? Murray McKercher.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, it's Murray speaking from Toronto. It just popped into my head that, I don't know if this has been dealt with before, but having someone from each RALO sitting in on the other RALOs' calls from occasional to get to the cross-pollination of what's going on. It's a manual process, not automated, but has that in fact been taking place? I know I've been away from the group for some time. I just want clarification on that suggestion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Murray. So far, I think that the sole channel of coordination between the RALOs has been the meetings, the face-to-face RALO meetings that have taken place, or RALO Secretariats meeting that have taken place in the different ICANN meetings, and I think there is one or two calls in between the Secretariats meeting. But there certainly doesn't appear to have been any page or any way for cross-pollination as you call it, between the different RALOs. Hence the concept of just having the page.

This to me looks like one of these recommendations where we're spending more time writing about it than, putting together a – I was going to speak like people from the Antipodes, but – put the bloody page up and get the thing done rather than just talking about it. But of course it needs the agreement of all RALOs to actually use it.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Thank you, Olivier. I noticed Heidi posted something. There is a RALO Secretariat wiki page.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. There's a cross-RALO workspace. I'm not quite sure whether it's used much, but you could effectively just link a page from there that each one of the RALOs could link to and have their hot topics in there. We've got the RALO Survey workspace, and we've got the RALO General Assemblies, but the thing is difficult to navigate on the one side, it mixes the internal stuff with the outside looking stuff, and it also it's got pretty much everything in the same bag. So when you go to RALO General Assemblies, At-Large Worldwide RALO/ALS Maps, and the RALO Survey

workspace are one next to each other. I'm not quite sure how that can work.

Certainly the next Regional Leadership Meeting is not going to be in Helsinki, so a lot of stuff needs to be updated. Then you've got all these comments underneath. Things just need to be cleaned up. But in addition to that, one page with which each of the RALOs could update with their hot topics would be really helpful.

Let's move on. We're actually spending more time on this than I thought but that's still in progress as you see. The next one was – Ariel, yes?

ARIEL LIANG: Sorry, I cannot raise my hand. I have a question about the next step for [Rec #29]. Should we include EURALO Chair and EURALO leaders to share with other RALO leaders about topics [briefing] page?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That works fine, yes. That could work. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. One of the things that pops from the Technology Task Force side of things was looking at how we can automate the syndication, I guess, of when things are happening or being updated on RALO wiki pages and on the mailing lists. One of the things I've suggested to ICANN's IT was to, for example, syndicate the previous mailing list as RSS feeds and then just have a mechanism to consolidate all of that on

one wiki page. So you could basically when you go there – "Okay, here's what's been posted on the NARALO list, last four messages, last few messages on LACRALO," etc. etc. etc. So you get a little sense of what activity is happening. That's something I have in mind. But you're right, what happens right now is that the information is still being very siloed. And even at the RALO Secretariats which many people are not aware of, I don't think it happens effectively enough at the RALO Secretariat level. So it's still a very confused and not up to date as to what is happening across all RALOs. That's just my [thing], so something from the Technology Task Force side of things that we're looking at.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Dev. So that works in there. Maybe we can add then to the next steps, "RALOs will develop an appropriate tool and mechanisms and reports and share their activities related to their topics of interest." Maybe we can say, "In consultation with the ALAC Technology Task Force." That is an ongoing activity and the Technology Task Force can continue its work on this. Because as you said, there might be tools in addition to just using the wiki page.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Sounds good.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thanks. Let's move on. Let's go to #36: "The At-Large community should envisage conference calls with other Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations in between ICANN public

meetings to improve collaboration and engagement." And that's something for the ALAC to consider.

And the next steps on #36 – you scroll down to it – the next steps are as follows: "During ICANN 57, the ALAC Leadership Team will discuss with David Olive, Vice President of Policy Development Support in ICANN about the purpose, feasibility, and logistics of holding conferences between the ALAC and other SOs and ACs in between ICANN public meetings. Those teleconferences will take place when there is need and urgency to address substantive topics of concern for both the ALAC and relevant groups."

That of course is a recommendation to the ALAC, and it's for the ALAC to act on. I would like to collect your feedback on this and see if this is appropriate first. And then I guess the discussion will take place on the ALAC and will also take place with David Olive.

And I note that unfortunately, Alan – I don't know if Alan Greenberg is with us or has he left? We're pretty much left. No, I don't see Alan here.

Let's default. Let's see. Dav Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. Is there a link to these monthly cross-community teleconferences that's being referenced there? Are the archives public or not? And if it is public then we should make a link to the Chairs of the Regional RALOs and ACSOs community leader meeting, I don't know what it's called.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. Two things, there are monthly cross-community conference calls which are undertaken by the ICANN policy department, and it's the Chairs of SOs, ACs, stakeholder groups, constituencies, and RALOs, that are on these calls. Frankly, I have no idea whether they are recorded, whether they are publicly available. The way that they started was just the Chairs of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees calling and speaking to each other without the ICANN CEO, without the ICANN staff once a month and informally exchanging ideas of what was going on. The calls were not recorded and there was no staff on there. So the Chairs could just talk with each other and basically say, "Well, we've got a problem with this or we've got that coming up," etc. It was very informal.

This whole thing changed when Fadi Chehadé came in as ICANN President and it sort of grew from this. I do not know whether there is anything of this that's recorded or not. And I don't know whether there are any pages relating to this. Perhaps if we can have an action item in here on staff to check on this. [inaudible] sharp eye for having said this. These are not secret calls by the way. Everyone is relating back to them and relating back to people. I think that – and I'm not sure again – are they Chatham House are they not Chatham House? Not being a Chair anymore – I'm a Chair of a RALO – but it's only recently that I became Chair of a RALO so I'm not aware of the rules these days on this. Let's have an action item to put some clarification on this.

But the next steps, are there any objections or are we all okay with addressing this during Hyderabad meeting? Alan is away. Murray is away. I don't see anyone else. Yes, sorry. Who was this?

ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel. I just wanted to point you to the Alan's comment. So perhaps it's better to check with him either after the call or towards the end of the call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. So let's focus on this afterwards. Let's move on then and go to the next one: "Additional logistical support from ICANN is needed to improve the At-Large wiki." Okay. Interesting. That was in 2014. A lot of things have been taking place with the work and there have been certainly a lot of incremental improvements to the At-Large wiki.

The next step here is, "Referencing existing analysis and best practices the At-Large Technology Task Force will coordinate with staff and continue developing a set of requirements to improve the information architecture and page templates in the wiki. At-Large will also request ICANN to provide additional staff or Intern resources to focus on this labor-intensive endeavor of improving the community wiki." This is a case of having a task that our staff are really paid too much for, and having an Intern for this would be a much better use of resources.

That's why this one we're far from having fixed this one. I certainly haven't heard anyone saying nothing needs to be done on the wiki and therefor this is why it's still in "in progress." Are we all okay with this?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Let's move on then and I don't know, Heidi is saying she's checking with staff. I don't know what… Heidi, could you please explain your –

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Olivier. This is on the question of the informal calls of the AC/SO Chairs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. You're looking at the previous recommendation. Okay, let's move on, #40: "ICANN should offer a process similar to the Community Regional Outreach and Engagement Pilot Program," – and I don't think it's Regional Outreach and Engagement, I think it's Regional Outreach Pilot Program, as I'm just seeing this. So Ariel, unless the name of the program has changed, maybe let me turn over to Dev on that. Has the name of the program changed? Is it now "Community Regional Outreach and Engagement" the CROEP – rather than the CROPP?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It is the "Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program," or CROPP.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So let's get "and Engagement" out of the way please, Ariel.

Anyway, let's get back to it. "…should offer a process similar to the CROPP but applicable to short lead time budgets not related to travel." And here we had – again, a significant amount of work was done on this and the next steps for that are as follows: "The ALAC will work with the GSE and Communications Department to clarify and institutionalize the budget requests for their discretionary funds facilitating RALO members' applications for those funds. The ALAC will also collaborate

with ICANN regional hub offices and make sure promotional items of the At-Large community are sufficiently stocked in those offices and can be distributed in regional events in a timely manner."

So that effectively means that if we have a meeting that takes place or an event that takes place in country XYZ and we have some CROPP attendees that have to go there, they themselves don't need to carry brochures but it could well be that if people coming from that regional office to that meeting, those people will have brochures with them in addition to the ICANN brochures, etc. We've certainly found in Europe that our Global Stakeholder Engagement Vice Presidents go to the same meetings as many of us do and they usually turn up with ICANN brochures but then we have to turn up with EURALO brochures. Hence, the reason it's more costs to send things all over the place. It's probably better use of resources like this now.

Judith Hellerstein, you have the floor.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks. Glenn and I had a meeting with Rob Hoggarth from [inaudible] about this. We also mentioned that at least in our region, the GSE when they go to events do not bring any brochures or anything like that or any ICANN literature. And a lot of our CROPP people also have problems getting this type of material to hand out because the NARALO brochure is not ready, the At-large they said, "Oh well currently we're [redoing here] because the first one had some errors." And oftentimes our CROPP people come to these meetings and have nothing to hand out and that makes it very difficult to do engagement.

So that is something that we are struggling with here, and so we would like that out there but also I think this seems to be very similar to the special budget requests that we put in and to get the money and there needs to be a better process of how do we go about getting the funding because at least in North America our GSE is very leery about doing outreach events because they do their own and they seem to be putting kibosh on ones that we suggest from the Outreach and Engagement Group.

I guess my question is then maybe have the At-Large brochures then created again, can there be enough sent out to different people in North America where the cost is not that high? But we seem to never be able to get them. And we tried with Dev putting a tracking data sheet but didn't seem to work.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this information, Judith. There are a couple of things that you mentioned in the… Certainly on the implementation details there is a discretionary fund of $10,000 managed by the GSE Teams to organize local outreach and engagement activities about ICANN policy issues. And that's something that started with FY17. But that's across all of the RALOs. That's written in the implementation details. What you're asking and what you're mentioning, is that properly encompassed in the next steps, because obviously the problems still are there and they still subsist and this is why this recommendation is not marked as being done.

So I'm hoping that the next steps – what you said. If you could please maybe type your comments on the side or type your comments on the next steps to let us know if what we have here is what you're thinking needs to be done or whether to add something else on this.

Dev Anand Teelucksingh and then Heidi has put her hand up as well. Let me first just defer to Heidi first because I know that she has some explanations as to what is going on here, and then Dev after that. Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. On that special request for the regional funds, I do need to make clear that the allocation of $10,000 was intended to managed collectively by the GSE regional VPs at their discretion to assist them in their continuing work with individual [inaudible] requests. So I would suggest that perhaps for future use is that if you're interested in using that please notify At-Large staff as well as the regional VP in the same note and we'll see what we can do on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Heidi. I note the concern that Judith is saying in the chat that the RGSE, which I believe is in North America and Global Stakeholder Engagement does want to give us access to this. I gather access to this discretionary fund. So that's something that needs to come through with implementation I think rather than us discussing it here. It really is out of scope for this working group here, but it's something that you need to work out for implementation. Please take a note of this and perhaps discuss this directly with Judith after the call.

Dav Anand Teelucksingh, you're next.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. I acknowledge the difficulty of this issue. And perhaps we should also [inaudible] perhaps in the next steps mentioned to Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee because I think the easiest thing to say is that should all be synchronized but of course the devil's in the details of how this synchronization takes place. It's a multiple-leveled whether the GSE should have the materials in the first place to how whether the ALAC should be or the At-Large staff should be sending the materials directly to the travelers and whether the travelers themselves are even aware to make the request properly within the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. So there's a few challenges in terms of collaboration on this issue but it has to happen and probably in a more structured way maybe, and we probably need to work a little bit more with staff in trying to find what's the best way, because otherwise I think you have a request going to instead of one person and the other group is not aware of it, another traveler that could have used some of those same materials could have probably been done at the same time.

There's lots of implementation issues. So I think we just need the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee involved in this and coming up with helping with the solution. So it's not just ALAC alone. Because I think if ALAC was to implement a solution then they need to bring it to the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. So definitely involve the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee in the next steps.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Dev. Point taken. Ariel, let's please add the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee to this next steps. Noting that Heidi has mentioned that we should discuss this with the Comms Department perhaps in Hyderabad or earlier as well. I don't know if there's any meeting that's scheduled to take place between the ALAC and the Communications Department or between the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee and the Communications Department. I'll leave it to you to work it out.

Let's go to Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm still trying to get a handle on this request on this ATLAS item. So this item was here and is very different from the special budget request that we put in last year. So this apparently has been in here since ATLAS. Then I guess I assume it's different now. Is this only for communications stuff or is this outreach, or is it like CROPP stuff? Because I know the GNSO has a different type of CROPP from talking to Rob. They have a different type of use for CROPP. They can have outreach events with [inaudible] with the Business Constituencies and they were starting up again in GNSO. So I first thought that this might be that but I'm really a little bit confused about what this point is talking about. Maybe someone can explain that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Judith. This one specifically said it's not something related to travel requests. So it's a bit like CROPP but it's not really to travel. It effectively would be a fund that would be provided for

the RALOs to use for expenses that are not CROPP-related expenses, and so what we made of this – we as in the whole group that works from this – is that it would have to be with anything to do with material, communications material, and not only brochures but maybe other things – banners and things that might be needed for ad hoc requests if we were to be present at a meeting or have some people present in a meeting – both through CROPP but through other means as well.

The difference between an ad hoc budget request that a RALO might be making with ICANN and this is that this would go into the core ICANN budget while the other one goes into this optional additional request budget which could in cases be granted and in some other cases could be refused. So it's really a case of institutionalizing the standard ability of RALOs being able to ask for brochures and all other material that might be of importance for the meeting that they are attending. Certainly in one way it would streamline the process of distributing the material to some… It also includes USB sticks, it includes all sorts of other promotional material. These all bear costs, but at present in the standard budget that we have we don't have the ability to suddenly request for 100 of this or 100 of that. These are ad hoc requests and they go through various ways but there needs to be some juggling of things for things to happen.

That's my take on this. Heidi, I would appreciate your being able to agree or disagree with my explanation or perhaps shed a bit more light from a staff perspective.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Hi, Olivier. This is something I really do feel that we need to sort out because it's been an ongoing issue. So we do have a limit to how many we can print per year due to budget items. We go at a rotation and primarily where the ICANN meetings are. So we're working on and priorities we're doing APRALO/AFRALO brochures so they're ready for the next meeting. We'll also work with the EURALO one next. But what's something that I will personally bring up with the Communications staff is that the ICANN officers in the Engagement centers have a sufficient supply of brochures so that they can be shipped out at shorter notice. But primarily we need at least a month just to sort things out, etc. and if there are any issues before any event.
	There was a wiki page that was set up for this, but it's not really been used.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Heidi, question for you.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Judith, can you just hold on one second. I had one additional thing to say. Heidi keeps on saying, well shipping things out from the local office sometimes it's actually cheaper to ship things out from the head office rather than the local office, but the specific thing that I've found completely unbelievable is that we would have someone or a group of people coming from the office in Brussels to a meeting and yet the L.A. office would have to ship some brochures over to me in wherever I am in the UK or in France or in Switzerland then I would have to bring the brochures in and the meeting is taking place in Brussels, and so I'm

shipping things into Brussels when they've already got an office in there. They could have just taken it, picked it from the office, and brought it to the meeting. It just seems like an extraordinary waste of money and resources.

Back to you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I guess Heidi and I will take this offline, but I do think on our end I do think the GSE should have a stock of ICANN brochures or even ATLAS, even At-Large, like not each RALO but they should also have a stack of the ATLAS of the At-Large [main] brochures that they could bring out, too. And the particular RALO ones we could talk about later, but they should also have a stack of both that they could bring out to different events.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. Certainly it's something we can mention to the Comms Department and the GSE next time we meet with them. I'm a bit concerned of the time, but let's go to Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to say that we'll make this an action item on the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee agenda to really discuss this issue properly and because we're trying to troubleshoot it now and we shouldn't be doing that. It's a work in progress. We'll discuss it fully in the Outreach and Engagement and by the various stakeholders involved and sort it out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Ariel, you have taken the phrase out that this will be discussed at ICANN 57? Is there a reason?

ARIEL LIANG: I'm just not sure whether it's going to be discussing. I have [inaudible] going to be discussing the Outreach and Engagement call first. So I wasn't sure. So I'm just going to put an action item here. And I don't think we have clarified that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Ariel. We haven't clarified this. Dev, are you planning an Outreach and Engagement call before Hyderabad?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, we are. We certainly do have to, or need to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: In which case, could I ask that there should be an action item in the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee. Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, just really quickly. I have placed that action item in the action item pod. Just Ariel, you can take a look at that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thank you. Let's swiftly move on. Again, concern about the time. We have #41: "The ALAC should work with the ICANN Board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities." That's one which was a little bit cryptic to try and understand, and it really is down to having some kind of a way to finance or to have external funding for being financed to travel to meetings, etc. Certainly the MoU's that some RALOs have now signed with other organizations have helped into their participation elsewhere in, for example, the ARIN meeting or the Regional Internet Registry meetings without ICANN footing the bill for this. But there is also the question of sponsors and fundraising.

Our Showcases have been run in a way that each one of the RALOs running the Showcases had to go and dig out the sponsors and talk to the sponsors and there doesn't seem to be continuity between the different RALOs, and so whilst one region might find sponsors quickly, thanks to mostly personal connections that they have with sponsors, the next RALO then has found itself in a really hard position of not being able to find sponsors. Then you end up with the same sponsor being hit regularly whilst others that actually sponsored things in the past not being asked ever again because people just forgot about them.

So the next steps here is for, "The ALAC Subcommittee on Finance and Budget to establish a Task Force to tackle fundraising and sponsor issues. Specifically the Task Force will work with ICANN staff to build and maintain a database that contains past sponsors' details and contributions. They will also develop a mechanism to build, maintain and strengthen the At-Large community's relationship with sponsors for long-term collaboration."

It's something that really makes sense. I saw it as a customer relationship management system. A CRM system for sponsors so we don't always ask the same sponsors for money repeatedly again and again, but at the same time there is also a continuity, and so we know when is the last time that a sponsor sponsored an ALAC or At-Large event, how much money did they put in there, or in what way did they sponsor it – sometimes it was in kind, sometimes it was actual funding – and we can build on the relationships on this as well. Who are the people to talk to in those organizations?

Are there any comments and questions about this? This is again one which hasn't been completed so that's why it's still in progress.

Welcome back, Alan. We'll come back to you immediately afterwards with one question that we had with regards to you – or not you, but with regards to the ALAC.

Any comments/questions on this recommendation? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I gather that this is all fine with all of you.

Okay, then that's the last one of the recommendations that are in progress. Let's go back to the one which required Alan's input, and that was the #36, I believe: "The At-Large community should envisage conference calls with other Advisory committees and Supporting Organizations in between ICANN public meetings to improve collaboration and engagement." Alan, the question was really whether there was something – and as the ALAC Chair you would probably have a better idea – there was something that could be envisaged? At the moment the next steps are as such, "During ICANN 57 the ALAC

Leadership Team will discuss with David Olive, Vice President of Policy Development Support in ICANN about the purpose, feasibility, and logistics of holding teleconferences between the ALAC and other SOs and ACs in between ICANN public meetings. These teleconferences will take place when there is a need and urgency to address substantive topics of concern to both the ALAC and relevant groups." These are really bilateral discussions between the ALAC and other SOs and ACs or ALAC Leadership Team. Any comments on this, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes certainly. I think we can say this is done. There are on rare occasions cross-community teleconferences, and I say rare in that I don't know if we've actually ever had one. But there is regular communication between me and the Chairs of the other organizations. There is regular communication in some cases between the leadership groups and other organizations. And if and when we find a need for something like this, I would have absolutely no doubt that it would be scheduled.

I can't think of a case where this kind of thing has come up and we've needed that level of discussion at the AC/SO level. But I have no reason to believe that should a need arise, that it would not be suggested and acted on. To the extent that I don't think we've had an example where we were desperately needing such a meeting, to say we have done them would be presumptuous. But I don't see any prohibition and I certainly don't see that we would have to ask David Olive's permission to do it if we thought there was a need.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I continue for a – There has been a need, for instance, to have meetings between the ALAC or an At-Large and the CWG, the CCWG, groups like that, and we've just done it. So I think this is business as usual should the need arise.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. So would you say that this is complete rather than in progress? Because it's currently marked in –

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if we lost Olivier or if you lost me. I see this as business as usual. If that means marked "complete" if that's the right answer, certainly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I thought you said, "We lost Olivier."

ALAN GREENBERG: There was a click and silence.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're going to have to change the next steps then, because the next steps at the moment mentions having the ALAC Leadership Team discussing this with David Olive and the feasibility of holding these meetings. Obviously we acknowledge the fact that there are monthly cross-community conference calls that have SOs, ACs, Cs, and RALOs, perhaps Ariel, could we add what a C is – no, "constituencies," we have said that. But no one knows – are these calls recorded, are they publicly accessible, or are they conducted under Chatham House rules? That was the other question which we had.

ALAN GREENBERG: The status of the monthly, what used to be monthly Chairs' calls are in flux right now. Some Chairs haven't participated in a long time and a whole bunch of other people – specifically GNSO, stakeholder group, and constituency Chairs were included inadvertently a while ago. We made a decision at the last such call – and no they are not recorded – we made a decision at the last call to essentially create two different groups, one the original one with just the Chairs of the ACs and SOs and a second, the larger one, which is roughly equivalent to the group that used to participate in the Friday afternoon – and will now be participating in a dinner that Göran is hosting – and that is the Chairs of the ACs, SOs, stakeholder groups, constituencies, and RALOs. In both cases the meetings are held without staff and I don't believe that they're recorded although I don't think there's any prohibition against

recording them should anyone decide. They will be going forward. The format will be changing. Stay tuned, I guess, is the answer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. So what should we do here? Should we keep this as in progress or should we just say this is complete?

ALAN GREENBERG: I say it's complete. This is clearly a case where if we wanted to do it, do it and let someone tell us we can't instead of asking for permission first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thanks for this, Alan. So let's mark this one as "complete," Ariel. That's a good one. That's one less in progress.

We have now spent an hour and 15 minutes on the 3A, which is a bit of a concern because we were then going to look at "Clarify the assignees for next steps for each recommendation." And there are 49 recommendations. I think it's a little bit difficult for us to go through each one of these. What I was going to ask is, we have shared this document with everyone just over 48 hours ago, is there anything that stands out as being out of place? I think that's more important rather than having the exact assignees, to see if there's anything that stands out out of place that anybody wanted to touch on as being perhaps more important than the assignees themselves.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I certainly see that Ariel has turned her sound off.

ARIEL LIANG: I just switched to the phone because my [inaudible] audio is not being heard.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. So no hands up on this. As I said, we've got all the next steps for all of the completed recommendations. Most of them are watching briefs. They're not next steps that are particularly huge. Often it's RALO leaders that have to continue doing things or the At-Large community will continue collaborating with staff departments, there's a whole lot of next steps. Most of the time it's watching briefs on external processes that have been launched, some of them independently of At-Large, some of them thanks to this ATLAS II. And there's just an ongoing thing like continuing to engage with the CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2. Certainly when it comes down to the Ombudsman issues, when it comes down to eliminating barriers to participation and engagement, a watching brief on ICANN staff effort on the elimination of participation barriers. And these of course are all enumerated here.

I'm not sure it's a good use of our time to go through each one of these next steps, but my question is whether there's anything that stands out. I realize you might not have all read through all these.

Okay, let's then move on to the next important thing which is the structure and content of the Executive Summary. At the moment we've got a table that spans four pages.

You know Board member attention is not that long. They are busy people. We've got one page with Appendix 1 with all the assignee details, which really shows the huge number of people that have been involved in this project, and then the rest of the document is all a huge appendix with the implementation details which is what we've been working on.

There is a question now as to whether we'd need a preamble in this. A summary of that four-page table and how should we build this? What should we include in that? Should it just be an introduction as to say how did we get here? How did this document end up on the table? Or should we highlight a number of recommendations which we think are particularly important and are more important than the other 43 recommendations?

The floor is open for comments, suggestions. Definitely no question at this point, it's all comments and suggestions.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: It would be good to have a short preamble because especially if we're having new incoming Board members just to understand what was the At-Large Summit about. So we could probably just use some of the text pulled from the Summit report just to say a few lines what this At-Large Summit was, came up with these 42 recommendations, and here we are going to report on how ICANN and the At-Large community has implemented these terms. That's it. Just a short preamble.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Dev. You think short preamble with just the process by which we reached these recommendations.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I don't think you have to go into the process. I don't think that's as interesting. Unless it's just to simply say, over the past months, over the coming months, [inaudible] At-Large community through various conference calls and show its various working groups have worked together to help implement the recommendations. Keep it simple.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Dev. I'd certainly be happy with that. But I don't know whether more needs to be added on this. Are there any specific recommendations that we'd like the Board to look at specifically? I was going to turn to the ALAC Chairs who have had some knowledge and some experience of sending statements, etc. to the Board, specifically Alan Greenberg and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

Cheryl, you were the Chair when ATLAS I was sent to the Board. We certainly looked at a system of a table with colors which I wouldn't say was similar but went along the lines or was inspired by the first ATLAS Final Implementation Report. What would you suggest that we have for this?

And second, Alan as well. It would be good at this point to have your suggestion on this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have moved from the point where under Cheryl's and beginning of Cheryl's tenure where when we sent things to the Board, we never even got an e-mail acknowledging it. We have strong evidence in some cases or had strong evidence in some cases that the person we forwarded it to never even forwarded it to the Board members. We're now at the stage where when we send something to the Board as advice, they take it seriously. They come back and ask us what we meant. We actually have to acknowledge it and interact with them. I'll translate that into saying if we give advice to the Board we'd better be serious because they're going to take it seriously. So we'd better mean what we say and not just frivolously toss something over the wall at them.

The world has changed radically over the nine years or something that the three of us had been Chairs. History is interesting, but it's evolving quickly enough that I don't think we can look at patterns from the past to decide how it's going to go forward in the future.

You will recall when we first sent the ATLAS recommendation to the Board and at the first go-round we included a lot of things for the Board's attention which they didn't have to have anything to do with really. Certainly there was no action they could take to effect it. And they came back and asked us, "What do you mean by this? We don't see how we're supposed to act on these." So someone actually read and looked at them and came to the conclusion that we hadn't brought it through as thoroughly as we should have before blindly forwarding them to the Board for forward action.

I'm not sure history is the governing factor at this point and I see evidence that the Board is treating us seriously and as long as what we send to them has some good basis, it will be considered. Will it be acted on is a different issue, of course. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Would you be okay then with just having the preamble that Dev has suggested, or do you think that four pages is too much and we need an Executive Summary that's 10 lines in length?

ALAN GREENBERG: Four pages is a lot to ask them to read if they don't actually have to take action, other than to demonstrate we're working. Sorry, again I haven't been following your discussion as thoroughly as I should have. With the transition possibly a day and a half away suddenly holes in our plan have opened up that have to have been addressed. So I haven't been focusing.

I think if we're going to send something to the Board it should be for information only and make it clear at the beginning that they can skip reading it if they really don't have the time right now, or be really clear on what we're asking them to do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. I thought maybe I should review this with Ariel, or we should review this with Ariel, and see if there are any of these recommendations that require at some point Board action and annotate them correctly. I know that we're using colors, perhaps we

could have a little red asterisk or something and just say the ones that require Board attention are marked with a red asterisk and then they could just see and we'll see maybe three asterisks around there, they just have three things to read.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, note Heidi's suggestion, the second to last comment which I think is very wise and I will be glad also when I have a bit more time to focus on something to look at whatever document you're planning and give you my thoughts on it as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks for this, Alan. I have no idea what this transition thing you're talking about but it must be important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once you check your e-mails or anyone looks at the ALT or the ALAC e-mails, you'll know what it's about it's not a secret, just required time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Another wonderful thing, yes. Murray McKercher, and we are reaching the end of our allocated timing. Murray, you have the floor.

MURRAY MCKERCHER: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Just a comment was on a call which Rinalia was on that call as well and she noted that there was quite a large turnover in the Board, more so than normal in the last few years so we may be

dealing with a number of folks that aren't aware of this process. So I just wanted to send that out there. I totally agree with Heidi's suggestions about perhaps having Rinalia steward that through to the Board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Murray. And yes, we will indeed. I think that's probably our next step is to then first send it to Rinalia and obtain her feedback on it and work with her before presenting it to the Board. So she could certainly be the shepherd of the document. Because we've found that with other documents that have been produced that she has shepherded, those documents have received a lot of attention from Board members. So that's a good thing.

Ariel Liang, you wanted to add something.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks. My suggestion is when I read all these draft implementation details I recognized there is three categories of recommendations, basically we can group a few into one category, it's the Outreach and Engagement related, the other is about enhancing ICANN accountability and governance and other legal issues, and the third type is the policy development specific recommendations. I wonder whether when we talk to Rinalia we can propose to provide that high-level summary in the Executive Summary just to showcase the progress targeting all these three categories of recommendations.

So that's if they want to skip the whole Annex they can still see what the progress [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Ariel. What you're effectively saying then is to reorder the recommendations as well, or how would that be done?

ARIEL LIANG: I don't think we need to reorder the recommendations. We can just highlight these three types of recommendations and the implementation of these three types in the Executive Summary. So if somebody just choose to read that summary they can still have understanding what's the implementation of the recommendations [inaudible] high-level.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That makes sense, too. Let's work on this together and we can propose it to the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force that we'll send this over to the mailing list as soon as this is done and then we can see what feedback we get. Yes? Not getting any answer from anyone. I gather silence is consent.

Good. Okay, thanks very much for this.

Next steps for ATLAS II recommendations. We've already discussed this. We're now going to work with Ariel on the feedback we've received today then work with Rinalia, and once we've got that then we can present this to the ALAC because it's the ALAC that has to ratify this

first. This is a new Recommendation Implementation Report. Once the ALAC has had a look at it and has decided to move forward with it then we can present this over to the Board in Hyderabad. Overall timeline is just over a month so time is of the essence. Therefore, if you have any input or comments, please make them as soon as possible.

This call is the only call we're going to have on this so from now on just the comments. You can comment directly on the document. You've got a link to the document in the chat here. So that should be able to help you.

That's it really for today. Any Other Business? Are there any other questions? Ariel, are we okay with the feedback we've got today?

ARIEL LIANG: Just one more thing about the next step for one of the recommendations but I can follow up with you to figure out the wording for that. And then just one note, if you are going to comment on this Google Doc I would recommend you either… Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Something went on and you got cut off. You would recommend using –

ARIEL LIANG: Yes, I would recommend you either log into your Google account or put your name in front of your comment so that we can identify who makes what comments on that Google Doc [inaudible] recommendation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Because we noticed that there were some anonymous comments here so just put your name, and that's of course not because we want to blame you for the comments, but we want to be able to come back to you if the comment is difficult to understand and be sure that the intent of your comment was actually what was done when the amendment was made.

Excellent. Any Other Business? I see a question from Murray: "When is ATLAS III planned?" Soon. And Heidi indeed, you had mentioned there is a multi-year budget and General Assemblies and Summits which has been put together, and it's also explained in one of the recommendations.

With this, we are six minutes past the official end of this call. I'd like to thank our interpreters for French and Spanish. I understand I've spoken extremely fast today so they must be relieved that this call is ending.

And I would like to thank very much, Ariel, for being such a star in first drafting of most of this stuff here based on the input of the community, putting it together, and effectively I'd say holding the pen if you want on that. So really, really, great.

Of course, thanks to all staff as well.

And with this, thanks to you all who have been on this call. This is really a process which is nearing the end which started more than two years ago and which has been quite extraordinary, and I think we can pat ourselves on the back when this thing comes out. It is unprecedented –

150 ALSes, people from all over the world, and really some not only just words but actual implementation which has been really great. So it's not just the report but it's the tens of thousands, maybe even hundreds of thousands of hours of volunteer time that has gone into that showing that a community can evolve and can evolve without being told what to do. That really is the bottom-up, multistakeholder model.

Thanks very much, everyone. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]