YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Group Party and ITEMS call taking place on Wednesday, 07 December 2016, at 13:00 UTC.

On the call today on our English channel, we have Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Kaili Kan, Barrack Otieno, Eduardo Diaz, Maureen Hilyard, Javier Rua-Jovet, Vanda Scartezini, Satish Babu, and Leon Sanchez. Currently, we don't have anyone on the Spanish channel.

From ITEMS team, we have Tim McGinnis, Tom Mackenzie, Rosa Delgado, and Nick Thorne.

We have received apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Ali AlMeshal, and Alberto Soto.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Larisa Gurnick, Lars Hoffmann, Ariel Liang, Nathalie Peregrine, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and Claudia.

I would like to add Alan Greenberg to the participants list as well because he has just joined.

Finally, if I could please 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, Holly. Please [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to the call. I trust everyone has had a little bit of time to read our draft final report, which was circulated earlier today – at least earlier today my time.
	Before we do anything else, let me just say thank you very much. It was a very interesting read with some very interesting suggestions. But I think before I do anything else, I would like to hand over to I think it's Tom. Will you be running the main discussion of the report?
TOM MACKENZIE:	Hello. Yes. I'll make very brief introductory remarks, and then for the main recommendation that we're making, I'm going to hand over to Tim McGinnis who is going to talk you through that particular recommendation. If we have time, I'm also going to hand over to Nick who is going to present a secondary recommendation that we're also making.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Good. Thank you very much. Well, in that case, over to you, [Tom]. Thank you.
TOM MACKENZIE:	Okay, well, thank you. Thank you all for being on this call. Yes, indeed, we submitted our first draft report yesterday our time. I think the most important thing that we want to say just as an introductory remark is that it is what it says it is. That's to say it's a draft report. It's our first

draft report. In some respects, it's a rough-hewn stone which we present to you, and there will inevitably be aspects of it, details, which will need to be clarified as we go forward. But we still have five or six months ahead of us. That's a very natural process. It's a rough-hewn stone which we're going to be polishing over the next few months.

I would like just to make one request as we start this call, which is that you try and focus on the big picture recommendations that we've been making because inevitably or the risk is that we start looking at the minutiae of At-Large procedures and we could get caught up in a conversation that would go on all night or day, and we don't really want to do that. We believe that this is going to be a very useful call, but we need to focus on the big picture.

Just very quickly, all I really want to say is that one of the starting points, I guess, for writing this draft was that when we collected all the interview findings and when we collected all the survey findings, there was one overwhelming impression that came over. That is that there is no question really in pretty much anybody's mind that the role played by At-Large is an important one. It's a role that needs to be defended. It's a role that people feel very passionately about.

The At-Large community has over the past 12 or 14 years evolved and been working toward creating a structure which will allow or give end users some kind of voice within the policy making remit that ICANN has. There is overwhelming support for the mission of At-Large.

On the other hand, there are many questions asked in many different ways by the different people that we've been talking to about how that

organization has actually worked itself out. Is At-Large actually successfully engaging end users? Is it engaging end users better today than it was 10 years ago? These kinds of questions. There are some people within the community who think that At-Large is doing a pretty good job, that things are getting better. But there are still many voices, even within At-Large and the broader ICANN system, who think that things could be done better.

Before I finish because I really want to be brief, there are several questions that as reviewers we have to ask ourselves. These are as follows. One: is it that the mission of At-Large is a mission that is a chimera, something that you are pursuing but it's going to be very difficult to actually get people to adhere to it? Is it a problem with the actual mission that you have? That's one question. It's not a question that we've [resolved].

Another question: is the problem that At-Large is facing to do with the organizational structure that you have in place? Maybe the structure that has evolved over time is just not one that fits the purpose. There are various different levels at which you could look at it. Maybe for one reason or another this structure has emerged which makes it somehow difficult for people, end users, to get [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We've lost him. Surely we can just mute that noisy line so we can see what Tom's saying.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can we get him back?

TOM MACKENZIE: The third possibility, and then I've said everything that I'm going to say, is that it's a people problem. In other words, the processes may be right, the mission may be right, and maybe the problem is the people. Maybe the people within At-Large, some of them are blocking the processes. Maybe it's something to do with a very natural sort of thing that happens within organizations, that some of the people may be blocking the system.

Now we don't believe – I mean, we believe that is a possibility. We certainly don't have any sort of conclusions at this stage on any of those three scenarios.

Now that's just a general big picture. What we presented to you yesterday, the [94-page] document, a very long document which I very much doubt that many of you will have had the time to read in detail. If you have, well, great. It's a document which is structured as you will have seen in the following way with various sections which cover all the different aspects that we have identified with a key to understanding how the At-Large community works.

Just very quickly because I think it's necessary to understand how we built this document, and then I'll let my colleagues speak. The first four sections of the report essentially give context. We explain the context

within which this review is happening. Then we give in Section 4 an overview of what we heard in the surveys and interview findings.

Now I'm just going to very quickly run you through the main blocks. In 5, we have looked at the Mandate and Purpose. That was the first issue area that we were looking at, the Mission and Purpose of At-Large and the extent to which the community and the people we've spoken to believe that At-Large is functioning according to its mission.

We then looked in Section 6 at how At-Large functions within the broader ICANN system. That's to say relations with the other supporting organizations and advisory committees within the wider ICANN system. There was also a section in there about relations which are quite close, the proximity between the mission of At-Large and the NCUC and NPOC.

We then looked at another section, Section 7, on the relations with staff. Now that's important. We identified that early on as a key part of the functioning of the At-Large community.

We then go on in Section 8 to the Structure and Effectiveness of At-Large. That's really about processes, procedures, how the community is working with its internal working procedures and whether anything needs to be considered for reform there.

We then [inaudible] section, which Nick will give you more details about in a few minutes, which is about the global meeting strategy. That is that the meetings are very key parts of the At-Large strategy, and so we were looking there at whether a possible reform of the ATLAS model in particular could be introduced or proposed.

We looked at funding issues and then, of course, we present to you an "Empowered Membership Model," which Tim in about a minute and a half is going to start explaining to you.

The final section of the report is our assessment of the way in which the previous review was conducted by the Westlake Consulting group in 2008. We present in that part some of the concerns that we've had about the way in which recommendations were made at that time and the way in which they were transformed and subsequently implemented.

I skipped over Section 12, which is a summary of all the recommendations that we make. We have 15 recommendations. Most of them are more specific smaller areas of reform that we have identified, but the main one is a proposed Empowered Membership Model in which we recommend a radical reform of the way in which end users are able to engage in At-Large activities.

That's all I'm going to say. I probably have already taken up too much time. I propose to hand over now to Tim, unless you have any questions already about the structure of the document or other aspects of the document.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. No, I don't think we'll take questions now. Theoretically, we've got 20 minutes for questions. But I think, Tim, the pressure is on you because now we've got 45 minutes left. So you've got about 20 minutes and I think Nick has 5. So, Tim, go ahead. Then after Tim and

Nick, then we will have, hopefully, I'll try to keep you all to time so we do have time for discussion. Tim?

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, I have a very hard time hearing you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, I know. I have to speak up. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's better

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, but you have background noise. Okay, go ahead. I can't hear a thing. Yeşim, can we [inaudible] where Tim is up to? I can't hear a thing.

YESIM NAZLAR: Sure. I will check it now. The operator just confirmed that Tim is not on. We will try to get him on, but meanwhile if anyone else would like to [inaudible]. We have to on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, if Nick is on, could Nick [inaudible]? Nick, could you have a few words while we're waiting to get Tim on the line please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, if my colleagues are having problems, I can…

HOLLY RAICHE: Nick has raised his hand. Nick, go ahead please.

NICK THORNE: Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: It sounds like maybe my colleague is having difficulty getting online.

NICK THORNE: I think we might be having computer [inaudible]. Can people hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, we can.

NICK THORNE: Okay, in which case, I'm sorry. If Tom is online, Tom, I suggest to keep the sequencing. Quickly run through the slides that you and I discussed with Tim earlier for his presentation. But please keep it short and I will be equally short so that our colleagues have a chance to ask questions.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. Well, in that case, all right. Do we have – all right. Okay, we do have the slides up on the screen. That's good. I'd just like to say then that…

NICK THORNE: Tom, please keep it short.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. The Empowered Membership Model is a model which has been entirely conceived to try and facilitate the engagement of end users in At-Large processes. The main thing I think to say is that what we are proposing is not a complete transformation of the current structure. We in fact keep the organizational layers within At-Large as they exist today. That is to say that you keep the ALAC, you keep the RALO layer, but the RALO level, there is a fundamental change at the level below that on the other hand because we are no longer talking about At-Large Structures but At-Large Members. So we make it much easier for any end user to become an At-Large Member.

Now the important thing to say about the ALAC and RALO levels that we have suggested is that these two functions become [inaudible] merged. That is to say that the RALO members will become de facto the ten regional members of the ALAC. The ten RALO members elected in each region will become the ten regionally elected members of the ALAC. So you have At-Large Members, RALO, and then the ALAC.

Now the way in which we see the functioning of this model is that any person, any end user, with an interest in policy advice within ICANN's

remit will be able to contact his or her local regional RALO and inquire about the possibilities for volunteering and joining a working group within ICANN. The purpose, the function of the RALO will be to direct that person to the working groups within ICANN. That becomes the main role of RALOs, just to direct people toward working groups.

I can see the slides jumping around a bit here.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, and while we're at it, I think Tim has joined.

TIM MCGINNIS: I have.

TOM MACKENZIE: Oh, good. Tim, over to you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Would you like me to take over, Tom?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yeah, over to you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Okay. I'm going to have to mute my speakers. Right. So as Tom has explained, we are not making many changes to your structure. You'll still have the same levels of hierarchy. We are introducing, in addition to

changing the name of the lowest level of membership level, this Council of Elders, which serves as the repository of institutional memory. But more on this later.

Can you put up the policy development slide, please? The policy development in terms of At-Large is still going to be done by the At-Large advisory committees. They are going to get feedback from At-Large Members who will be participating in various working groups, CCWG, GNSO, PDP working groups. They will give feedback to ALAC, and feedback will go to the working groups via these ALMs, some of whom we are calling Rapporteurs. They are the feedback mechanisms.

The refocus really of the Empowered Membership Model is to get the At-Large community completely focused on ICANN policy work. Our review has found that you are at the moment mostly not focused on ICANN policy work, as you will see once you read the report. The important thing for this slide is that the policy development still remains bottom-up. There's a feedback loop between ALAC and the working group members. And then, of course, advice goes to the Board. Next slide, please.

The election system that we have come up with is not too dissimilar. It's our expectation that a larger number of potential At-Large Members will participate in At-Large in this Enhanced Membership Model over time. The overarching design allows for a greater sharing of roles than we see in the status quo.

Your At-Large Members directly elect RALO leaders, as is done now. The major change is that RALO leaders also sit on the ALAC. They co-chair

the RALO – or chair and vice chair if you will – and they sit on the ALAC. So those people have two roles, and we're envisioning that that is more than enough work for them, so we are suggesting that two roles is enough.

After two terms in the ALAC, people can join in this Council of Elders that we've created or return to working groups as regular ALMs or as Rapporteurs. Also, they could run for the Board seat at that point. But no change is envisioned to the ALAC chair role. A number of electoral changes are made as part of the Empowered Membership Model [with] RFC3797 [like] processes, random selection processes. Take away a certain amount of workload, causes of conflicts, and any chance at creating the appearance of cronyism. Next slide, please.

We have new roles, old roles, and mixed roles just to sum up. The Rapporteurs are At-Large Members who are active in working groups, and they can volunteer for these Rapporteur roles. They report on working group activity to ALAC and then back to the working group from the ALAC.

Ten of these ALAC members, the ten elected by the region, serve as RALO leaders and they delegate [tasks] to other At-Large Members in their RALO just like what happens now. There's no change in the status quo there. Since they have two hats, we're not envisioning any formal role in any policy working groups external to At-Large. They are the deliberative body in At-Large, and we think that's enough on their plate.

The five NomCom Members who are not regionally elected become official Liaisons. That is not a change to the status quo. We're just adding a few more Liaisons, and the list is there.

Everyone in the ALAC has two hats. The five NomCom Members deliberate and give policy advice to the Board and they're active Liaisons. The ten regionally elected are ALAC leaders and they deliberate on the ALAC.

This Council of Elders is a new role. The Council of Elders is envisioned to serve not only as mentors but really, as I said before, the institutional memory. So they can sit in an ALAC meeting and say, "Oh, you know what? We tried this six years ago, and here's why it didn't work then. But things have changed; it might work now," or whatever the case. Next slide, please.

The aim of the Enhanced Membership Model is really to switch things around, ease your burden, simplify things, and reduce workload. As I said before, ALAC Members only have two roles. We're hoping that more volunteers at the working group level means shared workloads and less volunteer burnout.

We are seeing throughout the interview and survey process that you have an extensive internal focus. The EMM takes away some of the RALO focus, policy development at the RALO level, and also of course reduces time on internal processes. Then the random selection processes in certain places take away some of the election and selection workload.

This is part of what we hope to accomplish: a better At-Large through greater opportunities for all and a different focus for the entire community. It's not easy to grasp, we understand. But this is only minor surgery that we've done, and we hope that after reading through the report and we answer your questions you will understand what we're trying to accomplish. Thank you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tim. And Nick, I see Cheryl has raised her hand. Cheryl, go ahead please, and then we'll have Nick.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, I'm happy to wait for Nick. Go ahead, Nick.

HOLLY RAICHE: Nick, would you go ahead please?

NICK THORNE: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Holly, and good afternoon, morning, or whatever to all of you. I'll be very brief on the area of our report which deals with global ATLAS meetings. Let me just add one small point to what Tim and Tom have said, and that is that nobody seem to have yet mentioned the fact that we are introducing term limits for membership of ALAC. That's clear in the report which you, if you haven't had the chance to read it, you will find comes through very clearly.

One of the reasons for creating the Council of Elders is because we are conscious of the fact that there is a balance to be drawn between bringing in new blood and losing the very considerable experience which we now have at our disposal. Hence, the creation of the Council of Elders to give an opportunity to hang on to some of that wisdom.

I'll move on to the ATLAS ideas. As you will have gathered already, our objective is to bring in more views from the bottom to fulfill the original idea of having an At-Large, hence creating universal individual membership through ALM. This does not mean we are getting rid of ALS structures. They can adapt.

We looked at the idea of global meetings, the two At-Large Summits which have been held in Mexico in '09 then in London three years later in '12. We're conscious there's a budget for another one seven years on in 2019. We are proposing that a more effective way of bringing in more grassroots input to the At-Large process would be to more or less as an experiment try annual regional meetings to be based upon the region in which rotating ICANN C style meetings find themselves in much the same way as APRALO did with one element of this, which is an Internet Governance School in Hyderabad.

We're proposing that Internet Governance Schools should be part of these regional meetings, but broadly there would be a regional ATLAS organized with all the appropriate players from the area to take place in parallel with ICANN meetings in the five regions of the ICANN world.

Again, this is based on the findings of our survey and our interviews. It's not particularly huge as a change, but we do believe it will bring about,

first of all, a more effective buy-in from bottom end players and, secondly, a more effective and rational approach to recommendations from the bottom of the At-Large system. We would suggest that there should not be any mandatory requirement to produce recommendations but if they are going to be produced, they should be well thought through and prepared and not number more than five per regional meeting.

I will stop there, Holly, in the hope that we might have regained a few of your lost minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much, Nick. We've got three hands up, starting with Cheryl. Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, I'm very aware that [inaudible] some very specific questions. Indeed, probably get into the details which apparently [inaudible] avoiding, which makes me wonder how the hell we actually continue to [inaudible] full diagnostic on this without going into details, but [inaudible]. Put me at the end because I think Kaili and some of the others may, in fact, have questions that are on my list anyway. [inaudible] in other words.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Kaili, go ahead please. Kaili, you have your hand up. Do you want to ask a question? Yeşim, could you get ahold of Kaili, and in the meantime, Alan, you have your hand up. Go ahead please. Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Did you just call me?

HOLLY RAICHE: I did.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. It's very noisy in here. I apologize for the background noise. That's when the meeting was scheduled. A couple of things, and I will do extensive notes on the document. Before I make my comments, is it possible to get a Word document version of this? Does this exist in a Word or similar format? It's a lot easier to add comments that are readily visible and understandable in a Word document than in a PDF.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, why don't you go ahead [inaudible].

NICK THORNE: Holly, we [can get that].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. A couple of comments, and I'm not going to go into any extensive things. You first of all said there's just a minor name change. I beg to differ. You are ripping the guts out of what is the current structure. Now I'm not saying it's a bad change, but let's not pretend that dissolving all of the ALSes which has been the function

focus that we've been centered on for the last 10-12 years is a minor name change. So let's call a spade a spade. And it does involve bylaw changes by the way, which you imply not.

One or two very specific questions though or comments. You're talking about replacing the Summits with assemblies within each region. Are you not aware that we are currently doing assemblies within each region on a rotating basis? Did this somehow pass by? Again, no need to answer. There's a major disconnect here.

[NICK THORNE]: Hello. Holly, if you would like me to react to that, I can.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, we have three people [inaudible] Kaili [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let me just finish. As I said, there's a multitude of comments. I actually support the concept of moving from ALSes to individual members, but the impact of that is so minimized in this that it is almost laughable. There are many, many other comments I'll make which I'm afraid demonstrate a lack of understanding of what some of the problems are. Quoting verbatim some of the things from GNSO people I'm afraid is akin to the kind of campaigning we've seen in the recent U.S. election. I'll quiet down now. The background noise is just too loud. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:	[inaudible] go ahead and [inaudible] and [inaudible] also has his hand up. Nick, you got in first and then Tim and then we'll have Kaili.
NICK THORNE:	Holly, can you hear me?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Yes, thank you.
NICK THORNE:	Am I on?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Yes.
NICK THORNE:	Right. Let me just [inaudible], and I'm aware of the fact that it's early in the morning in various places. Let's not get too emotional about any of this. We are, of course, aware of the fact that there are regional meetings held by the RALOs, and you will find that this is covered in the report. What we are suggesting is a separate animal which is related to individual – and I'm very sorry if I didn't make this clear – which is related to the rotating Type C meetings of ICANN which go around the regions and which bring At-Large people into the ICANN family so that they can experience and contribute to what happens throughout the ICANN meetings.

I won't go any further than that. I will simply ask people please to read a report which would have been three times longer if we tried to get into too much nitty gritty. Thank you. I'll leave it at that point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Nick. Tim, you had your hand up.

TIM MCGINNIS: Yes, I think it was left up from the previous but I put it back up because we do acknowledge that there's a significant change. We are not gutting, we're not replacing ALSes. We envision that At-Large Structures will still participate. What we're finding is that you have an ISOC chapter or some sort of consumer protection organization. There's only one or two or just a few people active in ICANN from the organizations. So we encourage those organizations to still participate and send the same number or more to be involved in ICANN processes.

So what we are looking to eliminate and to gut is the focus on qualification in terms of a strict set of criteria per region about who is good enough to get into the club. Alan is right. It is more of a focus on individual membership. So we are envisioning and hoping that At-Large Structures will still participate. We did not intend to imply that At-Large Structures cannot participate in this model. They're an integral part of the new model.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tim. Kaili has had his hand up. Kaili, are you at your mic now?

KAILI KAN: Yes. Do you hear me now? Hello? Hello? Yeah, you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

KAILI KAN: Okay, great. Yeah, just a few comments. First, I like this report in the sense that the [inaudible] are part of development especially representing [inaudible]. Okay, sorry about that.

And secondly, about ALSes I think probably as Alan pointed out [inaudible] indeed major change in the ALAC structure. Now [inaudible] of the ALSes in individual countries. [inaudible] before we put all our emphasis on individual [inaudible] change our criteria of ALSes. That is not only they themselves are end users but also they represent and protect the end users' interest in their countries. So this APRALO would have its own [inaudible] organization in each and every country and that [helps]. So I think as part of a roadmap, probably we [inaudible] the criteria for admitting ALSes. That is easier, and that will refocus the ALSes' intentions.

Thirdly, did I mention about the ALAC [inaudible]? Maybe not. Did I mention that already? ALAC now has one seat on the Board. I think I would like what Rinalia quoted Bruce Tonkin in Hyderabad. That is the ultimate measurement of ICANN policies would be the effect on end users and within ICANN [inaudible] the representation of end users, ALAC. So I would suppose any policy developed should have the ALAC

by the end users. So as a first step, I would suggest this report also include [inaudible] by ALAC on the Board.

Also there is [inaudible] of course we don't want [stagnation], but from my personal experience being with the ALAC for one year already, I think I feel there is still so much to learn. So maybe either three terms or two terms where it's three years each, that might be better. So at last, I would suggest a roadmap for reaching maybe this as a goal and then we can see more clearly how that evolves and provide more impact. Thank you.

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

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it is a new hand. If ALSes still exist – although in all of the places in the report I could find it, ALMs have replaced them – I don't quite understand what ALSes do, where they are. Somehow maybe there was a section missing from my copy of the report. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. At this stage, Cheryl, do you want to speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As soon as Alan is muted, we might be able to manage. But I noticed that Tim still has his hand up.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's an old hand.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is it an old hand.

[HOLLY RAICHE]:   [inaudible] new hand. Tom just raised his hand. Tom, go ahead. Okay, rather than have dead air, I'll hop in then. Kaili has raised his hand again. Kaili, go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: Hello? Oh, sorry. Hello? Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Tom, go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: Oh, sorry about the mic. I was just going to say that in response to Alan's suggestion earlier about having a Word version of the document, what we could do [inaudible] we could share a working group version of the document as a Google Doc which you could comment on. Then that would be a much easier way for us to centralize everyone's comments instead of having dozens of potentially versions of a Word document with everyone's comments in them. So we could do that very quickly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unfortunately, I'm likely to be working offline most of the time. That isn't going to help me.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay, well, I'll circulate a Word version, but we can't have dozens of people submitting comments. It's very difficult to centralize everyone's comments. But we can circulate a Word and a Google Doc with our preference being for the Google Doc, obviously.

HOLLY RAICHE: All right. These are details now. I suspect since most of the people here are at the IGF in Mexico and really haven't had a good chance to read it, to think through it, to actually go through all of the background and all of the information as to why you arrived at the conclusions that you did and make the recommendations. I think it would be excellent for people to spend a little bit of time fully reading this and understanding the background and what led up to the recommendations because it makes a lot more sense, frankly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Has Kaili's hand been dealt with, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Pardon.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Kaili has his hand back up again.

HOLLY RAICHE: Kaili, have you got another question please?

KAILI KAN: That's a new hand. Yes, [inaudible]. Okay, thank you. About the ALAC members, two from each RALO, I wonder if these two members [for] ALAC from each RALO would also be the chair and the vice chair of the RALOs. As I see it, currently the RALO chairs and vice chairs are regional leaders while the work at ALAC would be offloaded to specific other members from those regions. So we have them wear two hats, both as RALO leaders and as ALAC members to develop [inaudible] policy development. I think probably that these two hats are maybe too heavy for these people. Just a thought. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I think we're at this stage getting into a lot of detail, and that's why I basically said I think it would be excellent if we all had time to read and think of this and then be able to have…

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, louder please.

HOLLY RAICHE: … probably another discussion. I beg your pardon?

ALAN GREENBERG: Louder please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. All right, Cheryl, I think this is the last question because after this I want to have Larisa talk about the Next Steps. So this is your slot.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, thank you very much, Holly. One of the things I wanted specifically to ask was about the Next Steps, so that's an excellent segue. First of all, I really don't particularly have a question as such. I have a couple of interactions and queries that I would like to have responses to which I had thought we would be able to do on the interaction with comments on a shared document. One of the things I wanted to ask was how we were going to do that and as I had suspected other people were asking those questions and I don't need to mop up on that at all.

There are a couple of things that I certainly need help to understand the specifics of, but as you've banned any details, we're certainly not going to deal with that at this call and certainly in less than 24 that most people have had to read the document. And I've given it more than one read through, and I believe I have a relatively good working knowledge of what is written. I suspect however what is written does need some review to make sure that our next audience is not confused, and some of the points made here today in this call I think will have alerted all of us that, for example, the maintenance and in what way the

maintenance of an At-Large Structure within this might need to be more clearly outlined and delineated.

So I'll wait for some of the Next Steps feedback to see whether or not I'm satisfied with how we go on to the next [part in time]. But one of the things I'm very keen to find out is the timeline on this. Alan was saying, for example, he'll be working offline. [inaudible] the next few days. So assuming that we have a reasonable albeit not terribly long time to interact on this iteration, I'd like to also suggest that we have a call that is a lot longer than one hour that for any of our calls has been insufficient in the past to go through – or several of the shorter calls if that's going to work – to go through the comments after they come in. And [inaudible] we can look at it as a collaborative interaction [inaudible] Next Steps.

Just as a [inaudible] and I don't expect the answer now, I am certainly going to need more help understanding the benefits of the specific role given to the Nominating Committee appointed members to the ALAC. I'd like to have a much longer conversation about some of those specifics.

So I wait now to hear how we're supposed to interact with it, but I did want to say there is very little in this document that I can't work with. I see it as a very worthwhile skeleton, but I do think some of the muscles need to be looked at and perhaps made [inaudible] stronger in some of the cases. And I'm certainly interested to see how some of that body ends up closed in the end. But there's not a lot in this that I have "an issue or problem with."

With that, I'll give you back whatever time you can get for the rest of the call, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Larisa, Next Steps over to you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much, Holly. Hello, everybody. It's pretty intentional that the slide that you see on the screen doesn't look like a timeline that, Cheryl, perhaps you expected and wanted to see. I think that the reason it's not there is for the right reason. We wanted to highlight the fact that there are ample and extensive opportunities from this point forward even just until the publication of the draft report. I don't even want to cover the remaining two slides, which talk about what happens then to get us to the final report.

The reason I want to keep us focused on this slide is because the feedback from this call and everything that will happen over a series of calls and e-mail communication that I anticipate will take several weeks if not a bit more, that's really critical time for the process to work the way it's supposed to. So really all I wanted to emphasize is understanding that the report is lengthy, the report is just a draft, it's the discussion and the interaction that you're all about to engage in between ITEMS and the review working party that is the most essential part of this process.

We will have a separate meeting with Holly and Cheryl and Alan to organize the more specific timeline, the details of how do we make this

all happen. But at this point, what's really essential is that people have enough time to read the report, provide their feedback. Our expectations from the ITEMS team is that for every comment and question and concern that is raised by this group, that there is open and substantive conversation to react and respond and help people understand. That would be a very good outcome.

Also, I really appreciated Cheryl's comments about how will the next set of readers react to this report. I think that's a very important area of focus that perhaps once there's better understanding and clarity from this group that is incredibly engaged and informed and has the context and the history, it would be worthwhile to think about how to position and executive summary or some other means of summarizing the key aspects of the report draft to make it easier for the people that might be participating or interested in submitting a public comment.

Again, that's just on the draft report. Then there is another whole cycle of activities that is going to move the ITEMS team from the draft report to the final report and another opportunity for this group to engage in a substantive way.

With that, I will say thank you very much and so much appreciate everybody's attention to this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Larisa. I would point to Ariel's note in the chat. The next call for the working party is planned on 14 December. She will be sending out a Doodle. So I would suggest people have a chance to think about and make some notes and so forth.

I do take Cheryl's point. This is going to be many discussions, and they're going to be longer than an hour I'd expect. Cheryl, do you have anything further to say? Your hand is still up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a new hand. I just wanted to say with 14 December, that gives me some of what I wanted, which is a time where this group has a run at its first comments. And on the Google Doc and I think working in that way is an excellent way forward.

But if we can look to say trying to get our comments, this initial run of comments, into the Google Doc by no later than close of UTC time – so that's a minute to midnight UTC – on say the 13th or even the 12th, then that gives us about a week to put our initial feedback in and then have the punctuation point of our next meeting. So that's terrific. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. On action items, I would add an action point…

ALAN GREENBERG: This is a new hand for me also, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Hang on. I haven't finished.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I go ahead?

HOLLY RAICHE: No. Let me finish the action items. For the next action item, I would like everyone in the working party to get their comments in as soon as possible using Word document or Google Docs, as is the preferred method, but either for the next call. Now, Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Number one, I requested the Word. I'm going to be running in planes, I'm afraid. I'm happy to have staff transcribe everything into a Google Doc.

The point I raised my hand on, if ALSes are indeed part of this new structure, could we have an addendum from the review team quickly explaining just where they fit into the whole model and what they would do and that kind of thing? Because it's not clear from the report and if indeed they're still there, I think we need to factor that into any comments we make. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. Are there any further comments? Tim, your hand is up. I gather that's an old hand?

TIM MCGINNIS: Sorry. That's an old hand. I'm just on my phone now.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay, thank you. Okay, with that, we are just a few minutes overtime, but thank you, everybody. We have got another call, and in the meantime just a reminder. If people can gather their thoughts, put the comment on the Google Doc if possible or Word either way so that we can have another session probably in a week's time. Yeşim and Ariel, if you can manage to get a Doodle out and we can confirm a time, that would be really terrific.
	So with that, we can end this call with a big thank you for everybody, and we will talk very soon. Tom, do you have any final last words?
TOM MACKENZIE:	No, not really. Just to thank you very much. I think that's all clear. I've noted down the various requests that were made, and I will send you a Word document and the link to a Google Doc in the next couple of hours. Then we can start working on the basis of that.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you very much. And thank you, everybody, and we'll talk within the week or so. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]