YESIM NAZLAR:	Operator, please start the recording. Can I go ahead with the roll call?
	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party ITEMS and MSSI Team call taking place on Friday, 6th of January, 2017 at 11:00 UTC.
	On the call today we have Holly Raiche, Aida Noblia, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Satish Babu, Leon Sanchez.
	On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto.
	We have received apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, And Ali AlMeshal.
	From ITEMS Team we have Tim McGinnis, Tom Mackenzie, Rosa Delgado.
	And from staff we have Larisa Gurnick, Lars Hoffmann, Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, our new team member, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Yesim Nazlar.
	Our Spanish interpreters for today are Veronica and David.
	I hope I haven't left anyone out doing the roll call. Cheryl has joined us as well.
	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.

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.

Thank you very much. Over to you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Yesim. You have the agenda in front of you which is going to be a very brief introduction from me and a reminder of the timelines. Tom is then going to go over a lot of the comments topic by topic.

Alan, I'm not sure about the longevity debate. I certainly want to have enough time for discussion by working party members so we'll work through that. We have a hard stop so we've only got 90 minutes, and I want to hear from as many people as possible.

A reminder, this call was initiated because at the last call of the working party it was felt that a lot of people would like a little bit more time to look at the actual report to make comments and to have a response from the ITEMS Team before it goes out for public comment. So the deadline for working party and ALAC members is not the 9th – that's Monday – at the end of the day. It's then, there's time for the ITEMS Team to respond to what they've heard and it is expected that the report will go out for public comment on the 20th of January. The public comment will close on the 2nd of March and at the Copenhagen meeting it's expected we'll probably have a half day meeting. Gisella is arranging that.

Once the public comment period is over and the meeting is, obviously Copenhagen is over, there will be a final opportunity for the Working Party members to be briefed on the report before it goes to the Board in June of 2017. And as Heidi has reminded us in Skype, there's a lot of work that happens once that happens. We've still got plenty ahead of us

but right now what I really want to concentrate on is response to the report that has gone out.

Just a couple of words from me. Many of the comments were either to correct mistakes – and that's fine – and I don't think we need to comment further on that. That's something that the ITEMS Team can do. There seemed to be a bit of concern about the wording, that in fact some of the wording may be used by people to criticize ALAC and probably unjustifiably or not. And so there was some suggestion the wording might be changed. I don't think we have to spend a lot of time on that frankly. There was some comment on – the comment that I'm sure we don't need to spend any time at all – we now know that ALAC is not representative of the users but the interests of users. We can put that to bed. We probably need to spend a lot of time on the actual… There were some proposals. The membership proposal I don't think anybody is disagreeing with the fact that there should be a membership category for individuals and it should be uniform. I don't think that's contentious. That can be done.

The things that I would like to concentrate on and things that people were really talking about were the actual proposals. In the last call at one point Tom actually said that the proposal for the membership for the rejigging of the structure was radical change, and in the same conversation Tim said it wasn't. So I think even within the ITEMS Team there was a little bit of a, "Well, what are we doing?" So Tom, I'm sure you're next to give an overview of the comments but given I would say a lot of the comments on the actual structures, I think that's where we're going to spend a fair bit of time.

	Could I hand over to you now, Tom, for your overview of what people have said and in particular the new structures that you have proposed? Thank you. Over to you.
TOM MACKENZIE:	Okay, hello. Can you hear me okay?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Wait a minute. First, Yesim, you have your hand up. Is that something that we need to know about right now?
YESIM NAZLAR:	Thanks so much, Holly. I see that there is a question on the AC chat from Satish Babu, and I believe he wants me to read it out. May I?
HOLLY RAICHE:	I could do that. "Will a draft report go for public comment with all the comments received so far after their removal?" What will go out for public comment will be the report. The individual comments made, I can't imagine they would go out for public comment, but maybe, Tom, address that first. Thank you.
TOM MACKENZIE:	Okay, hello. Hello, everyone. Can you hear me?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Yes.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, good. Okay. First of all, to answer that specific question about the document that's going to go out – the next draft which is going to go out for public comment – that document will not include the comments that have been made in this previous round. What we are going to do now in the preparation of the next draft is that we are going to take into account all the comments that you have made, we're going to decide which ones need us to take some action to change the document or not, and then we will submit a new version of the document – an updated version of the document which will go – a clean, without any comments on it – version of the document, and that's what people will have to comment on.

That was just to answer that question. Just a brief comment as we start this conversation. We acknowledge and have seen that there's been quite a lot of activity from your side commenting on the document. According to our calculation we now have about 15 commenters, most of whom are members of the Review Working Party. There were only one or two who aren't who have been invited in subsequently and there's one – Glenn McKnight – who we understand has made comments but we haven't actually received those yet. Glenn wrote a message to me saying that he'd commented but I haven't actually seen his comments yet so I don't know by what means he tried to submit those comments.

One point we would like to make is that we want to make sure that we keep a handle on the whole process. There has been a series of extensions to the commenting period. It was actually initially our

understanding that it was going to be the 6th, but now it's the 9th. That's okay, but we keep on adding on bits to the period. The main reason why we are a little bit concerned is because every time there's an extension it actually squeezes the time that we have to then take the comments into account and prepare the next draft. That was one point we just want to make. We want to make sure that at least from now on that we really try and stick to a very hard timeline which will allow us to have all the time that we need for the next phase, for the next draft and the final draft [of course]. We wouldn't like to find ourselves in a situation where we're overshooting the end of the review period.

The last point is that all comments that have been made – or most of the comments that have been made – on the document, and that's fine. That's perfect. That was the agreed methodology, and we do also have a number of comments that have come in by e-mail. We also said that that would be okay.

We feel that we cannot provide a particularly detailed analysis – we're in absolutely no position to provide any kind of analysis – of various comments before the deadline which is now the 9th of January. What we can do is that we can point out, as I think Holly you actually already had, the issues that people are zooming in on, but that's really about it. In a way, what we would prefer with this call is to hear from you what your objections are to some of the different bits of the written proposals that we're making and really to argue why you think that… we want to hear you argue why you think certain things are wrong, inaccurate, have been tried in the past, whatever. We don't want to get ourselves into a position where we are justifying power positions at this stage. We will do that as a later stage down the road, but not yet.

Holly, you concluded with a question about membership. Membership is obviously a key aspect of our proposal. We may have used slightly different ways to describe how much of an important change that is going to represent. If I could actually push back and ask you or you and the other members of the Review Working Party on this call to tell us what you think about the proposal for individual membership. We believe that we have come up with a strong model to replace the existing model based on organizations, ALSes. If you have disagreements with that, we're all ears and we would very much like to hear from you.

Perhaps we could just start with that – that slight pushback, if you like – and then if you want we can go through the different issues that people are zooming in on and ask for just… We could organize a discussion around that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. But first, Lars, the e-mail you sent me was 9 January was the submission of working party comments. That's what I have from the e-mail. My understanding was the reason that we held this call tonight was so that people would have a final chance in the next 48 hours literally to make a comment. Is that your understanding, Tom?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. [Inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Lars, is that your [inaudible] deadline.

TOM MACKENZIE: [Inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Lars has said… So let's actually clarify that before we talk to anybody else.

Heidi said it was the 6th. Lars says it was the 6th. Okay, it's the 6th. Right. Okay. That's fine. My timeline therefore will be changed. It's now the 6th January, and you all have 6th January at 23:59. Okay.

That's the admin stuff. Now we've got to go to comments. And I put myself in queue as well. The first, and right now the part that we are up to is the discussion – these are the people with the questions that people have about the actual structure, Tom, which is what you'd rather spend time on and I understand that. I think that's where we go from here.

Tijani? Go ahead, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Holly. If my recollection is good, I think that this call is intended to have not the feedback but what the ITEMS Team think about the interactions they received from the working party and tell us if our remarks would be taken into or would change something in the report or not. Of course, we are not asking for a new draft but we are asking about something like this – the feeling or the impression –

[did] the team of ICANN have about the impact of the comments received so far on the report that will be put for the public comment.

Unfortunately, I just listened to Tom and I understood that he said that they cannot do anything after 9. That' means that this call will be – I don't know – he said that wants to hear from us, but we said everything. We sent our positions, our views, our impressions, on the comments that we sent to ICANN. So I don't see any interest, anything good interest, of this call if we will proceed our concerns or our point of view about them or any other thing. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tijani. Yesim, first of all could you track down there's an echo that I'm hearing and a lot of other people are hearing as well. It would make it easier to hear all of us in queue.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Holly. It was coming from I believe from Tijani's AC line. Tijani, if you could please turn off your speakers, mute your speakers, and we would definitely prefer if you could use a phone bridge. Like yesterday, we have better audio from you if you use the phone bridge. Thanks so much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alright. Can I leave that between the two of you to sort? In the meantime, Alan and then Cheryl. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two different things. Number one, on the deadline I understand everyone in writing said the 6th. Tom said verbally the 9th.

HOLLY RAICHE: No [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: No. Please let me finish. I'd like to make sure that no one else who is not on this call was told the 9th. So if that's just Tom's misunderstanding there's no problem at all. If other people have been told the 9th and now we're pulling it back to the 6th, we need to know that. I didn't say we can't do it but I would like clarity on whether that was just a slip of the tongue or other people have actually been informed that it is the 9th.

That's number one. Number two, I think tom was asking for comments on the membership model and individual members. If that is what is being called for right now, I have some comments.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. As I've said verbally and in my comments, I think the use of individual members is something that is important. The name that has been provided in this report is deadly, and if that's used there's going to be all sorts of ugly implications – that is using the term

"empowered" which was taken from the ICANN Accountability model. That sounds like a nit but it isn't, and the devil is in the details. Simply glibly saying that we will only admit people who have been active for six months or three months – I think both numbers are used in different places or a year. I don't remember – is not going to cut it at this point. Those are the problems we've been struggling with for years now. If we're going to say we're going to rely on something like that, we're going to have to know how we're going to do it and it has to be truly implementable and scalable.

Scalable is an important issue. If we're going to be successful, there will be hundreds or thousands of these. We have to be able to work in that environment. Those are my comments. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Cheryl, you had your hand up. Has your hand gone down?

Apparently it has. My hand goes up. Tom, my question – and it's said against the background of a lot of comments that were made – which was, the role that ALAC actually plays – if you have ALSes with a variety of structures and concerns and so forth, many of which whose main focus is not ICANN but they are ALSes because some of what they do is partly relevant to ICANN. Their participation and understanding of what ICANN is about is at the moment channeled through the relevant RALO and then to ALAC and it winds up being a communication channel that assists people in both from different backgrounds understanding the ICANN issues but also as a conduit for information back.

And so if you're going to change that structure, I would be interested in how you envisage communication channels when you think of a flattened structure because you've still got people who perhaps are not sufficiently okay with ICANN and its processes and its language to make comments to actually understand what's going on. So I would be interested in comments on that. Thank you. And after that, Cheryl.

Tom?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. Hello. Your question is regarding the ALSes. The difficulty I'm having right now is that we agreed amongst ourselves that we really wanted to use this call and not to explain our own position nor not to get ourselves into a position where we're explaining the model but really for you to, as Alan started to do just now, was to say the real issues that you have with the definition of a membership based model for engagement as opposed to an organization based mechanism is what you've got at the moment.

That's the kind of thing which I think Is really interesting. In fact, I would almost want to push back to Alan, for example, to say that's very interesting. That's exactly what we want to hear, and please tell us more about the devil within the detail and that kind of thing. This is the time now that you have to push back and to criticize and to say that you've tried things in the past and you've been working on it for months. This is exactly the kind of thing that we want to hear. So please can we use the time for that?

And then I'm just going to hand over to Tim, I think, who's going to answer you, Holly, on the question that you have just asked.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And then there are a couple of comments in the chat that I'll ask you to respond to. But let's go over to Tim first. Thank you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Holly. I just replied to Maureen in the chat. Our work process is that we would collect all of your comments up to the 22nd of December and now pushed back to the 6th of January, and we are not making edits to the document in response to your comments so far. In other words, the answer to Maureen's question is no changes have been made in response to your comments.

On the other question, I think the RALOs still have their role to play in terms of communication. I would refer to you to the FAQs that we wrote about. There are groups that you currently call them At-Large Structures who will be eligible to be At-Large members and participate in a similar way to the way they do now. In fact, I and the rest of the team are counting on the current At-Large membership of At-Large Structures to participate as At-Large members. But I think we wrote about this in the FAQ addendum that we made for you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, you did. Thank you. Do you have any further comments because your hand is still up and if not, then I will go to Tijani.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, my hand goes down every time I go into my phone. So I can unmute myself. Could you do me the courtesy to keep me in the queue please?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy to. I just thought you were pulling out of the queue. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. In response to – and please remember I'm added in [the party] and dessert will soon be served – in response to the question in terms of the membership model I'm perfectly happy as I have [inaudible] this report to explore the options put forward by this new membership model. I think change brings opportunity and I'm happy to do some development work and see what we can do.

However, following on from Alan in terms of some of the devilish details, I have a couple of issues one of which I think is significantly concerning to me and the other which I think we just need to properly recognize because it needs to be considered as we look to what the RALOs can do as enablers and facilitators for this hopefully plethora of individuals who will come flocking to us to make contributions. I'll deal with that part first.

The opportunities to be engaged in GNSO, not specifically ccNSO and ASO, recognize of course that ASO work is within the regions anyway, policy development is open very much for any man, [Mary], and his dog,

to have one barking in the background to be involved with already. So I see no up or downside of the new model other than we can probably sell it in a different way to be engaged in at least what seems to be the focus of the report – and do please note my intonations are all deliberate – on GNSO Policy Development Process engagement. We may find it necessary, however, to facilitate, encourage, and [inaudible] coach these individual members in the new model. And again, I also very [inaudible] the term empowered should be embargoed and we shouldn't be using it for other reasons which we made clear and I can [inaudible] support that we have an opportunity for the regions to make sure that this does empower these individuals – I'll just use the embargoed word – to make effective contributions to these Policy Development Processes [all be them] in an individual capacity.

This however is not going to negate the necessity for response to calls for community comment, and community comment coming out of PDP processes are specific requests made to ACs and the SOs and calls for responses to public comments which of course is [inaudible] regional advice also comes into play and in many cases the specific advice from our [inaudible] ALSes comes into play.

So we need to find a way to make sure those things don't become blank spaces. We can have 101 additional people lined up to be hopefully active participants in a GNSO Working Group but we will still as a GNSO Working Group call for community comments seeking specific advice on issues and consensus advice from the SOs and ACs. That has to come from somewhere. Not just 10 of the 15 people sticking it off the top of their heads for an afternoon in the bar.

The same can be said for the public comment when not just individuals but consensus often gathered advices [for] they're very valuable. So that needs to be worked on. It's implementation, I know, but it needs to be considered.

The big issue – that wasn't the big issue by the way for me – the big issue and one I really have stuck in my craw is your suggestion on the ALAC structure to have the Nominating Committee appointing people allocated to the roles of the liaisons. That is just wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, wrong, on so many levels. And let me tell you why.

I'll give you an analogy. Nick is on the call. It would be like suggesting that your youngest entry, green, diplomatic, Corp cadet is given an Embassy job. We don't make people Ambassadors five microseconds after they're thrown into a particular forum. And to me, that's what that proposal is analogous to. Our liaisons are literally Ambassadors for ALAC and At-Large [views seen to] what is often politically sensitive and highly reactive environments, and the Nominating Committee's role is to put fresh individuals, independent, thinking views into the ALAC process. And to suggest that that group of people – untested, green, untried, and in many cases – are able to call on the history required to make a decent [fit for] these liaison jobs into those jobs is just wrong.

I'm going to stop there. Otherwise, I'll get really cranky. I'll try and find my mute button.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Tijani, you're next. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Holly, and thank you all. First of all, I'd like to repeat what I said. Perhaps my line was separated when I spoke that the first time. Perhaps that's why you didn't understand what I said. I said that this call if it is to repeat our point of view, our understanding that we already expressed in our comments, I think it's useless. It was when we decided on this it was intended to hear from ITEMS, and ITEMS are decided today not to give any feedback. This is first of all.

Second point, about the model of empowered membership – I think that all the report was built on changing the model. Why [inaudible] is not changing the model? We may change the model if it is really the only way to review and correct what is not going on well. And there is a lot of things not going well in At-Large. But I was expecting that we'd give solution to all the problems say not to decide or to propose to change the model.

Why I say that? Because if you go to a membership and [give] the membership model only, this will make At-Large in general – or ALAC if you want – this will make it , it doesn't have any [presence] from the [ground]. [Inaudible]. Organization are there. They have Bylaws. They are recognized locally in their country. So they exist. They are part of the end users on the ground and they have activities on the ground. So ICANN has activities on the ground. It is the spirit of At-Large in general.

Second big problem, if you want, if you go to an individual membership model and as you know now ALAC has one voice in the Empowered Community after the transition and as you know now, the community

has a lot of power so ALAC will exercise the power through the voice they have the only one voice. If there is an important decision that will impact, for example, registries or registrars, and you know impact registries or registrars means a lot of money for them so they can do anything to make the decision in their profit. And in this case, they may push a lot of people from their side to register as end user member on At-Large. They are end users anyway.

In this case you'll have the voice of At-Large [abided]. The interest that will be [defended] by At-Large in this case will not be the public interest. It will be also the financial interest of this party. I am giving an example. It is not the case. I am not speaking about a particular case, but I give an example to make you understand.

That's why I say that the ALSes is, in my point of view, the best model with end user membership as it is now. And it must be generalized on all the RALOs now. One of the recommendations that I was expecting from you is to recommend to generalize to make it compulsory for all the RALOs. And this is something important because there are people who are [inaudible] for At-Large to make use of their energy, of their knowledge, etc., but we don't have organization. So we don't have to refuse them. You have to accept them. They are an added value for At-Large.

Those are the two important points regarding the model, regarding the [inaudible] model, and regarding the ALS model. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tijani. Tom, did you want to reply directly to Tijani?

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes. It's not to reply directly to this point. Clearly this is an issue which is a very big issue, and it's one of the issues which we're going to be working on and taking your different points of view really into account in the next draft.

Tijani, just to reassure you about our position for this call, it's not that we are backing off or refusing to engage in any kind of dialog between now and the rest of the process. Not at all. On the contrary, there will be a time for further dialog. We're going to expose, further present, the model, and so there will be more time for dialog. There's no problem about that. We just wanted to make the emphasis of this call on your …a clarification, a presentation, of your points of view, and that is exactly what you have just spent the past few minutes doing.

And then as far as methodology is concerned, what we will be doing now, as I say, is going away with all your comments and working with a very clear methodology to take them into account or not, obviously as we are strict to our independent reviews.

That's really what I would say about that just before we go on to the next person in the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tom. Aida, you're next please. Thank you.

AIDA NOBLIA: Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, thank you.

AIDA NOBLIA: Okay, thank you. First of all, good morning to everyone. We participate as an ALS representative and we have a long history in our country and we have many types of organizations as well in our country. So I am a little bit concerned about on one hand the fact that surveys and all the work that ICANN has done so far reflect a great critical skill by the community, either by the interviewers or the respondents. So I believe that this work is useful and this is something very good for a joined work together with ICANN because I suppose there is a feedback process as we have been talking about and that everything will be used by ITEMS to solve the issues.

But I am a little bit concerned regarding this methodology. I am a little bit concerned about the geographical diversity. You know we have a model and we have countries with huge populations, and these countries have certain tools to have diversity. So in that case we may have those countries with huge populations and important and logical tools prevailing. I am a little bit concerned about inequality regarding developing countries – those countries which do not have the necessary technology or which do not have the needs or the necessary tools to participate. For example, they do not have the technology or phone lines. On the other hand, I am also concerned about security. Perhaps all these issues may be taken into account by ITEMS, those having access individually.

EN

And then we have knowledge. As you know, I belong to an organization with a long history, and we have working groups, we have a lot of people and expertise, specialization. Does not mean that anyone may not be able to specialize or be an expert or something. You know we need knowledge, and sometimes it gets difficult for people to understand the structure and to understand everything so as to believe that anyone can get access to a certain tool. I have to get in touch with people, I have to get to learn about things, and there is a learning process that we need to do in order to be able to have the necessary knowledge and be able to contribute. Sometimes, there is a lack of knowledge about the ecosystem because it is almost impossible to participate if you don't have basic knowledge.

So, for participating in those critical issues such as this one, such as Internet functioning, well, I believe that it would be quite risky, if you will, to start a new way of participating. Because we already have a way of participation, we have a method of participation.

And I know we have many criticisms about this, but we have tools such as the survey that has been done and the survey made by ITEMS. So, this is very important for us, and this has proved that the respondents and the interviewers do have certain skills that might be applied.

I'm a member of LACRALO. LACRALO works in a particular way, and we had last year a training process, a training cycle, and we have the webinars, we have workshops, so we had a transformation, if you will, in terms of learning, in terms of knowledge. We changed our websites. So, there was a process of improvement. And even in our monthly meetings, we have a lot of information being shared. So, in this case, we

have a process that is being developed, and this process is growing. So, we have a possibility of another country, for example, having LACRALO events. This is working very well indeed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

AIDA NOBLIA: Events being held within the country are also important, and the fact that ALSes may be able to promote events is also important. So, there are many useful recommendations, but my point basically has to do with these concerns. I wanted to make clear, to express my concerns in this regard. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Alan, you have your hand up, if that's a new hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is definitely a new hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okey-doke.

ALAN GREENBERG: A couple of comments. First of all, I'd like to comment on the last comment. Aida Noblia is one of the very few real users from the relative

periphery of At-Large who have become very active and very knowledgeable, and I think her words are important.

I'd be interested – perhaps not on this call – in finding out just to what extent travel to ICANN meetings on various occasions has allowed her to do that or was crucial in how active she has become. I think it is an interesting example, and one of the very few cases we have in our environment where someone has been transformed from someone from an ALS to someone who's actually active and contributing.

So, there are a few important messages there. In terms of the model which is being proposed, unlike Cheryl, I have a few other problems, not just the use of liaisons or how liaisons are created. We work as – I quoted Matthew Shears, someone who I've butted heads with a lot, but I quoted him in one of my comments that we work in a very narrow, highly specialized space.

There's never going to be a huge number of people. One of our challenges is to get enough information out to allow the right people to surface, because they won't hear about us on their own and they won't self-identify in the most general case. It's a slow process.

As much as I think the ALS structure was wrong-headed when it was invented in 2002, we have them right now, and they are a mechanism to reaching large numbers of people and trying to get our message out, if we use them properly. We have not used them properly in the past, and I think that's one of the really crucial issues.

If we believe people will suddenly flock to us just because of a vote, these are really the wrong people we are looking for. So, I think we have

to think about how we attract them, how we manage them, how we make sure they are real, committed people, and understand that the process is very slow.

It is not going to be something where overnight, people will materialize, as I'll demonstrate if and when I get a chance to do my very short presentation. It is not a –

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I'm aware.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I thank you, Holly. It's not an issue of attracting people. We attract lots of people through mechanisms, they just disappear. They don't become useful. And we really have to figure out how we create these people, how we train them, how we make use of them. And the issue was not to kick them out as soon as they're useful, because if we're not careful, that is what we will end up doing.

And we have to recognize, we're here not just to give advice to the Board, which the report said repeatedly. And when we give comments, it's not just on GNSO PDPs. I would guess – although I haven't counted them – the vast majority of our comments are not on PDPs.

And on those PDPs, if indeed we have people working on them, somehow we have to coalesce their ideas into a document that makes some sense. And again, the report, its only recommendation in that area is to abolish the groups that allow us to do that.

So, when I say the devil is in the details, it's not just the fine points of the details. It's the overall flow that will allow us to actually manage the overall process. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl, I've seen your hand pop up and down. Is it up? If so, you have popped up before everybody else, so go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you've seen it pop up, then call on her, the worst she'll say is no.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have. I just have, I'm just watching it disappear and then come back. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, what you should see is my green agree tick to what was just said by Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE: I did.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, if the hand came up and down, it was some latency issue. I'll just jump in and make myself a nuisance, as [inaudible] and I'm now going back to my – not from my [inaudible] but beautifully scotch – and I do mean beautifully drizzled pancakes.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think I'll leave you to it. Alberto, please go ahead. Is Alberto –

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, I was unmuting myself. Sorry for the delay. I fully agree with many of the comments here. I have typed many things on the chat, but for the record, I would like to state that I haven't read any foundation or any grounds to say that with implementation of this model, successful changes will be made.

There is no estimation regarding individual users that might be incorporated to the organization, so I believe that this research should have taken into account certain figures or estimates. I'm not against having individual users at all. Indeed, in LACRALO, despite that we have in our Bylaws certain regulations in this regard, we had individual users.

They do not belong to any ALS. They work in internal working groups. They have a voice, but they have no voting rights. So when they work in or within the working group, they have a voice and vote for the working group. They don't have a voting right for the elections. So, if we had a model allowing us to have individual users and they will be able to have voting rights and we will have metrics for the ALses and metrics for individual users, well, I believe that that would be good. There will be no problem with that.

But I am a little bit concerned about something, and this is that we do not know the comments, our comments. We don't know the comments that we're taking into account, the comments that were accepted.

Because we are having comments or providing comments that are similar, so it means that we as a group, or perhaps individually, we should have to give our opinions in the public comments as if we hadn't done it before. That's the only thing. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alberto. Tijani, your hand is up. Go ahead, please. Actually, Tom, are you replying to that comment?

TOM MACKENZIE: I could just reply quickly to that comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Just simply to say that we cannot answer every single specific comment that has been made, especially when several commenters are commenting on the same issue. So, we're not going to go back to every single commenter and explain the reasons why we have or have not accepted their comment.

But what we will do is that we will look at a comment sort of collectively and that will result in – if we think that it requires a change to the document, that will result in an updating of the document, which will be very clear for everyone to see. I just wanted to sort of reassure you on that particular point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Okay, Tijani, could you go ahead, please? Your hand is up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Holly. First of all, I would like to thank Aida for her intervention. She reminded me of one important point about the agreement. You know that in the developing countries, there are a lot of end users who may want and who want to engage as individuals in the developing countries, there are few.

The few are already in organizations or associations. So, trying to find people who are individuals and wanting to engage will be harder there. And in this case, we'll have a huge number of end users from the North and very few from the South. This will widen the divide.

A second point that I wanted to make – as Alan noted now, and as I strongly said in my comments – all the report of ITEMS was made around the conception of that the mission of At-Large is to deal with policy, and only policy. I think this is absolutely – I don't think. It is absolutely wrong. You have to read the Bylaws.

The main duty of At-Large is to defend the interests of end users. One aspect of defending the interests of end users is to comment on the policies proposed in ICANN. And it is written like this in the Bylaws. In the Bylaws, they say that our duty is to comment or to make comments on the policies, and also to do other things.

Don't forget that At-Large is everyone. Everyone, with most of the time no knowledge about the techniques, no knowledge about the law, no

knowledge about specific things. It is everyone. So, everyone cannot be making policy or commenting on policy. But they have rights. They have interests, and we are here to defend their interests.

So, I would like you to stick to the Bylaws' definition of the mission of At-Large. We are not supposed to make policy only or comment on policy only. We have a lot of other issues to do. When you say that we have to get rid of the working groups, that means that we don't have to do anything. So, we have to stop everything, only participate in the policy working groups in the other constituencies of ICANN, and this is what we have to do. So, this is really a big… You are killing At-Large in this way. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tijani. Tom, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, hello. I think sometimes, there's some very emotive language that's used, like killing At-Large and all these kind of things, which really is sort of a real distraction, and it's so far removed from anything that we're doing that I think it's really sort of unnecessary.

What we're trying to do, what we have done with this first round is to collect together the thoughts, the very different thoughts from different parts of ICANN on what's going right, what's not going so right within At-Large, and we've proposed a model which we believe will empower the end users, which we think is fundamentally the critical need, a

requirement for the At-Large as you sort of think about the years – as you move forward in the years ahead.

And I think actually, on a more positive note, I think a lot of this conversation has been about – and I think that's incredibly positive – from Aida and from Alan, from Cheryl, from others, Holly, I think what you're doing is you're providing us with a very constructive feedback on your thoughts about end users, things that have worked in the past, and that is definitely intelligence which we want to now take into account in the remainder of the process.

We definitely don't see ourselves in an aggressive, destructive, killing kind of mode. We want to build – we didn't want to lock horns with you either. That would be a disaster for all of us. What we want to do is to use this kind of call, the comment period to really instructively move forward. So, I just wanted to sort of make that point before we move on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent, thank you. We've got Aida and Alan. And what I have done is as Alan has pointed out, he does have a presentation. We have a hard stop in about 25 minutes, so I'm going to first hear Aida, then Alan again. And then Alan, if you can keep your presentation to ten, and then we can sum up with Tom, I think we can fit into the time. So Aida, go ahead, please.

AIDA NOBLIA: Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

AIDA NOBLIA: I just want to make a clarification. I understand this from the point of view of being a grass roots person, so this is a way to work, it's an additional way to work. It's complementary. From my point of view, we are all on the same page, both ITEMS and the community. We're all trying to improve what's already in existence. And both what's being raised here as the proposal and what we're all saying is our different point of views to reach an agreement or an improvement to the current situation, and what I've said does not go against what ITEMS is stating, but actually, these are arguments for us to see which of these issues, which of these concerns is more convenient, which solution can be applied.

Maybe we can have intermediate solutions, or Alberto talked about associations of individual users. This is something that is being seen in other events. So, what I wanted to convey is my organization is pretty big, and it has an important impact. So, we are working together to reach a common goal, to improve our situation.

On the other hand, because we are working here in different working groups and we'd been doing this for so long, and this had a good impact, and this is even listened to by the judicial powers – because we work in the legal field – and they even ask for advice for specific cases, all of this is somehow showing that this style is working. This is basic for

an association. Notwithstanding that we may allow the incoming of individuals, these are people we are concerned with.

So, I was actually concerned about security. Who is going to be in, and what for? This is also a very delicate issue. We believe that everybody will cooperate, but cybersecurity also has an impact in this situation. That is what I wanted to say. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Tom, did you have another comment before we go to Alan?

TOM MACKENZIE: No, sorry, I'll set my hand down.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Alan, do you want to go ahead with your presentation? Well, before we do that, is there anybody who now has anything further to say? Have we exhausted the comments? Because if [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand is up to make such a comment, and then I will do my presentation, if you'll allow.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't believe there is anyone who thinks the reviewers intend to kill At-Large. What some of us are pointing out is that could be the net effect of some of the results that are being implemented. We're living in an interesting space. As the untold numbers of comments that you have quoted verbatim in the report show – and you may choose to believe what I'm saying or not, but it doesn't alter my view – there are huge numbers of misinformed people who don't understand what is going on.

Just as people in At-Large do not understand the GNSO or the Board, or the ccNSO or the GAC. They work on a couple of [inaudible] facts that someone said to them in a hallway, and presume that is the reality, which it often is not.

So, this is a difficult space we're in, and what we do is going to have to work the first time. We can't afford to do it wrong. We can afford not to do it well enough and still have to make fixes, but we can't afford to do it sufficiently wrong that we in fact kill the process. And we are potentially very close to that.

And someone who has invested ten years of my life and a very significant part of that life trying to fix the problems in At-Large, I personally would prefer that not be the outcome of this. So, that's all I was going to say. I will be putting in some summary comments not targeted at particular sentences, but overviews. Somehow, I'll try to do that – if I can – by the end of the day.

I am now ready to go to the report, if Holly chooses.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: There were many comments in the report. Could we have the first slide, please? I realize everyone can switch themselves, but I would prefer someone else do it as I'm talking. And if you could move – whoever is doing it, move the cursor over so all the words show up. Thank you.

The report includes a huge number of comments attributed largely to staff and to GNSO – although I'm sure there are some other ones – that imply that all we do is churn over the same people time and time again. And to quote one of the few attributed comments, from Robert Guerra – who was on the ALAC about ten years ago, the situation of his demise or leaving the ALAC is something that perhaps we should talk about not in a public conference – saying that we are still the same people.

It just bears no relationship to reality. The same comments are made by numerous other people, and I reacted to that by trying to get some real facts. Our records are a travesty. We have over the years not kept our records very well. They are loaded with errors, they are loaded with gaps. It took not a small number of hours, not a small number of days to put this together. Next slide, please.

And the point is that perceptions are there. They're real. I learned a long time ago as a manager that if people think there's a problem, there is a problem. It's rarely the one they think, and I think that is the case here. Next slide, please.

I've put together a review of all ALAC members since the beginning of time, all RALO leaders, all liaisons, all delegates to the Nominating Committee. Most of what you see is correct. There are a few places – particularly in the early years of APRALO – where I have guessed at exactly where the transition between people occurred, because I cannot find the records yet. We will try to make them accurate, but they're very close to reality right now. Next slide, please.

Alright, I don't expect you to read. That's a chart of all the ALAC members who have sat on the committee since the beginning of time. You'll notice they change. The horizontal axis are ICANN meetings and years since 2003, going up to 2018. Yes, there are a couple of people – I'm one of them – who have stuck around. There are two or three other people like me. There aren't many.

If you look at the shaded boxes, the four boxes, the four people who are shaded in the brownish, purplish color are people who by the end of the Hyderabad meeting had exceeded the norm which the report espouses to, that is not more than two contiguous terms on the ALAC.

Those are the only three people who by that time had exceeded that. Everyone else had come and gone within that mandate. The two in blue – when you factor in terms starting at Hyderabad, there are two additional people. I happen to be one of them. Holly is the other one, interestingly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I should leave now.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it demonstrates that the people who are the most active, the people who are involved are people who have been around a long time. We need a few of them. And I'm not saying you need me. I'm on my way out. I can't speak to Holly, but I'm certainly on my way out of much of this process. But some level of continuity is really important.

But the churn is important to look at. Now, I understand the review said it's not just the ALAC, but it's moving from one Chair to another. From the ALAC, to the RALO, to something else. Next slide, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Wrong one, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that's RALO leadership. Again, yes, there are some people who have been around a long time. Yes, there is movement in it. And by the way, despite what the report implies, not all RALO slots are travel funded. For instance, if you look at the bottom of the – these are in alphabetical order – APRALO, you can see the Secretariat. They have been around forever. That's not an elected position, that's an appointed position. These are volunteers who do it largely without any travel support whatsoever. The second to last person is someone who when he comes to meetings comes on his own dime. The last person is someone who rarely comes to meetings.

In the cases where there are Vice Chair is within RALOs – and several of the RALOs have them – in general, they decide who gets funded. It

rotates around people. So, don't presume just because someone shows up on that chart that there's travel funding associated with it. That is not the case. Next slide, please.

Now, liaisons. You'll notice there is more continuity with liaisons. That's there for a reason. These liaisons are crucial positions. We have had times – and I am not exaggerating here – where we have attempted to train a new liaison for one of our groups, and we were politely told to never let that person in the room again.

It has happened twice. That's the kind of danger you can have when you put a random person in without the proper kind of training, without the kind of background. These are really crucial positions. Next slide.

We appoint people to the Nominating Committee. You'll notice in some cases that the same person comes back later. That's not particularly accidental. There are parts of ICANN – and the ASO is the one I particularly think of – that there's a two-year contiguous term limit to sitting on the NomCom as a voting delegate.

There's one person who every two years, they come back, because the ASO alternates them. They put the knowledgeable people there, because those are the people helping to govern or guide things. In the beginning, most RALOs used the NomCom as a training place.

We took someone who knew nothing about ICANN, and put them on the NomCom. I think that's particularly pig headed if you're trying to help your organization. It's a great training ground, however, so usually those people end up moving somewhere else, and then sometimes we put them back on the NomCom. Because at that point, they're really

good NomCom people for us. So, it's an interesting world we're living in. Next page.

This one I don't expect you to read. This is the consolidated one. It shows over the five years we have had I think 126 or 146 – I've lost track at this point – people move through the organization in the various slots. Yes, there are some lines that continue, and yes, there is lots of white space there, because people come and go. Next slide.

We're looking at 15 years, about 30 to 40 positions in the last ten years. The first six years, there were only 15 ALAC positions because the interim ALAC was in force. 124 people is the right number over that period of time. Next slide.

Some statistics: I took over the full period, and over the period since we have had RALOs, because the whole dynamic changes at that point. The Board-appointed ALAC members tended – with two exceptions – to stay there for the whole period of time, from 2003 to 2006 or 2007. We tend to churn people a lot more, so although the NomCom people changed every two years typically – because rarely does a NomCom person succeed and are kept around for another term – the ALAC members change.

What we see is the average person over the full period attends about ten meetings in their whole lifetime. Not necessarily contiguous, they may come and go, and that's equivalent of about three and a half years. And since averages are skewed numbers, the median is also interesting, and it's eight meetings a little under three years.

If we look at the period in what I call the modern period since we have RALOs and all of the RALO leadership that goes, the numbers change a little bit. They go down a little bit, as you would expect, because some of the original people had long lives in the organization. The Board appointed them, and unless they quit, they were there for life, or at least life at least the RALOs existed. And we're looking right now at a median of two years for people. So, that is clearly saying that everyone isn't staying around for life. Next slide.

Looking at the distribution, I expected a pretty standard distribution. What I found – perhaps not surprisingly, but I hadn't thought it through very well – is we have a huge peak at the two years, or just under two years.

The problem we are having is not the few people who have attended 31 to 33 meetings. I'm one of them. Am I a problem? Perhaps. But that's not the issue. The real problem is the churn we have at the low end, that we're not managing to keep people and get them involved, and get them productive and get them able to move up. Next slide.

Same slide, but looking only at the current ALAC, and the numbers are somewhat lower. The scale changes, so the height of the lines may not change, but the numbers are somewhat lower. Next slide.

Okay, do people stay too long? Yes, some of them do. If you look at the detailed charts, you can identify a people who have probably overstayed their welcome. They're not many though. We do have people who switch from one job to another and stay for a long time

moving through jobs as they gather experience, and as they gather perspective. That's a good thing in my mind, not a bad thing.

Do we rotate jobs among friends? If someone's going out of one seat because they're term limited or something, let's find another slot for them. Yes, we do it on occasion. I can point to perhaps a handful of cases like that, where we – when I say we, we're the community, because this is a bottom-up community – took someone who didn't really do a good job in their previous job, and put them into another job.

Usually, it's because there's no ability to really give feedback to the people making the decisions. In some cases, there are friends, and we're going to do it anyway. That's one of the dangers of democracy, unfortunately. In any of our countries, we have legislators who go back just because they're good. They're good at politics, not necessarily doing a good job.

But there's not many of them. And those aren't the problems we need to fix. Those are problems you fix with one-on-one confrontation, not by global rules. I once read – it was one of these humor management books, and they were talking about a policy in a company. A policy is something you write to fix a one-time occurrence which you don't mention in the policy. There's a lot of truth to it.

Is travel an issue? You bet. But most of the issue is not that it's fun. Time away from our family, time where you have to take vacation because you're actually working and your employer doesn't let you just take time

off randomly is not necessarily fun, even if you happen to go to a place that is interesting and take a day of vacation along with it.

It primes the pump, it provides the information. So, you have to look at it from that perspective. And there is an issue of travel for perks. We have a number of people – I could name them, but I won't on this call – who basically have said, and said in public ways, they said it in campaign statements that, "If you give me a job where I will be traveling, I will work. If you don't give me a job, I will not work." And they do that by simply not ever joining a working group, not ever showing up at a meeting, that kind of thing. But they continually apply for jobs, and sometimes their friends give them votes. That's a bad thing, not a good thing. Next slide.

Done. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Alan, thank you. We have got five minutes left. Tom, do you have a few things to say? First of all, thank you very much for the statistics you've gathered, it's certainly – I think they're very useful for the ITEMS team.

ALAN GREENBERG: By the way, I will provide all of the raw data. I just haven't gotten it at the stage where I can send it out to the review team now, but will.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, that's fine. Tom, any last words? And then I'll just go through very quickly the timeline, because we do have a hard stop. Go ahead, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. Just quickly, just to say to Alan, thank you for that information. It's incredibly detailed, and obviously, we'd be interested to see it. You've just mentioned that you will provide us with the raw data as well. I think as reviewers, we would need to have that raw data that you have used to make these charts, but that is incredibly detailed and interesting information, which we will obviously take into account in the next draft.

Thank you really very much for that, and for your thoughts about participation rates and who's actually involved, and reviewing all the data and things, which are – well, it's true. It's a central part of our thinking, up to now.

So yes, I won't say much more, except to say that you started out by saying that there was a problem of perception and people saying things about At-Large based on partial information, and sort of in a very judgmental kind of way without necessarily being particularly kind of informed.

One of the reasons for that may be that there are too many of one kind of quotes in our draft, and we can correct that possibly to a certain extent. But perceptions are important, and what we have found actually is that going through many of the quotes that we haven't included in our draft, this perception is a widespread perception, the ones that you were talking about.

And we will be able to balance out the quotes with examples from many other parts of the community who have similarly harsh kind of comments. I think what you were saying is that perceptions sometimes are a little bit unfair, and that's a possibility. But they're definitely things that you need to work on.

Perceptions are very important for a community. I don't think I will say much more, only really to say that this conversation has been very useful. All your inputs, we've noted down much of your inputs, and we should be taking that into account in the days ahead. And I'll just really hand it back to Holly for the timeline for now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right, well, with the 60 seconds remaining, the timeline is 23 hours, 59 minutes of today. From there, the report will be released for public comment on the 20th of January. The public comment will close on the 2nd of March. The Copenhagen meeting starts on the 11th of March, and during that meeting there will probably be about a half a day put aside for discussion of the report and the public comments. Following that, the working party will be briefed on the final report as drafted by ITEMS to go to the Board, and it will go to the Board in the June meeting.

And then from then, I think the work begins. But look, I'd like to thank everybody on this call. I think it's been very useful. Thank you, ITEMS team, thank you all members of the working party, and we're ending on time exactly –

TOM MACKENZIE: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes?

TOM MACKENZIE: Sorry to interrupt, just one last thing which I don't think you mentioned, which is that during the next meeting, the Copenhagen meeting, we are planning still to have a workshop, which I think will be a very useful mechanism to get us all together, to get an opportunity for us to really sort of go through all the aspects of what they're proposing, and engage with you and everyone who's there in what will hopefully be a very dynamic kind of meeting to explain and to go through the model.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, that has already gone through to Gisella who knows that she has to actually schedule that into the Copenhagen meeting. So yes, that's already on the cards, that's being dealt with.

                         And that said, it's one minute past, but I can thank everybody for their time. I think this was a very good meeting. We will see everybody in Copenhagen, but probably talk beforehand. So, thank you, everybody. Excellent meeting, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Thank you, bye.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you all, bye.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Bye.
YESIM NAZLAR:	This meeting is now adjourned, so you will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for your participation, and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]