GISELLA GRUBER:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large review working party call on Wednesday the 15th of February at 21:00 UTC.
	On today's call we have Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Oliver Crépin-Leblond, John Laprise, Alan Greenberg, Javier Rua-Jovet, Andrei Kolesnikov, Leon Sanchez, Vanda Scartezini.
	We don't currently have anyone on the Spanish channel.
	Apologies noted from Wolf Ludwig, Maureen Hilyard, and Seun Ojedeji.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Larisa Gurnick, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Gisella Gruber.
	Our interpreters this evening on the Spanish channel are David and Veronica.
	And if I could please remind you all to state your names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes, but to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other channel. Thank you very much and over to you Holly.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you Gisella. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. The aim of this call is to further our discussion on the draft. But the first item that I would like to clarify is the time of the upcoming At-Large review calls for this working party. Now, there was a Doodle that went out today, that would have had the leadership team call just at this time.

So, could we confirm that this is the time for the call up until Copenhagen? Or, is this so bad for some people, that we should do the right thing, Cheryl, and rotate the call time just because it's something I ask for all of the time? Just because it's something I ask for all of the time, don't get, but I should as chair, so [inaudible].

So, if people are comfortable with saying, with this time from now, every Thursday, up until Copenhagen, and by the way, not including the Thursday before Copenhagen, could you just either put your hand up or agree?

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume you mean the Wednesday before Copenhagen?

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry, Wednesday. It is Thursday in Sydney.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. But UTC time is still Wednesday.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Is this time okay for everyone else? Or is it just…? Oh God, look at that. There is one green tick, two. Leon is going to be away. Andrei, okay, good. I'm not seeing a lot of enthusiasm here, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Holly, Cheryl here. You know, I've given up. I'll, you know, fit in wherever.

HOLLY RAICHE:	So will I. All right.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I don't think this is sort of 2 AM to 6 AM for anyone. So.

HOLLY RAICHE:	All right, I'm going to make an executive decision. We're staying with this time, since nobody… Does anybody in the chat desperately want to argue for a significantly different time? And I will give you 30 seconds, and then I will become a dictator and say, Tijani, all right, go ahead, Tijani. Ah, Vanda likes it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay. Thank you very much. Do you hear me? Yes, you heard me. [CROSSTALK] Yeah, I know, I know. Okay, this time is [inaudible] but it is agreed by all members, I will accept it. Now it is 10 PM, and we will finish at 11:30. So it is a bit late for me. Yes, yes, yes, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:	We have accepted you, and accepted both of your agreement. So Gisella and Ariel, could you, as the first action item, put into everybody's calendar this time every week, please? Thank you.

That said, that takes care part of the timeline that we are working to. The timeline that Larissa circulated last time, has [inaudible]… There is an echo.

Could somebody find the echo please? Okay, it's gone. I don't need to talk to the timeline further because it was the up to date timeline circulated at last week's meeting. And if anyone does not have that document, please just directly contact Ariel, who will have it… Ariel, I think that's on the, our review page. So, that should not be a problem.

So, we've confirmed the time for the next weeks for a while. And the most pressing item on the agenda is to come up with a draft before Copenhagen, which is going to be a challenge, which is fine. Larissa, do you want to add anything to the timeline that's on the Adobe Connect now? It's on the screen.

LARISA GURNICK: Holly, this is Larisa Gurnick. No, thank you, I'm fine.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Okay. I'm just trying to claw back a bit of time before our discussion, because I hope this is going to be mainly discussion. The next item is a review of tools for the collection on the draft report. I have to say, we have, thank you Ariel. We have the Google Docs, and thank you both Vanda and John for putting your comments on it.

We have the Wiki that has been used, but not much. And I notice that the discussion is still going on, on the list. And while it would be nice if people would use the Google Docs, I will read discussion anywhere.

And I understand that not everybody likes any tool, so whatever the tool is that you use, including the email address, go for it.

I think what I will do is probably combine or go through all of the comments that have been made, because for example, there was some really interesting discussion on the actual structure that's included. Dev and Ed and Alejandro and other people, I may try to summarize that and put that on the Google Docs or somewhere, so that we can centralize, as much as possible, what people's comments are.

Ariel, could I ask you to circulate once again, the email address to everyone, sorry, the links for both the Google Docs and the Wiki? And again, if you're not comfortable using either, I will read everything. That said, let's go on to the discussion.

And Gisella's comment, I do not believe the 8th is the day for the meeting, because by that time, people are travelling. So, it's going to be next week's up until the week, the Wednesday before Copenhagen. So we've got very little time. Okay.

Where we're up to now, and this is going to be the rest of the meeting, and that is a discussion, but before we do the discussion, could I ask about process? Now, what I would like is for each RALO to put their hand up for one area, or a couple of areas, under the headings, and start to come up with some solid text in terms of suggestions for text, either an explanation of why we do not agree with the review, and in detail and not just simple, I don't agree, but why it may or may not work.

Or suggestions for text. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I would not use the word text. That implies we're going to cut and paste that into a final document, and that doesn't work well for style. So, we're looking for, you know, bullet format. Notes on content.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, okay. We are looking for something that will add to our draft. Okay? And if it's text, bullet points, whatever, I will start to welcome. Now, can we start to…? The headings that I have suggested, and let's start with making sure that everybody is happy with these headings. And everybody can scroll, so that's fine.

I don't think there is any discussion, or any need for discussion, on the purpose or mission. We all agree, or there are different words… Actually, if people have different words, and I notice John had a slightly different take on that, which was defend, we can play with that later, but I think it relates to end users.

There are some sort of headings that I looked at. One is the actual openness to end users. And from that, we have a couple of headings. One is, we are to a certain, the processes in ICANN, many of them are already open, we need to identify those. The other is a discussion on the extent to which we're asking for openness. And I know on the APRALO list, there is some concerns about just how open we should be, and what tests should be.

There has been a lot of discussion about structure. And I'm very tempted to split this up among people. Process and accountability. We have done some things, and each RALO has done some things, so I would like to start work on what it is that each RALO has done in terms of their own accountability, their own reporting back and so forth.

I know that APRALO, and I know certainly that in other RALOs as well, there has been a lot of outreach activity. And I think we need to document that. Social media, yes, we're starting there, and there has been some discussion. And there is discussion on ICANN staff, not as much because we all say thank you, and then there was some issues about the extent to which they're involved in policy determination.

Funding was interesting. It probably doesn't require the same kind of thought, but to me, what has been popping up a lot in discussion has been the actual EMM model and structure in particular, the role of the ALT, the ALAC and the RALOs. So, can we have a little bit of discussion, first on the EMM, and then I want to allocate some penholders. Okay.

Does anybody want to start the discussion on…? And Vanda, go ahead please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi. Are you listening to me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Of course, thank you.

| VANDA SCARTEZINI: | Hello? Yeah, okay, thank you. Well, yeah, okay, isn't in the Spanish exchange that the translation is normally not so good. The discussion about this [inaudible] is very, very hard. Because what we think that the proposal will [inaudible] in the way they go, the formal structure that we have in place, but I do believe that [individuals?] must have a place inside any RALO. |

In LACRALO, this is not true. And I believe people that could be, especially the younger ones, that does not belong to any organization, and we cannot list them. But, they cannot be disconnected from the structure, because we'll not get the feedback, for instance, from the [inaudible], they need to really go into the structure and participate in a way that is good for the RALO region.

Because just to, you know, I love ccTLDs, okay. And I will join ccTLDs working group just because I like, and that is not a problem. There is nothing everything that we are looking for in our region. Why we're going to waste this valuable person doing something that is not a priority?

So, working in the [inaudible] should be discussed inside the RALO, and the [inaudible] workaround. I also agree that we could not have real local working group, because we can maybe waste, you know, time and not focus on the many issues of ICANN. But those main issues need to be selected inside RALOs, because each region has its priorities, regarding what is going on inside of ICANN.

So, that is for me the main issue of this membership model that the EMM model that they have proposed. So, I will stop here, just to make sure I share with you my concerns. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Vanda, and you made the point here and in the list as well. I've got a couple of more speakers, and then I'm going to start asking questions. Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think Alan's first, Holly. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. One of the people listed as hosts is accepting speaker requests. Please stop that. It lowers the hand and takes us out of the queue. I don't know who it is, but I would appreciate you not do it anymore. I know it's tempting. Thank you.

I would suggest, number one, we not spend this meeting talking about the content and whether we object to something that is being proposed or being discussed somewhere else. We're talking about the process of how to complete this job. That's number one.

Number two, this is a document that is going to be used to collect input on the overall processes. So, I personally am not going to agonize over what the headings are, or for that matter, dole out work. If people are going to be moved to comment, then they will. And if they're not going

to be allocating the section is not likely to generate a lot of substantive comments anyway.

So, let's make it widely available and see what it gathers. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Holly. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And this is one of those times when letting Alan go first is a good thing, because I can only say what he said. I was concerned about allocating sections to RALOs. I think this particular format in the document you've put together, Holly, makes it a very easy and digestible exercise.

I certainly prefer to see this document widely distributed, and we accept what input we can from whomever we can. I think the temptation to carve it up and push it out is understandable from a style of management point of view, but I don't think that particular style of management is going to reap the necessarily desirable rewards, especially from the RALOs who will have, I would say, interests across a number of these issues.

So, I'd be all for the, let's just get it out there, and get feedback into it as soon as possible. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: I hear what you're saying, and I also hear that, in fact, when I… We've got two documents that people can work with, and they're still using email, so basically, I guess I'm going to basically whatever. That said, I do not want to write this myself. So, I think we need a very small team of people who are going to help me, and Cheryl if you, we can have chairs doing the actual drafting, but we have to do the drafting and it has got to be a small group of people.

So, if people want to hold the pen with me… Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If we get to item B, I think you'll see a sample of the kind of thing that I'm suggesting, and I'm happy to be a major contributor. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, all right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, if I could just jump in. I really don't think it's going to come down to, Alan and a small team acting as penholders. That seems to be the way things are normally done. But, you know, these documents are not being effectively pushed. I'm not seeing the links to the first one, let along this one, [inaudible] I recognize, let's get it and the other one out into the regional lists, up to every damned day ALS representative.

You know, that's not being done and it needs to be done. Sure, in our review team, we have representative members from each region. And

yes, they could act as conduits, but we're talking amongst each other instead of talking amongst each other and making sure the wider conversation happens. And so, I'm just clean that from today's meeting on, we very much commit to make sure the wider conversation happens as well. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Hands up, how that can be done. I think on this call, we've got people from every region. Could I ask, since everybody is on, this is the working party, could I ask people to take responsibility for getting this into the region, and I think this is also a matter… I think Cheryl is right. Let's have this mailed out to every LACRALO, to all of the LACRALO teams, and then have it disseminated further.

Now, Olivier, you haven't talked. Go ahead please.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I just wanted to let you know, that in today's, earlier today in the RALO call, RALO secretariats call, we had a good discussion on this topic. And we had a look at that specific page that had the work. One of the things that we have agreed to proceed with, is to have a second Wiki page that looks specifically at the issues that affect RALOs, RALO leadership, At-Large structures, all of that.

So, we're basically going to build a page like this, and then push this actively. Each one of the secretariats to the At-Large structures, and get them to engage on this. So, that we have actually have an input from

them, and we don't end up, we have recordable input from them, which I think is important.

We've even considered that the idea that the ALSes themselves should or could go and comment directly in the public comments as well, so as to really show that it's not a case of, again, the leadership, the ALAC, the small group of dancing chairs people that are, you know, that are basically controlling the whole process, but it really is something from the grassroots.

But it is something that is going to be hard to do, and we're going to need active input from all of the RALO leaders, and so we've got to follow up by email, and the next couple of days, we'll see some movement, hopefully.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, that is terrific news. That is exactly what I'm hoping for, because basically, there has been some really interesting discussion on the list, not on the document, but that's fine, about structures, and that picks up on Vanda's point as well. So, that's terrific news. Can I talk to you offline about that?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely, yeah, sure.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks. Alan, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is a time that I'm glad that you went out of order and went to Olivier first. I was going to point out that we may have missed an opportunity of the RALO leadership call earlier today. I'm glad to find out it was done anyway. I was going to suggest that given that we have two and a half weeks left to finish, essentially, not to start, to finish, we are too late to make the monthly round of RALO meetings.

And some of them have already happened, and didn't mention this at all to any great extent. I think it's going to need really targeted outreach. We have one RALO chair on this call. Thank you Olivier, at least, the only one I noticed. I think we need to, you need to reach out to the RALO chairs.

And what Olivier told us about is going to make that a lot of easier, and point out what the timeframe is, and what we need. Giving us input into the input document two weeks from now is going to be too bloody late. So, we need something really quickly. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm very aware….

ALAN GREENBERG: And by the way, Olivier, us puppet masters sometimes do a good job, but you're right, we have to make sure we get input from other layers as well.

HOLLY RAICHE:	That's exactly what was concerning me. I don't see hands from any other people. [CROSSTALK]
OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	There is a new hand from Olivier, yeah.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Sorry. I should have asked old hand or new hand. Thank you.
OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yes, thanks Holly. No, I put down my left hand, I put up my right hand now. Just to add on this. There is a difficulty, of course, with some of our community which is the, first the language issue, obviously, is one thing. But certainly the length of the report is a problem. So, one of the things that would really help is to focus, as I said, the Wiki page that would focus specifically on the points that affect ALSes, that affect RALOs, that affect RALO leaders, that affect the organization and the ability of individual users.

You know, this whole sort of balance that we have, if we could put that Wiki page up, and also have it translated, and we're talking about just a one pager, that would be something we can then push toward the ALSes. So, they don't have to take five hours to go through this.

They can take a few minutes and they can react. That was another sort of idea forward, that's all.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Vanda, yes, thank you. Working with… Because I have seen from LACRALO, some really good discussion. Alejandro has had a lot to say. In terms of just plain confusion, my suggestion, and see what people think about this, is to draw two diagrams. One is the current structure and one is the structure that they are proposing. And I've got to say, it is hard to work through just exactly what they think they are arguing for.
	But to do that so that we can actually trace what we do and what the changes are. I think that will help, because not everybody can actually pour through that report, and come up with the answers. Tijani, go ahead please.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much Holly. Tijani speaking. Olivier, I'm afraid everything will concern the RALOs and the ALSes, the EMM concerns them accurately, so it is the whole proposal. Yet, perhaps we can remove some parts of the report of the recommendations, but most of them with concern of the whole At-Large community including RALOs and ALSes. Thank you.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you Tijani. There are a few things that are also… This is a bit about funding. There is a bit about roles of staff. There is a bit about the Board positions. There are some other things in there which are there and need responding to, but from where I sit, what people really are concentrating on and what the comments are about, are the roles of the ALSes, the RALOs, and ALAC.

Lars is pointing out the executive summaries have been translated as per standard practice. Lars, are they on the review page?

LARS HOFFMAN: Holly, this is Lars. I believe Ariel was [inaudible] put on the Wiki. They're also on the public comment page, and I will post it into the chat right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent, thank you very much. Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Holly. Cheryl for the record. I'm just going to pick up on the points that Olivier made, and Alan, sorry, Tijani also reinforced the fact that almost everything is going to have some relevance to the RALOs and ALSes. But I think this document that we have on screen, you know, it does pass for things up, you know, in a very digestible way. I do recognize the length of the report is a barrier for anyone…

I mean, even if English is your first language, but certainly if English isn't your first language, it's challenging to get through that many pages. But, in a timely fashion, I think what Holly has put together here, is a useful way of seeking the important bits out, and having them all in a way where we can encourage more easy input.

So, that's why I keep harping on about, you know, getting the links to this stuff out, you know, and just getting people to start responding. And not everything is, as I believe Alan has certainly said before, but a

number have said before, not everything is, oh my God, no, this is an awful idea.

For example, recommendation five, I can buy in absolutely. I can buy it recommendation, sorry, implementation of the individual from any region should be allowed to become an At-Large member, because that is a duplicate input of what we have as, I think, the only thing that hasn't been implemented from our first review.

And that's because of the reluctance of some of the RALOs, and thank you for Vanda self-identifying LACRALO as being particularly one of them, to whatever reason, go extraordinarily slow, glacially slow, so implementing what should have been implemented from the first time around, which was the ability for individual members to join and be active within regional At-Large organizations.

So there is a few of these that I could just tick the box and go, yup, fine. This will help us be a better model. This will help us be a better At-Large community. This will help us be more effective and have greater outreach. I can also partly buy into some. For example, the part they have on term limits. I have absolutely no problem going with term limits.

I have a problem with two, two year terms. But I don't have a problem with term limits. So, you know, me and any number of other people may say, let's talk about what a term limit should be, and how we implement them. What the benefits and what the risks are on the choices we make, is what we should be trying to get people to look at

on a number, if not all of these recommendations and implementation points.

What I would have liked to have seen from a more palatable review, notice I'm trying to be kind, won't you? ICANN staff. [CROSSTALK] ICANN staff are probably feeling that I'm some sort of, you know, really nasty bitch, which yes, I can be, but at this point, I'm trying not to be. What I would have liked to have seen is more problem statements, as they saw it.

And some suggestions on ways that we should be considering we can solve those problem statements. Some issues, of course, such as the openness one, just a working off some 40 or limited assumptions that, and that just need ticking. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't do this, the matter of better participation and openness.

You know, if we could have identified better problem statements, or if we could have independently reviewed, analyzed and prevented better problem statements, that would have been a different situation. Unfortunately, we're now in defend territory, and that means we're going to waste a lot of time trying to, you know, dig ditches and put up barricades and say that, you know, you're wrong and I'm right.

And what we should be doing, where are the problem statements? Where are the issues? And where are the opportunities? So, let's try and also encourage, with this document, for people to agree where they agree, and state that simply, state if you have agreement in principle with the issue identified as needing to be addressed.

And it's okay to say that we think we should address it in a different way than outlined by the reviewer. And not necessarily try and put too many carts before the horses. Okay, that's enough from me for now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, I absolutely agree with you that there are times when I looked at some of the either implementation statements, or the recommendations, and thought, I'm not sure what that ties back to. And I think that ties in with what Alan says, which is, in some cases, you have to look at the methodology, you have to look at how you got to a conclusion point, and maybe that was the wrong conclusion point.

Maybe that's part of the answer. The other part is exactly what you say, which is we agree with the issues. We think there is a better way to do that. Or, we're already doing it. I think that there are lots of things where we can say, yes, we think there is an issue here.

We think basically that this is the way we operate, and there is a better way to address that issue. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A few things. It is unfortunate that we are in a mode right now that actually in the text of the document, they are accusing the old guard from being reactionary and fighting change, to allow them to keep their privileged position. They actually say that. So, we cannot stop from being defensive at some level, because I don't believe we can let statements like that stand.

That being said, we do need to support recommendations that are good. I've done the first five so far. Of them, four of them, I agree with. And I suspect everyone else will also. Some of them are easy to agree, because the recommendations are in fact, the status quo. And they didn't understand enough about what we're doing to recognize that what they're recommending is our business as usual.

And that is one of the problems with this whole report. That they think, or thought, they understood things when clearly they did not. But instead of just identifying problems, they did identify solutions, which do not necessarily fit because of their lack of understanding.

So, that's number one. Number two, Lars in the chat said that, language documents were available eight days ago. Why haven't we shipped out to the people who need language documents? I really don't understand why they've been sitting on a webpage, and not being made available to our people.

We only had a month to start with, and we've wasted a quarter of it because no one knew that they were available. That's really problematic. And lastly, there is been an awful lot of traffic on the mailing list of Dev's plan. As good or as bad as his plan might be, there is no time to flesh it out at this point, and fully understand it, and I don't want to be the one that says, let's stop wasting time on this right now.

But at some level, it is counterproductive, because we're putting time into something which will not help us address the report, as opposed to something that can. Thank you.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE:	Thank you. Olivier, go ahead please.
OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks very much Holly. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have a question that was asked to me by someone who was external to At-Large, but was reading the review, and was wondering about the review process, because they said that the reviewers seemed to be proposing solutions and making major changes in At-Large, whilst they saw that a review would be actually an analysis of the organization, and then that these proposals for changes and so on would have to be made by the community. So, I wasn't quite sure. I thought that the reviewers could make some proposals, but here it really seems that they're sort of making final proposals. Is there some clarification on this?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Well, Larissa has her hand up, and I think we'll listen to Larissa. Go ahead, please, Larissa.
LARISSA GURNICK:	Thank you Holly. This is Larissa Gurnick for the record. Olivier, thanks for the question. So, in the request for proposal, as well as in all of the other documentation that address the engagement of ITEMS, we've asked them to do the assessment, do the evaluation, and propose suggestions or recommendations. So, that is proposing suggestions or recommendations is definitely part of what they've been asked to do.

And because at this point, they've delivered their draft report that's out for public comments, so these are not final recommendations in any form. They're draft recommendations. There will be a webinar coming up in a couple of weeks. There will be the session in Copenhagen.

Then there will be an analysis and report out of all of the public comments. ITEMS will have to take all of this information onboard and decide how they will react to the feedback, and only then will they issue their final recommendations. Once they issue their final recommendations, it will be the job of the working party, together with ALAC, I suppose it will be up to you all to decide how that's going to proceed.

But it will be your job to provide input to the Board, to the organizational effectiveness committee, as to how you feel about, at that point, final recommendations, along with rationale about whether they're useful and implementable or not, and also to weigh in on what you think is high priority and what is not such a big priority.

So that input will then go to the organizational effectiveness committee, and would be considered by them, along with other analysis, and then all of that goes to the Board. So, I just wanted to make sure that that addresses your question. I'm happy to do any follow-up if you have further questions on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Larissa. Olivier, go ahead please.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. It's Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And thank you Larissa for, you know, for fleshing this one out, because I think that pretty much answers the question, and I will certainly relay this over to the person and persons, sorry, that asked for this.

ITEMS did say in an earlier call that, and in fact, I think it's even in the report, I can't remember exactly, but they said that the previous review somehow had been manipulated by the At-Large community, and they were going to make sure that on this occasion, it was not going to be manipulated.

Is this within their mandate or not?

HOLLY RAICHE: Can I answer that before Larissa does please? Olivier, you're right. That's in what they say. I don't know what they mean by manipulated, and I'm not particularly worried. It is a concern I heard from them directly, which is they did not want to have what they say not sort of make it as a recommendation. I don't think they expect for a moment that necessarily it's going to be accepted [inaudible].

But I think they wanted to at least to have their recommendations go to the Board. That was my understanding.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, I have a take on that, if you can put me in the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, fine, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: In the first report, they completely misunderstood the process that was followed following the Westlake report. They thought that the group that redrafted a new report, which was a Board subcommittee, involving no one from the current At-Large, was quote, the At-Large working party, and they believed that it was redrafted to remove things that At-Large didn't like by At-Large.

They have largely removed that diatribe from the end of the report, although they left a couple of pieces still there. But most of it they removed, because it was pointed out to them that they were wrong, and they misunderstood the process. Not the only part of the process they had misunderstood. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I think from here on end, we really have to wrap-up this call in 15 minutes. I do want a way forward. I will be talking to Olivier, but I'm also hearing what Alan has said, and that maybe… Olivier, do you think it makes sense for me to contact directly each RALO, and work through how we can get some bullet points from everyone?

There is also a lot of bullet points coming out of both the comments on Google Docs and what's gone on in the list, but just to flesh out further. And Olivier, just a further question, how did the RALO leaders say they were going to be eliciting comments within their RALO?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Holly. It's Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. So, I think the preferred way forward was to let each RALO have their own process to go and elicit comments from their At-Large structures. It appears that LACRALO has already started such a process, and if you could certainly, you know, send an email and ask each RALO to be able to start an internal process there, that would be really, really helpful.

NARALO apparently is saying that the process started on the At-Large list as well. [CROSSTALK] Yeah, their members have been taking part on the At-Large list. Sadly, on the EURALO list and in APRALO, and AFRALO, we didn't get any feedback on whether a process was already in place, but certainly an email from you to the RALO leaders would be very welcome, certainly in my view.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you very much, Olivier. Now Alan, your hand is up please. Is that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: It is a new hand. There was one more sentence that I didn't get in and I'll say it now. As someone who has spent a lot of time in my life as a consultant, you get, you take on an assignment, you get paid, you submit a report, and what they do with it is their business afterwards, period. No matter how much believe your answers are right.

The world doesn't always unfold as you want, as you want it to. I would just like a minute or two to talk about the document I included in item B of the agenda. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Can we pull it up please?

Okay, well maybe we can't, but it's linked in the agenda, in any case. I decided that the only way to start getting a handle on what was going on was to start writing. Now, this may not be the final text, obviously, if other people have other ideas and input, it will have to be merged in or replaced on what I wrote.

But I really had a need to start putting things in writing. Now, the first recommendations are a little bit different than some of the others, but interestingly, of the first five, with the exception of three on the empowered membership model, I agreed on the other four. It was easy, in some cases, it's the status quo.

It has what we've been doing for four years now. But if you take a glance at it, it's not a lot of writing. It's two pages or so long, you'll start to get a feel for what I think we need to do. Now, there is all sorts of things that we have to talk about in our comment that is not recommendations, because we don't know which of the thousands of ideas they have, will make their way into a recommendation in the final report.

So, we need to make sure we cover all of the ideas, not only the recommendations, but that's going to be done in a structure different from it. I also believe there is a whole bunch of methodology things

that we need to point out. And, you know, I've started, some of them, I'm sure, other people have. You may want to add a section to your document on methodology issues.

But you know, I think we need to start putting pen to paper, and as I said, I'm happy to be one of the people to do it, and I'm happy to work with others, if that is the approved way. But, there is not many days between now and the time we have to get on planes. Thank you.

Okay, if you look at the document. The format is pretty simple. I have an introductory section, which I haven't even attempted to write, and I'm not sure if it should be an introduction or at the end. But you know, and if you look at the recommendations, and it's quite interesting that several of the first recommendations are one that we can support.

So, we don't start out being all negative. I must admit, I got a little snarky in one or two of the responses, but aside from that, they're pretty easy. Three, of course, is the elephant in the room. And I just started on that one, but I think captured the really main issues, but there is going to be a lot of other parts that will fall out because of the implementation and things like that.

So, take a look at that, please get back to me publicly, privately, whatever, as to what you think about it. It didn't take me long to write it. It will take even less to read. So, input is welcome. Thank you. Was that short enough?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Alan. That was short enough. My one comment is, and this is something that Cheryl and I had a bit of a chat about, I've tried deliberately to get away from simply answering their recommendations for two reasons. Number one, it looks as if we're buying their view of things, not our view of things. Number two, some of their recommendations, or there are a few times when their implementation recommendations, there are about four or five of them, they're all on one topic, and we can address, instead of addressing them individually, we can address them as a thought and come back to them.

But my feeling was, we should be writing our own story, and responding to their story as it is appropriate, but because what it is in the review, some of what is in the review is not reflective in either the implementation statements or the recommendations, so we need to structure it differently.

At least, that's my view. And I think my final question to everybody is, do we actually want to go recommendation by recommendation by recommendation, and then implementation by implementation by implementation? Or do we want to write our own report, and maybe I'll let people come back to me on that. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: I do have an answer on that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I think we have to respond to the recommendations and implementations. That will not be sufficient because there is other stuff there we want to comment on. But we are preparing the way for, in worst case, they will change nothing in this go around. Maybe we will be convincing and they will change a lot, but worse case, they will change nothing, and we have to be prepared in our presentation to the Board organizational effectiveness committee, I think that's the name right now…

Remember, they're going to look at, should we implement the recommendations or not? That is exactly the question they're going to look at. So, we have to have laid the groundwork for that response to them, through this one. To show that we did attempt to make our case, and it was ignored.

Now, we may be wrong. It may be addressed and the new report comes out as completely different. But worse case, we must be able to point out that we have commented on the recommendations and we've laid the groundwork. Now, that, you're correct, that is not sufficient. There are other parts in the report that may make their way into a recommendation, that we cannot let go unnoticed, just because they didn't hit the recommendation this time.

So, you are quite correct. There are other parts that we have to address. And I'm not quite sure the format we do that in, but we have no choice to answer the address the recommendations and implementations. Yes, maybe some of them will be grouped together, several of the implementations or repetitions of the previous one.

So, it may well be appropriate to group them together. But I don't think we have a choice but to do that, along with anything else we do.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Alan. I don't think anything I said suggest that we don't reply to the recommendations. I think it was how we do it, and what we have to add. Leon, go ahead please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Holly. The lawyer in me sees this as a lawsuit. And as a lawsuit, we should be going recommendation by recommendation, and saying whether we agree or we don't agree. And if we do agree, why we agree, and why of course, say any tweaks that we have to the presentation. And if we don't agree, we must say why we don't agree, and we must not stop there, but we must also provide an alternative way for this to go forward.

So, in my experience in legalistic processes, the best criticism for any law proposal, or any study, is to provide with an alternative for a way forward, because criticism just for the sake of criticism, is not very well received in any area.

So, I think that if we can go again, recommendation by recommendation, given the facts, given the support or the disagreement, and then proposed alternatives to the disagreement, and of course, the way to implement the alternatives, I think that would be the best way to answer, because being [inaudible], I don't see that anything in there would be able to change because of our comments.

It didn't change before, and it will not change after that. So, what we need to do is to have a document that will help us… I don't want to say defend, because I don't think we are in a battle here, but at least a document that will enable us to show our position, and provide alternatives to build a better At-Large community. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Leon. Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Holly. Cheryl for the record. I'm coming in with full support to what Alan and Leon had said. And also Vanda in chat. I think we do have to go recommendation by recommendation and implementation. We need to agreement, disagreement, conditional agreement, suggestions or alternates, as we've particularly outlined by what Leon said.

And Leon, I think you need to be volun-told, that you need to be part of the drafting group with Alan, Holly [CROSSTALK]. So that's good, I'm glad you agree to that, Leon, because otherwise I would have to take you out in the back and have a chat.

[LAUGHTER]

Because we do need that approach. Just let me remind you all, I've got the t-shirts to slightly lesser extent, because I was doing it a little bit longer, so much that it has long sleeves and Heidi's t-shirt has short sleeves, but you know, some of us have been through this before. All be it, under a slightly different system.

Let me assure you, it was our annexes and our tables in our hard wrought and detailed text and narrative that people tended to read and react to and by people, I do mean the ICANN Board as well.

So, I think the recommendation and implementations in some form of relatively tabular form, is a good way of getting the right information being read by the greatest number of people. Should we have a narrative on the other issues? Absolutely. Maybe we should take a chapter approach to this. I just want to also remind you that if you call to people on their reading and understanding of the considerably hard work done and carefully debated outcomes from work stream one, or on the accountability activities that took up so much of our lives recently, you would find most people just read the annexes and the schedules, and they quote the annexes and the schedules.

Very few of them quote, you know, paragraph 89.3 at you. That's because they probably never read the bloody thing. So, let's make sure whatever we put out, acts with an appropriate narrative, where a [inaudible] is required, that should be included. Where compliment is to be noted, that should be included, blah, blah, blah.

So yes to the narrative, but absolutely has to go recommendation implementation by recommendation implementation, and it doesn't certainly only to be negative and defensive. I'm not suggesting that. But we have conditional support. While it's conditional support, and what alternatives there are, should also be outlined. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you Cheryl. Leon, is that an old hand?

LEON SANCHEZ: It is an old hand, sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just one minute, and that is, and the reason I actually suggested the headings that I did, the recommendation, if you go recommendation by recommendation by recommendation, you're actually skipping around. The recommendations actually, if you group them around headings, you have something that isn't necessarily an order.

So, I think what I would be suggesting is for those recommendations, and you've got to include implementations as well, that are around a topic that we group the responses so it's clear that we have responses to each of them. But under relevant headings, so that our own narrative can be sitting on top, and then we can address them.

It's simply my worry that's going by implementation by implementation, and then recommendation by recommendation. We are repeating ourselves, and our story actually gets lost. That was my feeling.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, if I may? I'm certainly happy to have them plastered, and I'm just trying to type them, it is taking me too long. Cheryl for the record. I don't have a problem with it jumping all over the place. I'm not suggesting they need to be in the report, presented numerical order. But I do mean that they all need to be, you know, put together.

And I don't have a problem mixing recommendation and implementation under the one heading, that you know, if someone is running a checklist, they all need to be checked off.

HOLLY RAICHE: Absolutely, agreed with you. Look, we're already two minutes over. Olivier, do you have about two minutes?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I certainly do, yes.

HOLLY RAICHE: All right, I'll ring you on Skype.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Actually, can you ring me on Skype?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I'll have to get to a slightly better connection than where I am at the moment, because… [CROSSTALK]

HOLLY RAICHE: Let's just stay on this call when everybody hangs on. Heidi, you've got your hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Holly. Thank you. I'm just wondering if you're seeing in the chat, there was a suggestion that we basically used Alan's document. Of course, you know, we can cluster them around into topics as you see fit, as well as the implementation aspects, put them on the Wiki, and just add the five columns, you know, add Alan's comments under the ALAC column, and then add five more columns to the right, to add the RALO's views.

And then at the end, we can just have them altogether. So, we'll have views of the ALAC in the five regions, hopefully with some ALS input as well, and then we can bring them all together. Is that something that we can go ahead with?

HOLLY RAICHE: After I saw all the stuff that's going on in the list anyway, even though there are two other places that are commenting, I have stopped worrying about where people comment, frankly. I much rather see stuff wherever, and if people like Alan's document may want to comment against that, that's just fine. Okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, this is Heidi. I see some people are saying directly into Alan's document. I think, you know, I'd rather just see it on the Wiki. If we can just put this up on a Wiki… Because I'm afraid… You know, my

concern is just going to… If we don't have one face, it's going to be all over the place, and people will not see where others are commenting, etc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi, I am very supportive… Heidi, Cheryl here. I am very supportive of, if you can get that done as an AI in short order, that would be great, because then we can promulgate that page to our RALO lists, our announce list, our ALS representatives, etc. So that, in my view, would be extremely handy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I get in since we're talking about Alan's document?

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, we're five minutes over, and as John pointed out, I would like Google Doc, the Wiki space is not best. We've now got a few documents. Frankly, I don't care how many documents, because people are going to do what they're going to do, and they're going to do it the way they're comfortable. Okay, Alan, one minute. Actually 30 seconds because we're over time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then let me speak instead of telling me how to speak. My document, the intent is that… Right now, I just wrote that because I had to write something. The intent is that document or some evolution of it, will be

the consolidated view that we're collecting in the Wiki. Let's not confuse the issue and have people commenting on that.

I will be going into the table on the Google Docs and making my comments there as well. So, let's keep the documents separate for the moment, and let's not give people two different places to comment where we have to try to…

I don't want to insult people when they make a suggestion on the final document. The drafters are going to have to take the input and consolidate it into something that is cohesive and understandable. So, I retract my comment saying you can post my document anywhere. Maybe it's best not to right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. With that, I think we can end this call. Are people…? Now, Leon, is that a new hand?

LEON SANCHEZ: Definitely not a new hand. Actually, I wasn't aware that my hand was up. Sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you. Okay. Look…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, I understood what Heidi was suggesting, it was, she simply has Alan's comments on one to five so far, inputted into the Wiki page, and

the Wiki page also to encourage individual RALO and ALS input. I don't see that as counter to what Alan was saying. But anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do that, but for the record, I am not the ALAC, I am just Alan. So, I can't fill in the ALAC column.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think what Alan is saying you don't… Put it on the Wiki page by all means, don't put it on something that people can comment on. We still have the Google Docs. And the Google Docs document actually has recommendations in there, at the moment. So, in fact, we're not missing anything. This is simply a different organizational thing that Alan has done, and by all means, it should go up on the Wiki as well.

And [inaudible] has to go, and everybody else has to go. So, thank you everybody. I'm sorry we went over five minutes, and Olivier, please don't hang up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, and don't post my thing to the Wiki until the next version. There will be another one soon. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]