

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party call taking place on Wednesday, 8<sup>th</sup> of February, 2017, at 21:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel we have Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Seun Ojedeji, Alan Greenberg, Vernatius Ezeama, Eduardo Diaz, and John Laprise. I see that Leon Sanchez has just joined us as well.

On our Spanish channel we have Aida Noblia.

We have received apologies from Alberto Soto and Ali AlMeshal.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Charla Shambley, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.

Tijani Ben Jemaa has just joined us.

Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

Finally, if I could please remind everyone to state their names before speaking not only for the transcription purposes but also for the interpretation purposes as well please.

Over to you, Holly. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Today the function I think is to actually plan out how we're going to respond to the review with some timelines and

---

*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.*

---

some organization and some handing out of chores. Lars has just prepared, and so the e-mail would have come in very soon, I'm sure a lot of you will not have seen it but a timeline which I will go over at the end and just make sure that everybody's comfortable with this timeline because I should get back to Lars and confirm or otherwise what's in the timeline. If people are comfortable with it, can we start to think through how we are going to respond as a large group in coming up with a review process?

I'd like to start with the document that I circulated. It's essentially a chart with headings. And it's my headings that – and they're only mine, I am absolutely open to anybody adding or subtracting from the headings – on putting issues under headings so that various groups, probably maybe RALO by RALO or individual by individual, we can break down the work and therefore probably all achieve a response. We don't have a lot of time. I remind people that we are going to be meeting in Copenhagen, but by that time we should have come up with an agreed response.

I'm going to just go through the headings and then stop and have everybody chip in as to if those headings are enough, too many, too few, and if the items that I've put under those headings actually work for people or not. So with that in mind – and I'm looking at the document. I hope other people are as well.

First of all, I would like to thank Ariel for putting this chart into the wiki page so everybody can contribute. And John Laprise said he was going to put it in Google docs, which will be fantastic if he's done. The link is there and it will mean that people can use either the Google docs or

---

what's in the wiki to make their contributions which would be really useful. And thank you for putting the chart up.

Okay. The headings – and I'll just go through these briefly – first of all, although it's only a sentence or two I think it's worthwhile starting with our understanding with what ALAC is. They've picked up things that were said in comments which is essentially, "ALAC is a two-way conduit both funneling the interests of end users up into ICANN processes and downward funneling knowledge of ICANN processes and policies and issues back out into the RALOs and the ALSes." I think we have to say that right up front because that's going to be our guiding set of principles.

Next heading – and I've just called this "Openness of ALAC to End Users." There are some statements in there about the ability to participate, and I think all of us took a deep breath and said they don't really understand the processes that they in fact are open. Some of the things we have to explain or address, and that is membership of individuals. Certainly the processes are not uniform across all RALOs. Do we want them to be? And if so, what are they? The openness of processes, I don't think they understand that many ICANN processes are simply not open to the public, particularly say SSAC, GAC, ccNSO, etc. So there's some statements, both what is open – which they haven't acknowledged – and what isn't open – which they also haven't acknowledged.

The difficulty in participating in ICANN processes, they don't stress as much as many of us have which is pretty difficult to actually come just

---

off the street and be involved in ICANN processes. There's a lot of barriers there and essentially that's what we're there to do.

There is another whole set of comments that is made in the review about the structure and processes of ALAC, comments about the complexity, comments about whether or not we need an alt, whether or not we need several layers. This is going to take some work in terms of actually understanding what they're saying and the extent to which that does or does not accord with actually what is possible and what we do.

The role of RALOs – they've actually got I think some useful suggestions but whether they reflect RALOs or not, I'm not sure. They talk more than in one occasion about a small group on a leadership team and I think I am one of those small group and basically we should all go out to pasture and shut up. I'm not sure that's exactly what [inaudible] want to do, but what we do about rotating a lot of positions and bringing new people in.

There are some things that they in the structures they talk about some new structures, things like the EMM model, and that's going to take a lot of work, the Council of Elders, the rapporteurs, how that all works. So there is a lot of thought and work there.

They make comments about the processes and accountability. They have not understood some of the things that we do. They make some suggestions which may be useful in terms of membership terms, limitations on terms, rotation of individuals, focus on procedure, the need for accountability and transparency. I think some of those are

---

interesting and probably constructive. There's a lot about outreach and external activities. I was surprised that they actually think that we should be going out into the Internet Governance world, and I don't think they understand the extent to which we have. But there's some very interesting things that we could support.

And then there are resources. There's statements about ICANN staff and the role of ICANN staff in policy and research and whatever. Funding – they made some interesting observations about the allocation of funds, particularly auction funds which we never did. And then the discussion about a Board position – do we need another? Do we need it? What is its role and function?

With that, I'm going to hand over to at least three hands and I hope there are more in terms of what have I missed. And after we've got some discussion on what I've missed or said too much, then we're going to start actually allocating some work.

Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Holly. I didn't put my hand up to respond to this piece of work at all but while I have the microphone I will in fact do so. The reason I put my hand up was to point out what is probably a bit of a process piece that we need to deal with earlier in our agenda because in Lars' e-mail which I did just read while you were doing your introduction on this piece of work, he also asks for us to get back as to whether or not Tom could join us in the last few minutes of the call. So I think you

---

might need to read the additional part in his e-mail so we deal with that as well.

On this work however, I'm perfectly happy as you and I discussed, for us to carve it up under classification like this listing does do. I think that's a way of making our response pieces easier to manage and to give the potential for some good framework for future texts and drafting of responses.

I haven't looked at the Google Doc. I'm only looking at the pdf. It's going to be important that we are allowing enough space and opportunity for people to put in comments within the column structure. I'm not sure that the three-column structure is quite doing justice to that. Perhaps someone with a little bit more wiki-nous than I have could set up something that allows us to have yet another free-form column or something.

What I don't want is to have just this endless shopping list of input in comment boxes at the end of the wiki page. In the Google Doc, obviously it's going to be hard to [section] and in a column which is forced if we have it as comments because comments turn up in a right-hand column. I just want to see if we can also design an optimal format for using this type of tool and to be honest, Holly, I'm not going to bite into the, "Have you missed anything?" because this is just the beginnings of a methodology. It's not a deep analysis. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. First of all, she raises the point about do we want Tom to actually listen in, participate, or what? And I'm very much in all

---

of your hands. Basically if we want to invite Tom – and this is just a very casual vote – would you put your hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the question was, could he participate in the last few minutes of the call. I think that's what Cheryl said. Which is different [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's correct, Alan. The request was very specific. Would it be okay if Tom joined us in the last few minutes of the call to interact with the working party regarding their expectations about interactions?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem with that.

HOLLY RAICHE: [John] is happy. Is there anybody else? Can I just see a show of hands please?

Tijani says no. Maureen's uncomfortable. John, Cheryl. Okay, fine. I think the checks have it. Lars and/or Heidi, could you contact Tom and say it's okay? Thank you, Lars.

Okay. Next I think Cheryl has a good point. This was just my thought, but perhaps we could have Ariel put another column on the table that's up

---

just for comments. Cheryl, would that assist so that people can look at the three columns and then go, "I agree," "I don't agree," and put some... First of all, are people comfortable with the headings by and large so that we can work with this structure? If people are comfortable, could you just put your hand up please?

Maureen is.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, maybe we should go through the speakers.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Eduardo's not. Okay, well I'll listen to everybody. Okay. Eduardo, go ahead please.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay. About the headings, I was going to ask the question, where these headings came from, if they come directly from the document or these are heading that you just thought encompass the whole theme of what the document is saying within that specific category. You can answer that when I finish. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: These are my own. I was just trying to group things together so that instead of replying point by point by point, that we have a few headings and people can work on a heading and related issues. It's just my suggestion, Eduardo. That's all.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, so just like Cheryl said, this is a good starting point so we can not only comment on the recommendations we can comment on the headings if the need [inaudible] I guess.

HOLLY RAICHE: Absolutely.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The other thing I was going to say about the way going forward with this, I think we should use only one place to put the comments. My recommendation is that we use Google Docs and we don't use the wiki. We use the wiki to put the final thing here but I think we use the Google Docs and then with Google Docs, everybody that is adding comments you can add it directly into the corresponding column but they should use "suggesting" not "editing" because when you put "suggesting" it gets colored – whatever you put has a specific color – and that color gets attached to you. It would be easy to see what things have been changed and follow the comments. I recommend just use Google Docs and then when we're done we just can throw it in here.

---

Then the other thing I just want to add is, for example, when I look at this EMM model, I don't agree necessarily with that model but I don't my suggestion will not be, "We don't like this." I think we should take that, whatever has been suggested there, and see how we can translate that into a process that we have actually in ALAC or a process that we have currently in ALAC that can be enhanced. I think that's the focus of what we need to do here in terms of commenting on this document. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Eduardo. Before I go any further, may I get a sense of the meeting? Could people put your hands up if you are comfortable with using Google Docs because I actually think that's a very good suggestion, Eduardo, but if there are people who are not comfortable using Google Docs and using the suggestion bit of Google Docs, let me know. Tijani, okay. Wait a minute.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I have [audio]. I don't have a hand. I'm comfortable with Google Docs.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm sorry. Are you for or against Google Docs, Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I'm for.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you. If Tijani's not comfortable, then –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, I had my hand up specific to the Google Doc point of view if you want to take it as a [point].

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I am an absolute fan of Google Docs. I personally will be using the Google Docs, but I think we have to maintain the wiki alternative because there are people in our community and wider communities which cannot for whatever reason utilize the Google Docs effectively. What I would suggest is, for those of us who are most comfortable in Google Docs – and I'm hoping that that will indeed be the majority of us – we go hell for leather on the Google Docs but a fourth column – and I agree with Eduardo on it being the comment mode. I think that's very important. What that does ideally, of course, is create a right-hand column with those comments in it within the Google Doc and therefore we can collect those comments from the Google Doc and copy them into the fourth column on the wiki. That will then give parity between the two copies.

It's not going to be totally synchronous but we can do it every day or so. That was what I was going to say. Thanks.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm about to take an executive decision. Eduardo was saying – and I hear a concern we should use the wiki only – I think my comment is, whatever makes people comfortable and I will assume – and actually, Cheryl, I'm putting your hand up, too – Cheryl and I will assume responsibility for looking at both and probably having a summary of what people have said in both sets into the wiki so that everybody can see what people are saying, because I think you're right. Maureen has pointed out, that Google Docs requires a lot of broadband and that is expensive in the Islands. Other people are much more comfortable with Google Docs. I think I'm not going to choose. And Leon's right. We're talking 20 minutes and talking about process. I agree.

Alan, go ahead. Tijani and then I'm cutting the call off so that we can get onto the actual headings. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I mentioned in e-mail and you agreed with me but it seems to have gotten lost. I think we have to look at a longer picture, that the current comments we're making are for ITEMS to potentially revise the paper. That will then go essentially to the Board Committee and then ultimately the Board. If at that point we are still unhappy with the recommendations – and remember, it is the recommendations which get implemented not necessarily the analysis – we have to be in a position to explain why we are unhappy with some of the recommendations.

I believe in preparation for that and to make sure that ITEMS understands what we are agreeing with and what we are not, I think we

---

need a recommendation by recommendation and implementation by implementation response. That is the form of the template they gave, and although this other document may well inform us and help both construct it and perhaps add some extra notes, I think in parallel we need to be able to respond to the recommendations as such.

My concern is, there's a lot of overlap between what is here and what is going to be in that. So I'd like to understand the purpose in the final document, not as a tool to preparing things, of this table versus the responses for the recommendation by recommendation.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Fine. And at this stage we can ask a fairly substantive and important question. My vision of a response is that it is a positive one. Under every heading that I have put, there is a response to what they say. I've actually gone through all of the recommendations that they put – and by the way, if you look at the recommendations a lot of their proposals are actually in the diagram about the EMM – so in fact it's going to be a very long document if what we do is simply reply to them. My concern with simply replying to ITEMS is that we don't actually then set out as to what structures we want and how we plan to move forward.

If people would like to simply have a document that is a recommendation by recommendation report/response to ITEMS, we can just stop this discussion right now and not use the template and go back and simply have a template – recommendations 1 to whatever, and the EMM. Really we need to decide that right now.

---

Do people want to have our response simply as a response recommendation by recommendation to ITEMS because we do not have time to do both a response recommendation by recommendation plus –

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, may I respond before you ask the other people?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Go for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's not clear to me that... You said you want to be positive. In some areas we have other solutions. In some areas we do not believe it is a problem that they're identifying.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: And it's not clear that in every case in every recommendation we are going to have an alternative. Certainly when we have alternatives that we can present, we should be presenting them. But I think we have to be honest and make sure that we're getting our message through because ultimately this will – or some version of this – will go to the Board and we have to be prepared for that time as well. Thank you.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: My response to John Laprise –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, this is Seun. I'd like to stay in the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, Seun.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There's Tijani in the queue. Holly, I believe your queue is now Tijani and Seun.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, I don't see your hand but you are there. So Tijani first, Cheryl, and then Seun please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Your queue is Tijani, then Seun.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Holly. First of all I would like to apologize for being three minutes late for the call and I wanted to propose a modification of the agenda, but unfortunately I was a little bit late.

---

Thank you very much, Holly, for the work you did. It is very interesting and very helpful. I would perhaps propose that we add two columns to this table. For ITEMS, two columns – one the concern and one the solution. And for ALAC, two columns, too, to respond to the concerns and to respond to the solution. Because sometimes, as Alan said, the concern doesn't exist at all because they have wrong information and their concern is not a concern.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

This is a first proposal. Second, I wanted to modify the agenda to first address our strategy. What is our communication strategy for this issue? Shall we wait until making our comment and that's all? Is it the only channel we will use? I don't think so. I think that we need a very aggressive communication strategy going to people who may be helpful for our comments, for our idea, for our way of thinking. We have to touch people who can do something. We are not begging for something. We are going to people who are in charge.

For example, on the Board there is a committee who is in charge of the review. We have to contact them. We have to explain them. Because there is a problem. If you have read the ITEMS proposal, they say we need this reform. This reform is very interesting. Are they in charge of reforming At-Large or reviewing At-Large?

---

There's a lot of things that we have to do from now, even before we prepare our paper. We have to explain people something. We have to make people aware of what is the misunderstanding because I think that there is a big misunderstanding. This is something that we need to decide today. I said that on the e-mail. We need to decide on our communication strategy and also we have to work on this document. Thank you very much for preparing this for us. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Seun, you're next.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Go ahead please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. Thank you, [Holly] for this effort. I also agree with what Alan was saying in relation to how we approach providing our response. Even if we're going to be identifying specific headings, then I would suggest that it should be based on recommendation by recommendation. So for Recommendation #1, there may be some of the headings ITEMS which only as listed that will be applicable for that particular recommendation. We can mention in there. But I think one thing I want to also say which I little bit agree with Alan on is the fact that it is after if it is when ITEMS there's no change or reflected changes [inaudible].

---

I think right from now these recommendations [where] we don't agree with, it should say clearly that we don't agree with them. [Inaudible] for us to [nice] our words right now. We don't have to be nice at this point in time. I think the cat has been let out already so we should be clear about the ones that we don't agree with, and if we must not have alternatives for this and so I would suggest that we go just like the way we approached the CCWG Stewardship, CCWG Accountability [inaudible] recommendation so that it should be clear [inaudible] on this particular one we have [trusted], we are [inaudible] recommendations [inaudible] and decide that they want to [inaudible] this recommendation [inaudible] and avoid repetition in our work.

And just to add, I agree with Tijani. We need to add a comment how we're going to particularly engage our community because on the long run we have to – some of us understand these things more than the other so it depends on the extent to which people we want to talk to [part of our community] because we shouldn't just go from ALAC. I'm hoping that some other individual from the community will put in their own comment as well.

I hope one of these calls will also invite the Board representative for At-Large to also brief in as well. Maybe there's something that she could also help us advise us on how to engage the Board in order to ensure that this thing is very clear because it looks like to [the rest] of the community – some of the rest of the community – it looks like ALAC has been doing something else all this while and this is just the right way to go for them. So I think we have to be very proactive on this and I look forward to contributing to the recommendation. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Tijani, is that a new hand? Tijani, your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Holly. It is a new hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. I am sorry. I forgot to make this remark. I would like to understand why we need Tom to be on this call. We may have another call, and they said we may have the other call with ITEMS but this one is for us and I propose that even it is a closed one. Means that the transcript and the recording will not be public until we finish our preparation for having a document that can be used. Now we are discussing and you know that there is tension with ITEMS. He was angry last time because we said that they are destroying At-Large, etc. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: At this stage, I think we have a couple of things, and they're separate but related. Number one, I think you're right about the strategy. I don't think we can resolve that on this call but I think we can actually deal with that at least on an e-mail list if not on other lists as well. The other is a structure for our response. I'm hearing loud and clear that people

---

---

would like our response to respond to every recommendation, in the sense that either we agree with it, we don't agree with it, but also what is in place now or we could put in place to be positive.

I think Eduardo has summed it up very nicely. This is how we move forward in capturing all the comments in one place and putting something together. We have suggested that we have – and I think the problem with having everything in one place, Eduardo, is, depending on the technology and peoples' capability, we can at least have two places and two agreed ways forward. If people want to reorder this and have it recommendation by recommendation, we can do that as well. That's simple. But I think we have to decide how we are going to organize people's responses and then I want various RALOs to take responsibility for some of those.

Cheryl, your hand's up. Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Holly. I think we can find space in the structures to note where a recommendation has a specific link or nexus with a topic. Obviously, things that are specific to recommendations should have priority in terms of our gathering of interaction and information and getting it into a text form for later use. I also while I've got the microphone wanted to point out that I think it's probably a little early to start allocating tasks. I understand your drive to get on with the job, Holly, but I think we actually have a bit of marketing we have to do here in advance of job allocations.

---

I think it's important that we also plan now how we can assist the RALOs to spend a reasonable block of time in their upcoming monthly call to look at this very important document and to be made aware of the opportunity if not the absolute mandate for them to comment, respond, and have input into our information collection point and reaction collection point. I also think we need to make sure that we specifically push/task – so this is kind of a job allocation but not perhaps in the way you were thinking, Holly – for this conversation and this interaction opportunity to go further and make sure we engage individual members and ALSes – and I mean ALSes and their membership – in opportunities for input as well.

I think what we need to probably do is get onto the marketing aspect of what, when, and the timeline as a particular priority. We then hopefully by the time people gather together, the leadership gathers together, in Copenhagen, we'll have had some far more significant input from our grass roots than if we just work with the usual suspects.

It may work. It may not work. I think one of the advantages of having both the wiki opportunity and the Google Doc for collecting input and comments is that it will encourage individual rank and file [people] but we need to make it clear that it's not just up to the RALO leaders or just up to the ALS representatives, it is something that rank and file are to be encouraged to respond to.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. And before I call on Alan, one thing that may make people a little bit easier about using the document that's on the screen

---

– if I add to it under each heading the relevant recommendations so that it's clear that what we are responding to in terms of the headings I've got actually relate to the recommendations because I did sit there with all of the recommendations and the EMM as I did that. That may help if that would work if people are comfortable with that.

Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. There's an awful lot going on here, and I have a little concern that we're not going to be able to pull it all together in the very little amount of time that we have. I'm not quite sure how to proceed. Cheryl's comments about getting input from the RALOs and ALS and ALS members is something we've had a hard time doing until now, and remember we don't have these documents in multiple languages. I'm just a little worried that we're going to be doing a lot of work over the next month, and going into Copenhagen we won't have something that is almost ready to ship out.

I think at least some of us need to start trying to put together outlines of final documents and things even if we can't fill in all the details to make sure that we're not going to be left with a huge amount of work to do in the last couple of days of the comment period. We may get it extended but probably not. I'd just like to make sure we understand the whole timeline of how we're going to pull this together. Thank you.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

With respect, Alan, that's exactly my concern. We're sitting here the first week in February. We've got March deadline. And in fact, we've got a lot of work to do. So we need to agree how we're going to proceed, and I'm hearing people would like to respond to recommendations. My suggestion is that on this outline, we include the relevant recommendation so that people understand how what we're saying relates to it. I'm happy to do that. I'm happy to go straight into a response. But we have to agree now on a structure.

And Cheryl, with respect to marketing and strategy, we also have to do that but we really have very limited time in which to come up with a response. We have listened to ITEMS. We don't need to listen to them anymore because frankly, we've heard what they have to say. Now they have to hear what we have to say.

It really is a fundamental question. Are people comfortable working with this outline but under each heading there is a list of the recommendations or the findings. Because in some case, all they've got is the finding, no related recommendation, and what we don't agree with is the finding. So if we structure it a little bit that way and tie it back, are we comfortable doing that so that we can move forward and at some point we have to actually look at Lars' document.

Tijani, go ahead please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Holly. I don't see that there is a conflict between what Alan proposed and what Cheryl proposed, because we may ask or we may encourage our ALSes to comment to give their thoughts. At the

---

same time we have every one of us at least of the working party to we have to put our comments in the dedicated column for our comments. We need, as Holly said, this is not the final template. You may add headings and at least as she said, we will put all the recommendations related to these heading etc. etc.

This is not a concrete. It is something that can be changed and [inaudible] if you want or improved, but we have to start from something and I propose that we start from this and improve it and I have some idea of improving it. Everyone have, I am sure. And we have to start immediately, very soon, to put our thoughts in the columns here so that we collect now it is the phase of collecting points of view, collecting opinions, in the dedicated column and then we compile them. We try to compile them. Our document will be the compilation of all the thoughts that will be put there.

In the same time, we encourage all our ALSes to make comments even if we don't have all the languages, but at least those who understand English can make some comments on this document. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. And Tijani, you've got a couple of people absolutely, totally, agreeing with you and I agree with you. So let's move forward.

Cheryl, your hand's up please.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just briefly, it was a time check activity. I thought this was an hour call. If it is, then we only have 15 minutes left and five of that is dedicated to Tom and we do have a timeline to review. Based on Lars' very close to our start of meeting e-mail, the parallel activities I don't think are mutually exclusive. I think they can be complementary. But I also would point out – and Tijani, you should note in the chat my support of your multipronged approach where we don't just do these things sequentially. We also start working in other quarters actively if not, as you suggested, aggressively. But I'm always up for a bit of aggression. You should know that.

But I think the more we have on wiki or in document form, the more collection and collation of information we have, while we're also looking at other approaches and [spheres] of influence will also be helpful. Otherwise, we're going to be talking to people in hypotheticals and not having an active link with work going on to also buff us up on things. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan, your hand's up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two things or maybe three. First of all, Cheryl made a comment before which I read out literally, "Grrr. House should be on hold on drafting or behold on drafting," I would appreciate if she could retype that so I can understand it because I can't parse that at all. I think it may be a valuable statement.

---

In terms of parallel work flows, I agree completely. From my perspective, I'm going through the report and trying to put my thoughts in order in terms of the recommendations and the implementations. I hope to have that done by the end of the weekend and I will contribute that to the process. Whether that forms part of a report or simply informs people of what Greenberg is thinking, we can decide later. But I will do that and hopefully will contribute to the overall process. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Alan. And an action item on me – I will go through this outline and add at every stage not only where the recommendations are but some of the findings that I think all of us have taken exception to as well as details of the EMM because that, in fact, forms part of the recommendations even though they don't say so.

We have got exactly 12 minutes, and in that time period we have a time frame that Lars would like to be confirmed. I'm only going to go through the bit of the timeline that gets us up to Copenhagen.

The week of this week is a call to discuss the updated draft and talk about any changes – that's for us and I think we need to do this weekly which is what I've already flagged.

The week of the 13<sup>th</sup>, what Lars is putting out is there will be a community-wide webinar for ITEMS to present their report. They've invited everybody and everybody will be contacted. I don't think that's a problem but I'm sure that also during that week and the coming weeks we as a working party need to meet as well.

---

When we get to Copenhagen on Sunday morning as discussed, there will be a meeting with ITEMS and the working party. At one point – and some of us have basically said, “Do we still need to meet with ITEMS?” And I think at this stage that’s a big question because we will have listened to ITEMS in the webinar. So could I ask, do we need on Sunday morning as well as – we’ve got Sunday morning meeting with ITEMS and then Sunday afternoon – workshop with ITEMS and ICANN to discuss the Empowered Membership Model. Do we need those two?

Hands please – do we need something to meet with ITEMS on Sunday morning in Copenhagen as well as a workshop in the afternoon?

Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I wanted to recommend something on the end so I’m going to put my hand at the end before we all leave. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Eduardo. Lars, your hand is up. Go ahead please.

LARS HOFFMAN: Thank you, Holly. Yes, I think Tom is about to dial in. He might also to shed some light on this. I just want to say that there was obviously some confusion about the Copenhagen session. We put in a request for the idea that ITEMS had was to hold a workshop in Copenhagen, not to talk necessarily about the report – obviously to talk about the report but not necessarily talk about the content and what they found and their

---

methodology and their recommendations which I think perhaps that will be the webinar – but to use it as an interaction with At-Large and the wider community to discuss specifically their new membership model, and what strengths and weaknesses ITEMS sees in that, and then have the discussions with the community about how that can be further improved during the next steps of the review.

We tried to – and I misunderstood that I thought the workshop would be held during that morning session Holly referred to – we tried to get that session on the agenda. We were a little bit late due to the back and forth. And so it's currently not – the session you mentioned on the Sunday afternoon – is currently not on the schedule yet. We're working behind the scenes to make this happen, but personally I would be very grateful if... I appreciate it obviously completely your prerogative... if you would cancel that morning session so that at least we have one session open still in case the Meetings Team are not able to provide us with a room and a time for ITEMS to meet with you and other members of the community [inaudible] we feel that is a very important interaction that will I think benefit the report and the process of this review overall.

I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Lars. Could I respond on behalf of everyone? People have not had an opportunity at this stage to think about what we're going to do in Copenhagen. We had come up with some suggestions. I don't think we've had an opportunity to work through what those suggestions

---

are and how it's come out. Could we have say 24 hours of time for the working party to get their head around what's being proposed and our response just so that we can come up with some kind of coherent understanding of what we're doing as a working party and briefing? Okay? If that's okay, Lars?

LARS HOFFMAN: Absolutely, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Okay. The action item on everyone in the working party is we have to discuss just those two items that are not quite what we had discussed before, and I want to get people's thoughts on that.

Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Holly. Lars, and [Vander] and probably others in the chat are reacting the same way as I did when I read this timeline. I'm very doubtful of the use of a public meeting on the Sunday. The Sunday is before the meeting starts. I'm all for the public meeting. Don't get me wrong. I think that's an important part of the process. But on Sunday, who on earth other than the usual suspects are we likely to be getting? The meeting hasn't started and the GNSO is in session. This is like putting a billboard in the middle of the desert. But maybe that's what you want.

---

LARS HOFFMAN: May I respond, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Of course. Go ahead, Lars.

LARS HOFFMAN: Cheryl, two things. First, I put it actually at the time when the GNSO which is at quarter past three was the time I requested for the Sunday [which is] the time when the GNSO has finished. They only meet until 3:00 on Sunday. And the second issue is that because of the misunderstanding, we were late for the submission for this extra session because we had been under the wrong impression. I'm not blaming anybody. I misunderstood this. But the session on Sunday morning would be the workshop with ITEMS.

The possibility of sessions and free slots and just rooms, it's very limited right now. At the moment the Sunday is fully booked so it doesn't look like it's actually going to be on the Sunday. We will literally have to take the slot that we get. As for Sunday not being part of the agenda, I thought – and I might be wrong as well – there was a new format. My understanding is that the meeting actually starts on the Saturday and it's a six-day meeting from Saturday to Thursday. But again, I might be wrong on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Lars. Larisa, go ahead, please.

---

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Holly. I actually wanted to raise the same point that Lars just raised. As we understand the meeting scheduling, the official dates of the meeting are [to start] on the 11<sup>th</sup> of March which is Saturday, but also since I have the floor, as you continue with your discussion I just wanted to offer at whatever time would be good for the working party if there is an interest the group that has worked with other review processes, my team and I would be happy to walk you through the steps in the process that were followed for the GNSO Review in terms of how that team formulated their responses to the recommendations and how they worked toward getting the information communicated in their case to the GNSO Council and ultimately to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board in areas where there was disagreement and concerns and such.

If such a overview of steps that were used previously and what the process is would be helpful, we would be happy to provide that overview whenever that would be useful. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Larisa. And we may take you up on that a lot sooner than Copenhagen, but we'll have a chat offline. Thank you.

Tom, go ahead please.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Hi, everybody. I've only actually literally just dialed in so I haven't heard anything of the earlier part of this conversation. But hello and I think it's good to have this opportunity just to exchange with you briefly. As I'm

---

only here alone and I was only really told to come in on the call literally a few minutes ago and so the other team members aren't here, it's a little bit in addition to what we normally agree to do. But that's fine.

The one thing I just wanted to say was that regarding the webinar and the workshop, we've already started working on these and we would like to have an open dialog with you or to keep the exchanges free and flowing and open as possible about those two events. What our ideas are for both of these – the webinar and the workshop – very briefly we want to use the webinar as an opportunity to very quickly give an overview of the report, the main findings, and the main recommendations of the report. And our idea is that it's to an audience that's a wider audience than the one that we've been talking to up to now – that's to say mainly you. So it's a first opportunity to exchange with a wider At-Large audience and presumably anybody else who dials into that webinar. And so the format will be fairly traditional just running through a slide deck going through our findings and conclusions and recommendations.

Secondly and importantly, our idea for the workshop is that this will be an opportunity which we hope will be as open as possible with as much participation as possible from At-Large – At-Large members, yourselves of course, and anybody who's at the ICANN meeting and interested in the functioning of the At-Large community. So it's a fairly big audience we're hoping. And then as far as the format is concerned, we want to make it a very dynamic workshop in which we really run through the mechanics of the new Empowered Membership Model which we describe and just explain on one hand the blockages which we've identified and how we expect this new model to relieve some of the

---

blockages and hopefully make things run more smoothly for the At-Large community.

That's just a very quick, if you like, presentation of how we envisage running these two presentations in the coming weeks. I'll stop there. I guess there's maybe one other thing which is that you wanted to have a call with us, but that's something that is not very clear in my mind as to if and when that will happen – a Review Working Party call with us.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Tom. At this stage, we are I think finalizing both how we're going to develop our own response. Certainly it is very clear we need to deal with recommendations as well as our own suggestions, and we're also working through with Lars as to the timeline and I'm really keen to listen to Larisa's suggestions as well.

We've run out of time but I'm sure we will be – I think most of us will be involved in that webinar in one way or another and we're hopefully going to have many more meetings to develop a response as well.

Are there any further suggestions, comments, questions, whatever, because we're over time? Otherwise, can I thank everybody for their time and say that we will be in touch and talking very soon.

Thank you, everybody, for your time. We've raised a lot of questions. We haven't produced a lot of answers but there's some ways forward. I'll be sending out an e-mail to say this is the way forward.

Thank you, everybody, for your time and we will be in touch very soon to organize another call. Thank you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]