
YESIM NAZLAR:

I will ask my colleague to start the recording. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party and ITEMS Call on Wednesday, the 5th of October, 2016, at 12:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Vanda Scartezini, Alan Greenberg, Satish Babu, Raitme Citterio, Sebastien Bachelett, and Eduardo Diaz.

On the Spanish channel we have Aida Noblia and Alberto Soto. On the ITEMS Team we have Tom Mackenzie and Nick Thorne. We have received apologies from Fatimata Seye Sylla, Kaili Kan, León Sánchez, and Heidi Ullrich as well.

From staff we have Lars Hoffmann, Ariel Liang, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. For today, our Spanish interpreters are Sabrina and Veronica.

Finally, I'd 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, Cheryl and Holly. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Yesim. I can start, and if Cheryl wants add, that's fine.

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.

ROSA DELGADO: Hello. This is Rosa Delgado. I just joined.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Regarding the preparations for the meeting in Hyderabad – but in the meantime, this is a call to actually see where we’re up to with the survey and what further steps we have to take. I hope all of you have filled out the survey form that Tom’s about to talk about. We’re going to look at some measures we might need to do, if we need further response – which I think we’re going to do – what we’re going to need to do and what we’re going to do for outreach.

In the meantime, do you have anything to add? If not, over to you, Tom?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. All right. Hello, everyone. This is Tom speaking. Thank you all for being here. We’re very much aware that the more civilized the hour is for us, the more uncivilized it is for just about everyone else on the call. Thank you all.

I’m just going to talk you through very quickly the results of the survey so far. Just as a reminder – good. I’m just now seeing what you can all see. If we just go to the next page, please, or have I – oh, I got the controls. So that’s why –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] right. We've all got – right.

TOM MACKENZIE: I've got control.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

TOM MACKENZIE: Just as a very quick reminder, the survey was launched officially on the 12th of September. That's just to say just over 23 days ago, three weeks ago this week. It was launched simultaneously in all parts of the world, and we were very grateful for the support that we were given to announce, to communicate, the survey through various mailing lists.

What we can report already today – I'm going to go straight into the figures – is that we have what we consider to be a very respectable response rate from all parts of the world. We have, as of today, 150 responses from a total of 46 countries around the world. So that's already a very good result, considering that we are – I think it's important to point out – only just into about halfway into the whole survey period, the originally-defined survey period, which will take us to the end of this month, October.

So there we are. There you can see that we have 150 responses from 46 countries. We've listed on both sides of this slide all the countries from

where we have received responses. You can see, I suppose, that the most striking block, perhaps, is that big chunk of 30.4, which represents the United States. So the United States still does have a much larger number of stakeholders or people who are interested in spontaneously responding to this kind of survey.

The second largest chunk, for your information, is Canada, so we really do have a very sort of large proportion, if you like, from North America. It would be good, if anything, to learn from this slide that we really do need to push more responses from other parts of the world.

I'm just going to move on. This is a simplified version or representation of the previous slide. It just shows you the responses per global region. In fact, this actual pie chart needs to be slightly corrected because, as you know, we have been running three surveys simultaneously: the main one, which is the English version of the questionnaire, and then we've got French and Spanish versions of the same questionnaire running simultaneously.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Tom, may I interrupt you there? Just a question. If you've got 30.4 from the United States but the next region – if you look at the next region, according to the next region, the biggest seems to be from APRALO. I don't understand that difference.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Right. Now let me see. Right. Hold on just one second. APRALO. Hold on. Just let me check. I'm just scrolling through the –

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE: Sorry?

ALAN GREENBERG: North America should be at least 37% if it's Canada and the U.S.

TOM MACKENZIE: There is a reason. I'm sorry for this. I'm sorry –

HOLLY RAICHE: No, it's all right. You can keep going ahead. Maybe when you [inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE: No, no, no. You're right. There is a reason, which is that – and it's actually another point that I wanted to make, which is that – in fact, it's a very important point, which is that all the charts that we're showing you today are fairly high-level. That's to say that they do not have anything like the precision of the charts and pie charts that we will be using in our report. That's to say that the very first chart, which is the countries one, is a chart that I created. That's not something that was automatically generated – this one. The one that you can now see on your screen. So that is a chart which shows you all respondents,

whether they are staff members, whether they are anybody who's responded. That's how that representation comes up.

This next one is a reflection of the At-Large community, if you see what I mean. So we're not taking into account in this particular representation the representatives of SOs and ACs and these people and these other kind of respondent categories.

So it was a very good question, and it gave me an opportunity to clarify that it's very important that all people on this call should be aware that these are very high-level representations of what's going on, which lack the precision, which we will be extracting in the weeks ahead and which we will be presenting to you in Hyderabad.

But that, I'm afraid, is the best that we can do at this stage: we can extract a general impression of what's going on. This vision will get better, more precise, as we move forward.

This next –

HOLLY RAICHE: I've interrupted. Please go ahead. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: No, no, no. It was a very good question, and we now get onto the next slide, which is about language. This is the question in which we asked people to state which was their first mother tongue. Actually, you see a very surprising – this, again, was a question that was asked to all respondents. So this is not just the At-Large, but everyone else. Again,

you see a very large number of respondents stating English as their first language. That section is likely to be somewhat smaller if we just represent the At-Large community, but still, it does suggest that a very large majority of the people participating in At-Large discussions do have English as their first or mother tongue.

If we move forward, this is a simple representation of the age and gender of respondents. You see that a vast majority of respondents are age between 40 and 59 years old. A very small number of 15 to 19 year olds, a significant number of 20 to 39 years olds, and quite a large number as well of 60 to 74 year olds, the older or senior members of the community. So that's good, but it does suggest that we could focus a little bit more on these other groups, the smaller age groups.

When it comes to the gender of respondents, there's a very conspicuous majority of male respondents to the survey, with 17 to 29% for female respondents, and only a sliver of non-identified.

That suggests that, if possible, it would be good if we could try somehow to boost the number of female respondents to the survey. After all, At-Large is intended for all Internet users, so, hopefully, we should aim to have a more fairer distribution of male and female respondents.

This next slide that we're now on is the question in which we asked the people to specify their connection to the At-Large community before responding. Here you see the At-Large community represent 33-34%, at the moment, of respondents. There's a 28.7% of ICANN-supporting organizations, and it's actually quite important to point out that, within

ICANN-supporting organizations, most respondents are from the GNSO. There were very respondents from the other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, so we really do need to work a bit more on those others; the ccNSO, ASO, and etc. Those communities either have zero or very few – one – respondents.

The Board of Directors at the moment – we have three. But I think, for a survey like this, we would need to have responses from as many as possible – ideally all members of the Board and the CEO – to get their points of view on this situation and what’s going on.

We have ICANN staff at 12 – that’s sort of to be expected – and Internet users non-affiliated with ICANN at 36. I think it’s important just to point out that, with the people who are non-affiliated, there are respondents in that category who have been affiliated in the past. So they do know the At-Large community, but some of them have moved on.

We are now on this slide, 8, which is the topology of ALSes. Now this is zoomed in, it’s important to say, exclusively on the At-Large community, so we’ve excluded all the other respondents from these charts.

We have on the left there the years of At-Large membership. That’s quite a nice, even distribution of older and newer ALSes – hold on. Someone’s scrolling down a bit. I don’t know if that’s a deliberate scrolling down just to speed me up. I’ll just quickly – I am coming to the end. It’s just to say that that middle chart shows that a vast majority of At-Large Structures are ISOC chapters, and then there’s a smaller distribution of other types of ALSes there.

Then you can see that we also have quite a nice distribution on that chart on the right of larger and smaller ALSes, everything from the one-member through to the very large-membership organizations.

Right. Obviously, we'd be happy to answer any questions on the responses that we have received so far. We do also have a few bullets there on some of the issues that are coming to the surface through the comments sections of the survey.

We did want to just point out that, as far as the survey is concerned, we really do feel it's too early at this stage to give you a much more specific analysis of what people are saying and the salient issues that they are expressing because there are many, many things which they are saying but we have not yet had the time to analyze those findings. That's more of the kind of presentation that we're going to give you in Hyderabad.

But we have prepared this final slide –

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, fine. Alan has his hand up. Why don't we wait until you finish the presentation, and then we can take questions? So, Alan, you're first off the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENEBRG:

That's fine. Tom said he's asking for questions, so I put my hand up. [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. Tom, you said you were to your last slide?

TOM MACKENZIE:

Yeah. As you can see, these are the two last slides. We have some of the issues that have come to the surface through the survey. And this is just a final slide on our milestones between now and the end of the year.

If you like, I can just run through very quickly this particular slide, or you can read it for yourselves, on the issues that people are very much passionate about but equally divided about: the issues of accountability and the actual mission of At-Large. There seems to be a sort of discrepancy of what people actually think At-Large is there for. So that's definitely something that we will be looking into more.

There's quite a few people commenting on this tension, if you like, between the need to maintain institutional capacities and institutional memory within At-Large versus with imperative to renew leadership and identify the next generation of leaders. This is an issue that you yourselves – many of you on this call – have talked to us quite frankly about. So that's also coming up from the respondents to the survey.

The capacity of RALOs to engage with end users is something which is discussed in all kinds of different ways, with very different views, again, about how that might be enhanced. You have people who are very critical of the RALO system, others who defend it, and others who suggest other alternative ways in which the community could be organized. Again, this is an area which we will need to be looking into and will be looking into.

There's stark differences of opinion on RALO efforts to engage with end users in each region and the appropriateness of the system of RALOs to ensure end user representation within ICANN. That is a little bit like the previous points, and there are several quite interesting ideas, which we will be looking at, about how the community can improve the way it organizes itself and how it's represented in ICANN.

In the penultimate point, quite a lot has been said about the need for a better coordination of efforts between ICANN the organization and ICANN the community. We've been told that there's a lot going on, that ICANN as an organization is organizing a lot. But there's not always a perfect match between what ICANN the organization is doing and what ICANN the community expects or might be able to benefit from in terms of synergies and organizing joint events and this kind of thing.

Finally, there's the effective use of translation and interpretation services. Again, there are lots of people who are calling for translation and interpretation services. On the other hand, you have people who clearly need to use these services but who find them to be less than perfect. So it's a very difficult issue, and it's something that we've, again, only just started a group work on. But it's obviously an issue which needs to be looked at more.

So that's it, as far as the main issues are concerned. Finally, if you'd like, I can just show you this simple slide, which is our next milestones. We shall be making a much more detailed and precise presentation of the survey during Hyderabad.

Before the Hyderabad meeting, Nick Thorne will be participating in the Indian School on Internet Governance, which is just before Hyderabad. On the 30th of November, according to our contract, we have the presentation of an interim report.

In fact, I meant to include a line just before the interim report to say that we are actually thinking very seriously amongst ourselves as a team that we would like to have a week retreat where we all get together ourselves to write the draft of the interim report. That will take place in the very first week of December. So what we would like to propose is that we postpone the delivery of our interim report from the 30th of November to the 5th of December.

The final milestone is the IGF in Guadalajara, which we proposed to attend and to include as the North America regional event. Once we have attended that meeting, we will have covered the five global regions.

That is it for now. I welcome any questions.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Well, you've got two right here. Alan, go ahead, please. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of comments, but first a question. You said you had 36 responses from non-affiliated people, although they may have been affiliated in the past. Where did you get those from? Were those people who attend conferences you participated in?

I'm just curious. It's a rather large percentage and large number for people who say they have no affiliation at all with ICANN.

TOM MACKENZIE:

I know. These are people who are self-identifying themselves as non-affiliated. I can't say that I had the time to go through every single one in detail, but it looks like these are people who have been affiliated at some time in the past but who are no longer involved and who choose to identify themselves in this way because the only explanation for them having answered is that they have received information regarding the survey. The only channels of information for the survey, or the main channels of the information, have been the At-Large mailing lists. To a certain extent, we have been raising awareness about the survey during IGF meetings and this kind of thing; IGF national events. So I guess there are likely to be a few people who are in that kind of category –

ALAN GREENBERG:

[inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE:

But we will give you –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. Go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: No, no, no. I think we will be looking into these figures in more detail, but, for us, that particular pie chart tells us that we need to reinforce the At-Large participant chunk/section of the chart. What that means is that we need to send out another set of e-mails through the At-Large mailing lists just to encourage people to respond because 46 out of 200 is okay, but it still needs to be increased. I think, out of a community of 200 ALSes, it would be better if it would be closer to 100 ALSes. Then, obviously, that chunk of non-users would be reduced.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you –

TOM MACKENZIE: In other words, each segment actually changes quite a lot in size by the day, and, suddenly, for that reason, that non-affiliated chunk got a bit bigger over the past few days. But it's only an indicator for us that we need to boost on the other fronts.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. The reason I ask is I wouldn't have thought you had participated in that many ICANN events in the three weeks that the URL for the survey has been available. That's what triggered the question.

TOM MACKENZIE: Oh, we haven't participated, but, for example, we monitor many of the IGF meetings that are going on around the world, and we know that there are people even on this call who've been participating in IGF and

other kinds of meetings in various parts of the world. What we tend to do in those cases is say, well, “This is a survey that’s going on. It’s likely that you’ll have an interest in what’s going on, so please respond.”

So we haven’t physically participated, but we –

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I do. Sorry. That was just a curiosity. I wasn’t looking for a detailed analysis of it.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: A couple of observations, and most of them were made because I just filled out the survey last night, so it’s fresh in my mind. And a couple of observations on your observations.

First of all is the size of ALSes. You said there were some as low as one. Now, I didn’t answer that question, so I don’t know what the gradation was in the options. I sure hope no one said they only have one, but I’d be interested to know who it is because that sort of violates the whole concept of an ALS.

You said there was a lot of diversity in answering the mission of At-Large questions. That's not surprising. You may recall that, when we were looking at this initially, I said all of those answers apply to some extent. Since you only give people the option of answering one, different people weighted them differently. But each of those in fact is true for some segment of the population. So it's not particularly surprising that you got a split in that.

On the issue of leadership and turnover, in my mind, anyway, the situation is very different in different regions. So, again, it's not particularly surprising there's diversity in the answers because, depending on the perspective of the person answering them, there may be a very different answer even those tightly coupled into the ICANN world.

Lastly, on teleconferences, again, I think you asked the question of, "Are the remote participation facilities good?" or, "Are the opportunities for remote participation good?" In my mind, we provide excellent opportunities, but they don't always work, largely because of the quirks of the world phone system and things like that.

So we may be doing a good a job as ICANN physical can do, but that doesn't mean the end results are necessarily usable in all cases. So, again, you're going to splits depending on how people interpreted some of those questions. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Alan. Tijani, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much, Holly and thank you, Tom for this presentation. Do you hear me well?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. First of all, I can say according to this survey that the population of the At-Large community is a little bit [inaudible]. This is something that is a little bit surprising for me. I didn't know that people over 16 are so many. Anyway, this is only an observation. But I had a big concern about this survey. I can say that the proportion of the At-Large community all in all affiliated and not affiliated is less than 60% of the respondents of this survey. If the conclusions that you presented at the last slides are based on this configuration, that means only 60% of the At-Large community are participating.

I am afraid it will not lead us to good recommendations for the review because the review is the review of At-Large. I am very happy to have the other parts of the ICANN community respond to this survey so that we have a feeling of what the people think outside At-Large. But for the improvement of At-Large, I think that the community of At-Large should have the [respondents] say and with 60% only I don't think it will be a good representation and I don't think it will lead to a good improvement of At-Large. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And Cheryl has her hand up. Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, I wondered whether someone wanted to respond to Tijani.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Tom?

TOM MACKENZIE: Tijani, I think that's a very valid and important point. I think there were two things to say, which is that we will not be merging or – we will be separating out to put it more simply – we'll be separating out the responses that are given by members of the other Supporting Organizations within ICANN and the At-Large respondents. So there will be no confusion there about who is saying what. But we did think, and I think we agreed during previous calls, that we needed to have in carrying out a review like this we needed to have reviews of people within – within the other Supporting Organizations and even beyond the organizations. So we needed to have all these responses, but in dealing with them we will deal with them separately.

When it comes to the size of the respondent pool from the actual At-Large community, I think I've already said in answer to Alan's point earlier that we do need to make that bigger and to a certain extent we're counting on you as the heads of RALOs to make sure that the members, the ALSes that are members of your RALOs really are getting the message that this survey is happening and that they should be

strongly urged to respond. And if they stubbornly refuse to respond, I don't know what much more we can do about that.

As far as our own efforts are concerned, we have sent out individual e-mails, in coordination with ICANN staff many e-mails have been sent out through the mailing lists to target the community itself, and I believe we've actually also sent out individual e-mails – or I did anyway – I sent out e-mails to the representatives of all the RALOs urging you to send out messages to your members. So I think that lots of effort has already gone into this, but no doubt more effort should go into targeting these kind of respondents for sure.

Anyhow, so that I hope answers your concern about that. Do you want me to answer some of the other questions from Alan?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Cheryl has her hand up and Alberto does as well, and then any other additional issues we can deal with that stuff, but Cheryl's got her hand up first and then Alberto. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Holly. It's just an observation. It was triggered by one of the points Alan was making, so Tom may want to pick it up when he responds to some of that later and we could go straight to Alberto.

Regarding the opportunities and the effectiveness of the communication and interpretation translation tool, something that has happened recently, not so much in At-Large community calls that I'm aware of but certainly it does happen in some of the calls that our

communities are engaged with such as the Asia Pacific Regional IGF meeting calls and things like that. But it's also happening quite a bit lately in some of the GNSO calls relating to Subsequent Procedures to new gTLDs. And that's where we have leadership of calls who are relatively newbies and they are simply not using the tools effectively and/or making rookie mistakes such as relying on an Adobe Connect phone connection rather than getting an actual plain telephone or Skype-enabled/ voice-enabled phone connection so we have ridiculous amounts of time being wasted in calls where people can't hear each other or whatever.

These are the sorts of things that will bias responses there. I'm not sure what we can do with that other than be aware when we analyze but I just wanted to say that that is something I've recently noticed and that may affect some of our data collection. Let's go to Alberto now.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you very much, Holly. In the first statistics when you mentioned the percentage for North America and then the regions, I believe if I'm not mistaken that in the first page you counted individuals and in the second graph you measured the participation of RALOs and not individuals. That is my comment. That percentage being indicated there as a RALO is not so far away from the participation that each RALO has in their monthly meetings. Perhaps if we do more average we can get a better number.

I believe we are facing a structural problem regarding participation of people within each RALO. For example, in LACRALO we have 50 ALSes and generally in a monthly meeting we are not more than 20 ALSes or 18 ALSes participating. And we did that making a lot of effort because at the very beginning we were only seven or eight and we have leadership communications that are not transmitted as they should. For example, we have a reminder but a reminder for a meeting like this comes to us but indeed we need to see the importance of these type of meeting or these review for each of the ALSes. So I believe we have many problems that we need to face and some of these problems should be faced simultaneously. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Alberto. Tom, do you want to have a quick response before we see if anybody else can contribute, and then we're going to talk to perhaps some more ideas for outreach. And Rosa has raised her hand. Rosa first, go ahead please and then Tom.

Rosa? Rosa, you raised your hand. Okay, Tom, go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE:

That was a very interesting point that was just made by Alberto just then, and what I would say is that as far as... There is one point just to make about the participation from the LAC region and African regions in this particular pie chart which are slightly under represented in this chart, and that's because we're carrying out the three surveys simultaneously. So this is the representation of what's going on in the main survey – the English version of the survey – but we have had a

certain number of responses in Spanish for the LAC survey and in French for the other one and so that would increase for the LAC and African sections of this particular chunk by several percentage points.

So those two regions are under represented in this particular chart at the moment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Actually that means that probably the figure for the ALAC participation will go up as well.

TOM MACKENZIE: And it will go up slightly as well, yeah. As I say, I think it's very important that we should emphasize that these are sort of rough pictures of what's going on at the moment and with a need for a little bit of adjustment and explanation.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you. Rosa, you have your hand up? Rosa? Is she on the call? No, Rosa. No we cannot hear you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank Rosa for demonstrating my point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, exactly. Can someone type in the chat please, "Rosa, we can't hear you." And could she type her question into the chat?

ROSA DELGADO: Can you hear me, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, thank you. Go ahead please.

ROSA DELGADO: Okay. I just wanted to answer regarding the LACRALO. We have made efforts in representing the survey in the LACRALO meetings. There is a version in Spanish now and also I attend a meeting of [LACNIC] in Costa Rica and be talking with different people, different member of At-Large and new members of At-Large and I think we'll have more results in the next few days. I just wanted to add that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Tijani, is that a new hand or an old hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: A new hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Could you go ahead? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. Tom, I think that the charts have to be updated according to the respondents from the other languages

because it will give us the sense of the amount of effort we have to do in outreach to make people take the survey. [Inaudible] in AFRALO I personally did a bigger [call] on that. I sent several reminders to all the groups and those updates I don't think – if there is other things to do I don't know what we have to do. So we need to know what is the average of people who responded to our survey. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Okay. I don't think there is much more to add there apart from the fact that I can tell you now that we have five responses on the French. It's not very high. It's only five responses compared to 150 on the English. But still, that will boost the response from that part of the world and those five responses are mainly French African countries.

But still, I do think we need to get more so any communication support from the RALOs or AFRALO in this case would be much appreciated. And presumably you can use both links – the English survey and the French – for the African region. Any support from, in fact for all the regions, would be much appreciated.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Tom. Aida, go ahead please. Aida? We don't hear you. Your hand is raised.

AIDA NOBLIA:

Thank you. I just wanted to say that I had replied to this survey and I had replied in Spanish. That would add a country and ALS to the survey. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Olivier? Go ahead, please. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Frantically trying to unmute my stupid phone. Hello. Is this working now?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. I did get a question recently – well, just a couple of hours earlier – I sent a reminder to the EURALO mailing list. I got a private response from some people who said they had already been interviewed by Tom at EuroDIG and they wondered why they would have to fill this again. My response was I think that the questions are different. That was maybe one of the concerns.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yeah, okay. That's a good point and thank you for that, Olivier. Maybe we can take that into account in the messages that we send out from now on that this is a very different kind of exercise to the interviews that we were conducting in the earlier, and in fact which we're still conducting. The aim of the interviews is to allow people to fairly freely... to allow the conversation to go where they feel that they have something that they need to say and to comment on regarding At-Large.

The survey is a much more guided process which allows us to go also much deeper into the community to get responses from individual users. It's a very different exercise. To come to your point about people who I may have actually interviewed already, yes but we do need to, even people like that we would like them to reply to the survey because quite often in a way the answers that they provide in the survey are enriched because of the interview conversation that we've already had. It's already given them time to think about issues which they think are important and so quite often that category of respondent provides us with quite interesting material in the written sections of the survey.

Yes, please respond to our interviews and please do the survey as well.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Tom. Alan? Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A purely mechanical thing. My understanding was if you submit the survey, at the end you can go back to it if you're on the same computer. I assume that's done with cookies or something like that. My experience was it didn't work. So I don't know if I'm just particularly inept. I did capture the URL that's presented at the end, the infinitely long URL, so I can go back and edit my questionnaire or finish it if I hadn't finished it but the ability to recognize the same person on the same computer and allow them to get back into their survey seems to be broken, at least for me. So that might also impact a number of people who are able to fully complete the survey. I know when that

happens to me in a general case I just throw it away and say I'm not going to bother doing this again. This is a waste of my time. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Thank you, Alan. Again, thank you for getting back into the survey and copying the URL and at least getting back that way. It is a concern to hear that you weren't able to get back into it as you should be able to get back into it from the same computer. I don't know why, to be honest, that's happening. We did run, as I think we mentioned last time, lots of tests to make sure that that would happen.

If it's any reassurance, we have not had any complaints or any phone calls or messages or anything from anybody who's had a difficulty with the survey. The one thing we have noticed but it was on one or two respondents, is that apparently somebody tried to fill it in and only got so far, and then perhaps changed their mind about some of the things that they wanted to say. But instead of getting back into the survey they were able to respond a second time and so we have two lines. That has happened on one occasion for the same respondent.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I would note what Vanda said in the chat which is, "I lost my first responses because I needed to stop and the system did not save it." So maybe you can have a look. You've already responded to that, Tom, but might have a look at Vanda's experience as well which she brought to the team.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record I'm using Firefox and Windows.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: We are close to out of time. We have a lot to get through. The next item is discussion of outreach ideas. Now, from the survey you have identified, Tom, the groups in fact that you were trying to target – it was women, it was other SOs and ACs, the Board including the CEO, I don't know if he's replied, and ISOC, but mainly it's ALAC that you were concerned about. And as we found out in the discussion, some ALAC members may not have been counted because they weren't doing the English survey so that figure may be different. But if we can spend about five minutes thinking about the groups you particularly want to target for more, do people have strategies or, Tom, do you have strategies on how we might reach those particular groups since those are the groups you've identified that you would like a response from.

Maybe first to you, Tom, Cheryl, and Lars, and then anybody else with additional ideas on how to get further input of the kind that you're looking for. So Tom, a couple of minutes from you and maybe Lars.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. I don't think I need to add a huge much. Just to say that... Well, we've already said that we need to send out more messages through the mailing lists. We can do that with staff. But also counting on the members of At-Large and the representatives of the RALOs. So various messages to go out there to the communities specifying perhaps in the message that women are strongly encouraged to respond and this kind of thing. That's my main recommendation would be at this stage. Many more messages actually specifically spelling out the respondent types that we would like to hear from in particular.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note that although women are pretty well represented in our various leadership positions, if you look at our incoming liaisons we almost restrict it to women in some cases, or seemingly, they're not equally represented in our overall At-Large community and therefore some of your targets are at odds with each other. If you want a higher representation of people who are actually active in At-Large, that will again preserve your disparity in gender. And if you target increased participation in women, you're almost by definition likely to decrease the percentage of people who are very active and the ones who do participate. So just noting that those are competing things and one is likely to suffer at the expense of the other depending on how successful you are in each case. [Inaudible] the demographics.

TOM MACKENZIE: Absolutely. We're definitely not aiming to have a 50% - 50%... Some of these charts are not intended to be red flags to say that we need to get exact parity, but sometimes it's just an interesting reflection of who the community is. So it's more of that kind of piece of information.

But still, it would be better to... We could slightly increase, somewhat increase, that particular respondent category. And then otherwise, it's as I say, it's just drawing conclusions on how the community is made up at a later stage.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, do you have anything to add at this stage?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, very briefly because the next call is calling me. The other thing, of course, is we are going to be accepting more input throughout Hyderabad and immediately following Hyderabad, and people looking at these figures will be inspired to go, "Well, gee. I'd better fill this out." And I don't think we should underestimate the power of when people have committed a week of their lives or nine days of their lives to be at an ICANN meeting and possibly [women] might find time to fill out the survey as well. And at that, I really do have to go because I have to get to this other call. Sorry. Thank you. Bye.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, we're about to go over time. We'll go a little bit over time. Tijani, you had one comment. Go ahead, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Holly. On this slide, this very slide “#7 I have counted there is not 150 respondents. There is only 136. And all the percentage there are based on 136, so I don’t understand how it is done like this. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Tom, I’m going to let you... I don’t think we have time for a discussion about the percentages. Tijani, earlier in the call we did hear Tom say these are rough estimates and I think that by the time this chart is presented at Hyderabad we would hope that all of the percentages are finalized, and I guess to take Tijani’s comment into account [inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE: It’s very simple to answer that question, which is that the 136 figure which is no longer 136 because we’ve since during this call have received two more responses, but so it’s 138. But we have in addition to that, we have seven Latin American responses and six African. So when you add up, the total comes to 150. That’s why the figures that you’ve got on your charts are the figures for the English survey.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I think Tom will be clear with everybody he’ll be going through this with a fine toothed comb and just checking out the figures and made sure they all work and that the discrepancies that people have talked about, which you’ve explained, maybe what I’m thinking of this presentation a line or two of explanation so that the questions that

were raised by the slides are answered before they're asked might be very helpful.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Next question now, do we have any more suggestions – and I didn't talk to Lars – on more outreach? I think we've covered that one pretty well have we not?

TOM MACKENZIE: There's one question is that at recent ICANN meetings I have been aware of the women's breakfast or something. There's an organization –

HOLLY RAICHE: [Inaudible]. Vanda has already in the chat said she's going to send out notices, and talk specifically with Vanda to that. If you read the chat earlier on, she has already mentioned the DNS Breakfast. So don't worry, that will help the women's percentages. [Trust me].

Any other suggestions? Okay, and Lars: "Staff is using ICANN org announcements and Twitter handles." I think really we've done what we can at this stage. The face-to-face meeting, what would you like to achieve, Tom, at the face-to-face meeting? Clearly there will be a presentation of the final version of these slides, is that right?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. That's right. I think we need a good hour, if possible, in which we will present to you slides which will actually be quite different, to be honest, to the ones that you have seen today. There will be pie charts, of course, but there will be maps, there will be graphs, there will be bar charts, there will be very different methods of representation that will be used and they will be much finer looking in response to the questions that you've raised and our plans all along actually to extrapolate findings in a much finer way.

So there will be that. And then I think we really do need to... We will present to you some of the main issues that are coming out in the comments section of the survey and we would like to have the opportunity to engage in some kind of discussion with all those present at the Hyderabad meeting, and I think that will require a good hour's presentation.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, you had your hand up? It's not down. Do you –

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I took it down deliberately. I don't need to waste time on it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Aida, you have a question or comment? Thank you. Aida? Why don't we hear from Nick Thorne while –

AIDA NOBLIA: Aida speaking. Thank you. The face-to-face meeting will have no remote participation. Will there be remote participation, because I will not be able to attend in person. That's my question. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm not sure I have an answer. Lars, can we leave that with you?

LARS HOFFMANN: No problem, Holly. I strongly assume there will be remote participation, but we'll make sure [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I think so. We've all heard about the fire in the [ship] and what that might or might not do. But that's a good question. Thank you very much. Nick, you had a comment?

NICK THORNE: Yes, Holly, and good afternoon to everybody. Mine's a question really. Could we please on request look forward to a briefing from the working group and perhaps from ICANN staff on the implications of the study of the IANA transition? I'm thinking particularly in the enhanced role for ALAC/[GAC] in that process now that we've made the move.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, my goodness.

NICK THORNE: I don't want to go into it now, but I think it's something which we do need to address and we – the ITEMS team – [inaudible] from you as to how this should impact our work. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That is a huge question. Alan? We have not set, Nick, in response I don't believe we've set time for that at all, but I think that's something we should be taking offline and Cheryl and Alan and I are going to have to deal with that because if you really want that, that's a big analysis to do and it's a big discussion quite separate from this. So Alan, I'll be e-mailing you on that one.

NICK THORNE: Holly, I appreciate that. But what I wanted to do was to just put down the mark that this is out there and we need to deal with it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. That's huge, yes. Okay, and probably, Nick, just to respond further there are some people within ALAC who have spent a lot of their life on the transition who'll be very familiar with that [inaudible]. It's very, very different. It's very, very, different question and I think we just deal with that separately. Okay?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Can someone mute Tijani, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Okay, on the face-to-face meeting that we're talking about – and then I realize we're over time, that's okay – my suggestion is if you want a lot of time for the issues raised, that the presentation probably should take no more than 15 minutes to go through, that everybody can look at it. I'm concerned that if it's a big presentation, you won't have time. Either that or we should have an hour and a half, and I don't know where we're going to get an hour and a half.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: But Tom, it's maybe something that you and I and Cheryl and maybe Alan can liaise with, but one hour with enough time for everyone in the room to raise questions is a bit of a challenge. And in fact, if people can have a look beforehand at the presentation and formulate their questions and possibly feed them back to you, that may actually save a lot of time. But I am concerned that given the amount of information that's in these slides, if you're going to do a much bigger pack you will be lucky to get through the hour and that will leave no time for discussion, which is what I think you really want to get out of the meeting anyway.

So maybe offline could we plan that so that we've got plenty of time for questions and maybe get something out beforehand? Alan, how do you feel about that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Our experience with people doing their homework and preparing questions is not particularly good. Be aware of that. They're nice words but in practice it doesn't seem to work very well. The participation we get in these webinars just before a meeting is very, very, slim especially if it's a targeted subject.

How we're going to find an hour and a half for a general session, we haven't done the agenda planning yet. We're very late on it because ICANN still has not come out with what the high interest topics are going to be and it's not clear when that's going to happen. This is going to be yet another meeting that's going to be a real problem for agendas and I don't know at this point. We will certainly try.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. Both Sebastien and Eduardo have raised an important suggestion which is – any chance of a webinar? I don't know if we'll have time for a webinar. Could I just ask either Sebastien or Eduardo and you, Tom, if we can't do it before could it be afterwards, particularly since you are thinking about a timeline that extends when the final report is in.

Ariel, sorry. "Our time is from 12:45 to 13:45," and that's lunch time. I hate to say that, but that's lunch time and that means instead of having

one hour we're going to have 45 minutes because people are going to want to eat.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, Holly. That's incorrect. The lunch time is an hour and a half.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, is it? Okay, well maybe we can actually feed into the lunch time hour and a half. Maybe we can just ask people to bring something and bring it to the table, just how we'll extend that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, if I may? Number one, on the face-to-face, that's on the first formal day of the meeting. Some of us have conflicts on that day but this is lunch and we're presuming that the GNSO PDPs will be breaking for lunch at the same time. That's an assumption. If that doesn't happen, we're in big trouble. And as Eduardo pointed out, since he's there on the NomCom dollar, if he doesn't get there in time for that meeting there's not much we can do about that.

HOLLY RAICHE: No. Tom, I think we're stuck with an hour, okay? And so [Inaudible] for the plan.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. That's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's for the face-to-face for the At-Large Working Party, not the general meeting which we're now going to try to schedule.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Maybe the Working Party, Tom, let's actually sit down and allow a lot of time for questions so that we can get those questions into a presentation for later, okay?

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think that works.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I think we can do a bit of tick-tacking on the face-to-face as well. The draft report – now you're saying next steps draft report I note that you would like to extend the timeline. I don't know that we can agree at this meeting because are you saying that's in your contract and [inaudible]?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yeah, we have a 30th of November provisional deadline for the interim report [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, well we're not signatories to that contract so we can't make a decision. I think that's a matter between you and Larisa, really. Is it not?

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Are you asking us are we comfortable with that or are you telling me this is what you will be asking [inaudible].

TOM MACKENZIE: No, first of all we would like it as we're doing this review with you and in discussion with you. It's like whether we would have your approval to extend it by a week. The reason for the extension is that we need to have this time to work on together on the draft and so it just postpones it by week and so we're asking for your validation of that and then we will put that to ICANN staff just to see if that can be agreed.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think Larisa's hand is up and I think I'd like to listen to her first. Thank you. Larisa, go ahead.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Holly. Tom, I think we can have a discussion about the timeline. What's included in the contract was always intended as the best estimate that we had back in April when this information was put together, and I think every step of the way we've always wanted to be very flexible to a point to make sure that the quality works that the At-Large community deserves and expects from ICANN can actually be delivered. I think this just falls under one of those administrative discussions we need to make sure that your proposed timing works with the holidays, gives the Working Party enough time to consider the draft report, the posting for public comments, and all those other connected elements. But I don't anticipate that this will be a big issue because I think everybody's interests are to make sure that you have enough time to analyze information and produce a high quality draft. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: To whatever extent my opinion counts, I support the delay if that's what's going to get a better quality report, and if that means the other steps also have to be delayed or changed because of the holiday interactions of the holidays and stuff like that, so be it. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks very much. Okay, we've dealt with the face-to-face meeting. Now, Tom, I think we've covered the draft report. Is that correct? I think we have.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Is there Any Other Business?

TOM MACKENZIE: Not from our side, no.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Look, I think we've only gone about 15 minutes over time which is excellent. Thank you very much. I think that Nick's suggestion for some kind of presentation on the implications of IANA is really a very interesting one. I think that's something that we will just have to take offline and think through how we're going to manage that as well. It may be something that we just do over a glass of beer or something. I'm not sure. But that's something that is a very separate issue that we'll have to deal with otherwise.

Tom, thank you very much for the slides and for your explanation and I'd like to thank everybody else for all of your time and the excessive time. Is there anything else that anybody would like to say, on which case otherwise this meeting has come to an end. Thank you.

Tom, anything else? Any last words?

TOM MACKENZIE: No, just a thank you. And we remain available to answer any questions that you may have regarding this or other issues to do with the review. Otherwise, that's it from us and thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. And a reminder to everybody, please urge everyone who hasn't filled out the survey to do so, and Lars, if you could just go ahead with your comments, there's suggestions on what else we can do to increase the input. Otherwise, thank you and see you later. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: This meeting is now adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for your participation, and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]