MARIO ALEMAN:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party call on Wednesday the 22nd of February, 2017, at 21:00.
	On the call we have today, Alan Greenberg, Andrei Kolesnikov, Aida Noblia, Charla Shambley, Eduardo Diaz, Holly Raiche, Lars Hoffmann, Maureen Hilyard, Negar Farzinnia, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Mario, you also have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. She's not listed on the [inaudible] is on the call.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I am now, Holly. I'm on AC now.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay.
MARIO ALEMAN:	Is she on the call?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I've been on the call for 10 minutes actually, Mario. They dial out to me 10 to 15 minutes before a call and I usually only join the AC at the top of

the hour. I actually have a working [inaudible] that I occasionally try and deal with.

MARIO ALEMAN: Perfect. Thank you so much for your confirmation.

We have list apologies from León Sanchez and Kaili Kan.

On staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, Lars Hoffmann, Gisella Gruber, and myself, the call manager.

Our Spanish interpreters are David and Veronica.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes but also for our translators.

With this, I will turn it back over to you, Holly. Please begin.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Mario. And thank you, everyone. First of all, welcome to the call but on the agenda item the first thing I'm going to do is actually remind people of a few deadlines because we're coming very close to some deadlines. A reminder that the community-wide webinar for ICANN to present their report is on the 27th of February at 13:00 UTC. Also a reminder, we have two more of these calls, same time. So we are rapidly running out of time.

The next thing I'd like to do, remind people what we can talk about. This particular issue is we have got a couple of ways for people to provide comments. One of them is our Google Doc and one of them is on the

wiki. There was a template that is providing an alternative structure for people to make comments. There was some discussion whether we need that or not. My personal view is that anything that actually elicits response from people I'm very happy with. And I'm very happy to go through all of the comments and make sense of them. But I'm going to open the floor up and see if people are happy just using a template that is structured such that it simply elicits responses to the recommendations but does allow people to comment so they can go further.

Let's start with Alan and Cheryl. I'm open to having any template up as long as it's accessible to people, as long as people can use it.

Cheryl and Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are not going to be using the formal ICANN template. Period. I don't want to have to say that again. We've said it 39 times. Our answer will be a superset of that. If ALSes and RALOs or individuals choose to use the ICANN template for simplicity, if all they're answering is comments on the recommendations and one more general comment, it is fine for them to use that template. I don't think we much care. The template is pointed to in the middle of the formal ICANN public comment text. It is not normally our practice to edit things out of that, so I suggest we just leave it be and people can choose whatever vehicle they want.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's pretty much my view. Cheryl, are you comfortable with that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm more than comfortable with that, Holly. I just also want to make the point that part of our job as co-Chairs is to ensure that we also accumulate material that is germane to what we're doing out of e-mail lists. Now we may need some staff assistance on that, but that's an important part of it as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right. Good. Thank you. I would also note that in the template in the wiki – the other template. The one that we had put there originally – there are five columns – one for each RALO. And the idea has been that each RALO contribute – or go back to its ALSes and have some kind of contribution – from the ALSes, get feedback, and have a RALO contribution so that, as many of you are aware, part of the criticisms or comments within the review was that there are a very few old guard who do the hard work and write the reports. This has to be – and be seen to be – a response from everyone.

So can I call on Tijani and Eduardo at least, and Maureen as well and possibly Olivier, so that we can cover what each RALO will be doing to contribute comments back into the final draft? Maybe start with you, Tijani?

Alan, go ahead. Your hand is up first and then we'll have Tijani. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The idea of having columns for RALO was well-intentioned, but I believe a mistake. There are multiple ways that a RALO may contribute. They could contribute through the Google Doc, they could contribute through commenting on the final document that I've started drafting, or they could put something in the wiki.

Right now we have five columns in the wiki that are empty. It is a blatant –

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, that's exactly my point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm just making it clear. It's a blatant statement that people are not contributing and it's only the old guard so I think it was a mistake to have those columns there. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, I'm really less perturbed about empty columns than I am about contributions from individuals and areas. I don't want to talk about columns. I want to talk about people from areas.

Tijani, could you go ahead, please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much, Holly. I think that AFRALO should contribute by any way they want. I will take if you want the… I will urge them. I will try to urge them, to urge everyone on my RALO to contribute to this

effort, and I will give them all the ways they can contribute with and at the end, I will be putting something in the column of AFRALO to summarize or at least to get the ideas and put them there at the end if they don't choose to use the column. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tijani. I think that's my point. I'm really less fussed about who does what as long as there's contributions and it can be saying that it is from a variety of places.

Cheryl, I believe you're next. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. And thank you, Tijani, for what you just said on behalf of AFRALO. That is exactly how I envisage the columns. The columns are an aspect of data capture from wherever contributions come in. But if at the end of Copenhagen we have empty columns, then yes, I will be concerned, but certainly not now. Noting of course, that the RALOs are really only in this last week to 10 days mobilizing themselves in this ridiculously short period of time to get their consolidated or varietal views collected and put together in some coherent form. So I think Tijani's way forward is a good model for the others and I'm not sure when the Regional Leaders had their meeting or are about to have their meeting. But again, that's the sort of thing that they will be discussing and the Regional Leadership will no doubt be reminders I hope by staff that their columns exist as a accumulation point of the material that they may put together.

I understand Alan's concern. I'd have that concern if we were at the end of the Copenhagen meeting though not right now. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. And just to note, in the chat there is a special purpose call tomorrow for the RALO Leaders and I imagine we can just flesh out a little bit more in that call not so much the content of what people are saying but how best to make sure that we hear from all of the RALOs to make sure that our response is global. Thank you very much.

Olivier…Tijani, is that an old hand? I'll go ahead. Olivier, go ahead please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Just to let you know what's going on on the RALO front, indeed there is a parallel piece of work that is going on with the RALOs contributing to a Google Doc at the moment. The plan was to have the RALO Chairs to look at it in a 48-hour period. Only three out of the five Chairs have so far looked at it or done any work on it. So hopefully we should have something that will be ready by tomorrow with a bit more information for us to be able to look at as the wider Regional Leadership. And the idea is to, from that discussion that we will have tomorrow, make a decision on how we will present all of this to our respective At-Large Structures and get them to contribute. The timing is extremely short. It's well understood. But unfortunately we have to play with what we have. That's all. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I am looking forward to tomorrow's call for exactly that reason. And both Alan and Gisella have corrected me – and as I should have done – there is only one more meeting before Copenhagen. So the next meeting is really going to be to draw together a lot of the comments that are in various places to bring together to some kind of structure that we can all work with.

Maureen, you're next please. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Holly. Yes, I would just like to say that I agree with everyone that we need to encourage all the members of the RALOs to contribute. We've got four Leadership Team members who are going to be at the APRICOT meeting [this next] week and we'll be out in force to talk to people from the region to [inaudible] to make sure that any members of our ALSes do have an opportunity or have made an opportunity to please contribute we'll let them know they might be able to do that in other ways other than talking to us.

I think we need to impress on them how important it is that we want to hear from them and I know that that's the message that's been given out the whole time and I really think that that's important [and] whatever way you can do that, as Olivier has mentioned, the RALO Chairs [being] a contribution. That's only RALO Leadership. We need to get a view from them in their role because they have an important part role in any model in the ALAC and that sort of thing so we do need to get their contribution but we also need to hear from our other

members to actually [hear] about what they think of that model. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:
Thank you, Maureen. It would be really helpful if you just schedule either a cup of coffee for all of you or possibly a glass of beer to get together with the Leadership and talk to as many members at that meeting and get some feedback. And if you can provide that either into the Google Docs or the wiki or a column, I seriously don't care, that would be really, really, helpful because it will represent the view from a range of people in APRALO which will be very useful. So thank you.

Vanda, go ahead please.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:
Yeah. How about you all? Sorry I joined a little late. Just to let you know that from LACRALO, LACRALO has create a working group to get all the contributions that we have gone [around].

HOLLY RAICHE:
We've lost her. Can we try to get her back please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:
[Inaudible] and even considering that it's a translation just arrive a little late but we have discuss… Hello?

HOLLY RAICHE:	We can hear you but you keep breaking up.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Hello?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Vanda, we can hear you but you keep breaking up so talk carefully.
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Hello?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Yes, we can hear you.
	Mario, could you find out where she's gone? Thank you. In the meantime –
MARIO ALEMAN:	[I will] actually. Vanda's breaking out actually and we can even try to call her back [inaudible].
VANDA SCARTEZINI:	Okay. Just [LACRALO].
HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: To get all contributions, even if the [inaudible] came late. I have put some in the [text], okay?

HOLLY RAICHE: Good. Thank you.

Alberto, go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: What Vanda was saying [is] that LACRALO created a working group [for it]. There are actually many people in this. Unfortunately, it was created too late. I've been saying this for 15 days already. And we will start working effectively on this tomorrow. This is because we have very limited time and that's why I have suggested to the person leading the working group that we need to give each person a different chapter to end as fast as possible. I can't really commit to a date but I will commit to do this as fast as possible. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alberto. Before we go into the comments themselves, when I looked at the report and thought about its structure – and this may help. This is the template that's actually on the wiki – it is taking the report including the recommendations and the implementation and dividing them up into topics. So the first topic – and I think it's pretty easy to comment on – was simply the purpose or mission of ALAC. And there are some statements that are made in the review which I think we

pretty much agree with. We have had a bit of discussion on the list as to, "We represent the interests of end users, not end users," and another statement that was made in the review – our function as a sort of two-way conduit both providing information up into ICANN and taking ICANN information up and disseminating it. That was really the framework for the rest of the report.

Another section – and there are lots of recommendations that fit under this heading – was, "The openness of ALAC to end users." This encompasses the concept of their empowered membership but there also in that topic I have looked at – and there's a comment on, "Is membership open in terms of can anyone walk in and participate in processes?" And there's answers there [and if you mean] what processes and what's open. "Can they participate in membership?" which is a very different question perhaps with a different answer. Also in that heading is some of the comments that have a lot of the comments that have been made by ALAC and the At-Large community, which is the many barriers there are to participation not the least of which is the actual broadband access, the complexity of the issues, the ICANN-ese that we all speak, geography, language, and the other barriers that are there which we can comment on and have. And then just a need to clarify for the response the degree of openness in terms of membership and then participating in the processes as well as our own voting procedures.

Another part of that is transparency and accountability, and we have plenty to say on that indeed. We've been working on that. I've actually grouped that sort of topic as just to the "Openness of ALAC" both to everyone and to end users. What's basically got a lot of the comment

and thought – and probably will have most of our input – is the actual structure and processes. That's because the review itself suggests a different structure and we need to agree or disagree with that structure and why, and to say very clearly, "This is the structure that we have. This is why it works or not. And this is how we believe it can be reformed or not."

So there's actually a lot of work and a lot of thought that's gone into that particular heading, and I suspect that's going to take a lot of time and work for everybody. So any work you can do on those particular parts of the report we'll be really grateful because we really do need to respond to the structure that has been proposed and the extent to which we do or do not think that that's a useful way to proceed.

Another heading, which is perhaps less contentious, is the support that's provided for end user participation. There are lots of recommendations on that – things like training, staff support, funding – and clearly some of that we would support and need to say so.

Partly in that, there's a whole section on outreach and the extent to which ALAC goes out into the broader Internet community. And there was some recommendations in terms of the participation of the At-Large community. And I have to say, reading some of that it's clear to me that ITEMS did not understand the extent to which many of us are already involved in a range of other activities. So one of the very useful things for our response would be if in the RALO Leaders you could chronicle or document the amount of outreach that you have – what Memo of Understandings do you have? What participation do you have

in your own niche, in other governance forums – would be really, really, useful.

People, did I leave anything out and does that actually help people to group their thoughts together so that we can come up with a structured response that isn't just a, "We agree," or, "We disagree" with the recommendations. Actually I might start – Vanda, does that help with that structure to better get your head around the report because it's a big report and it's a big ask for people to read it? Maybe Vanda and Alberto will start – Alberto, is that an old hand?

Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Sorry, I was unmuting my mic. This is just for the sake of translation.

We can collaborate from LACRALO. We can do it in LACRALO since three or four years we have been creating and having many activities promoted and created by the ALSes. Many of these activities were supported by the CROPP Program. Some other activities were organized with the effort of ALSes, and we had end user events and then we have the necessary feedback. But we were also able to interact with the other multistakeholders.

Not long ago we had an event with the participation of the government and with the participation of ISPs as well, end users, universities in Colombia. We are now having an agreement that is a project if I'm not mistaken with a university, there is a university offering us to create [to] issue the certificate for the webinars that the GSE Department is

offering for Latin America. So there are many activities. I don't want to go into details but we have gone a long way. There are many activities. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alberto. And it would be very useful if you could get together a long list of what you do, because reading the report I'm under the impression that the ITEMS Team were not aware of a range of activities that people do. So if you can actually list those things, I suspect in our report we will have at least one Appendix saying, "Look, each RALO does a very wide range of things outside of just ICANN." And if we have a list, that will actually be a really, really, useful document. So thank you for listing those and can I encourage you to provide that feedback to us so that can be included in our report?

Aida, yes please?

AIDA NOBLIA: Thank you very much, Holly. I hope you can hear me well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

AIDA NOBLIA: I just wanted to confirm what Alberto is saying, because not only [Uruguay] but also in LACRALO as a whole there are many events. There is a conference on computing and digital law. Rodrigo De La Parra was

there. And there was an agreement been signed with this association and the academia is also present. So we have many activities. We participated in the IGF and we had the participation of Vint Cerf as well and Steve Crocker.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent.

AIDA NOBLIA: This is a different type of event with different issues, but before that, this was held last year. I think it was last year and I mentioned it in a report. But before that event, we had events in 2013. In 2014 we also had events. I believe Alberto has a better record of all of these events and activities. But I just wanted to add that to Alberto's comments because we have plenty of activities and, of course, it is important to mention that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Aida. That would be really, really, useful for us to have that kind of list just so we can point to the activities of At-Large community in to the At-Larger community.

Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. What I'm hearing is something that I have more than suspected – I've mourned over literally for quite some time – and it is

something that the ITEMS report does vaguely address, and that is that where our outreach is necessarily and should be happening, which is within the regions and via the At-Large Structures, we are doing or have done to date an appalling job of promoting, recording, and archiving that in any form of digestible form.

The ALAC itself is equally guilty of doing an enormous amount and having a darned awful way of hiding it I think is what we do as opposed to presenting it as our forward-facing promotion of what we do and how we do it. So step one has happened in as much as the new – hardly brand new now but newish in the scheme of things – ALAC page is a big step forward. But the regional spaces haven't been as effectively utilized. We certainly are not. These are the things we're agreeing with in the report. We are not historically very good at having used our social network and other tools other than what really is almost foundational stuff. [Web] should be seen as where you drill down to when you happen to eventually want more information or a particular article. Just the Instagram photos of these activities properly tagged linking to Twitter feeds which are appropriately hashtagged, etc. etc., Facebook feeds, etc.

All of that is stuff that I think we recognize we need to do a better job of, and that's how we will solve the problem of not having the enormous amount of work properly recognized when someone wants to look at it, whether or not they are another part of ICANN, a external government or organizational entity to ICANN, or of course a external reviewer.

Whilst I'm more than happy to criticize the external reviewer for not having turned over as many rocks as is necessary, or more to the point just listening to a few noisy wheels and thought that was a mantra of deep, meaningful, analysis, I do think they have done a very good job of showing us that we do not promote ourselves and what we do effectively.

The list is great. But I'd be as keen to see a commitment from the Regional Leadership to say, "And the regions and ALSes are going to work together to find ways of better promoting and recording all the amazing things we're doing." Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. I think what it does is it changes our recommendation from number one, we need to get out there and sell ourselves more, to, "Well, we already do a lot of that but we don't tell anybody and we don't document it." So the recommendations would be, not that we get out and do it but that we actually leave a record so that people know what we do because so much of what we do is not well recorded, is not appreciated, and therefore when we come to a Review Team there's nothing for them to look at to say, "Well you guys do this."

So I think your point is well taken, and it means that in response to a recommendation of theirs which is to get out and do something, we replace it with our recommendation which is, "We should actually tell each other what we do," because I'm hearing a lot.

Actually, Olivier, could you go ahead please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I thought that Alan was before me.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Cheryl said a lot of what I was going to say, interestingly with a completely different slant. She's quite right that we are really poor at documenting this. In my mind that doesn't excuse the reviewers from not at least talking to us and asking us why aren't we doing something when they think it's important. And I think that part of the review phase was completely messed up, and that is running things past us to make sure they weren't [missed].

By my tally of the 16 recommendations, 12 to 13 of them we are agreeing with largely because to some extent or another we're already doing it. So yes, I agree that to the extent we can identify things in an Appendix, that's fine. But the important thing is to make it really clear that we are doing it and certainly, as Cheryl said, we need to do a better job of documenting it going forward. But do recognize that much of what they're identifying that we should do, we're already doing to one extent or another. Sometimes limited by funding. Sometimes limited by other things. Thank you.

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

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. In addition to what Cheryl and Alan have said, when I was being interviewed I did tell them about many of the things that we as RALOs were doing. It appears that the reviewers basically took the lowest common denominator, in other words, looking at, "Well, some RALOs are not doing it so let's put it as a recommendation," and I gather that the way that it was drafted then made it sound as though we weren't doing it at all. It might be just the way the language is being used or the way they presented things rather than saying, "Oh, no. You're not doing it at all."

That's because they've actually taken the verbatim points that were made by people who have absolutely no clue whatsoever about what's going on. I do wonder about the quality of the review at the end of the day. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. I will say one thing, the EuroDIG event was praised very highly so they obviously attended and thought very highly of that. So they did take some note of some things. I think what we have to do is just ask them to fill in the blanks because a lot of people have done a lot of other things.

Maureen, go ahead please.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Holly. Someone raised about the fact that we're not telling others what it is that we do. And I think that when Cheryl and I were

working very, very, hard on the [Metrics] Group one of the things that we did ask for was some sort of report by members of the ALAC to actually explain the sorts of things that they were doing within their region and on the ALAC and on working groups whatever. Aida and Alberto mentioned lots of events that have been happening in their region. APRALO, did they read through the Strategic Plans that [we had to write?] Did they read through the overviews that people write about how they've achieved or what they've achieved in these Strategic Plans? It's all those sorts of things.

We actually sort of opted for alternative ways of actually telling people but as you say, Holly, we're probably not doing it enough. Maybe we need to get those documents out onto the website because it is being written. We're having to do overviews and [that's for] everything that we do within ICANN [inaudible] paying for it. The information's there. It just needs to be dug up. They obviously didn't do much digging.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Maureen. Alan, is that an old hand or a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's a new hand.

GISELLA GRUBER: Holly? Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. I'm terribly sorry to interrupt but Maureen's audio is so saturated that we were not able to interpret on the Spanish channel. Sorry, I was trying to unmute my microphone.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I go ahead?

HOLLY RAICHE: Gisella, is that something that can be fixed? Do you think Maureen should be repeating what she said?

MAUREEN HILYARD: [Inaudible]. What do you mean, Gisella? I'm just using my laptop microphone.

ALAN GREENBERG: She sounds fine to me.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's the interpreters that are having a problem. Rather than have her repeat it, I think we can go to the transcripts and find what she said. At this stage we've got two people wanting to talk, so Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have an easy time bashing the reviewers for doing a bad job of trying to gather and remember all the information and prioritize it. On the other hand, we do a really rotten job, as I pointed out to the RALO Chairs, the monthly reports they're supposed to be filing in some cases, with one exception, are woefully out of date. One of the RALOs which we just heard from doing all sorts of things, the last monthly report I believe is from July, 2015.

So if they went to the meetings, to the reports that are pointed to on our common websites, they would find nothing. So we are liable and we do have to get our act together, too. Thank you. That has nothing to do with this report.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan. And I think that's a point that we can actually make within our own recommendations to ourselves.

Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. Just to briefly recap what Maureen was saying – hopefully the interpretation will pick this up clearly – is that much of

what is done in the regions is of course actually captured in things like their strategic planning, etc. But obviously those documents weren't either picked up or read or easy to find. And Alan is absolutely correct, which I think just goes along with my earlier point. ALAC and the regions have not done a good enough job of promoting, marketing, and capturing, what we do and doing it in such a way that we have easy to find, easy to read, and then detailed stuff underneath if we want it. I can't imagine rank and file wanting to read some of the dry reports that might be created out of these activities, but they'd be more than happy to look at a few happy snaps and then drill down if they want to know more about it.

That said, one of the issues here I think we need to make sure we attend to is not seeing this public comment opportunity as only an opportunity for correction of errors and criticism of methodology. I think we do need to make sure we put as positive a spin as possible so we should recognize and relish the fact that this obvious inability for the average reviewer let alone the average person to find out easily and understand the work we do, has clearly failed. So we need to do a better job of getting that right in the future.

Whilst I'd be the last one to suggest that we shouldn't correct and modify where error occurs, we also shouldn't spend all our energy on fighting this little conflagration, which is all it is in the scheme of our Review process. We really need to look at also how we can make this better in the future.

So I absolutely agree with what Maureen has said. Absolutely agree with the fact that Alan has pointed out – and of course that's something

that he and Olivier and I have been grumbling about for more than a decade – and that's the very poor way that we market ourselves. But I've got to remind you all – and more to the point, remind [through all] of the process – we are working with volunteers. And when they've done the good work, we cannot actually expect them to then work even harder in many cases, more than they would in their full-time employment, and then filling out administrivia, doing too many reports, etc. etc. etc. We need to find a model for our future activities which does all this good stuff, reports it and records it effectively, but does not mean that only independently wealthy retirees have the time, the energy, and the inclination, to work full time on doing it as volunteers.

I think we cannot engage youth who are also doing their university degrees, we cannot engage the millennials who are also doing their careers – heavens above, we barely have time to engage the independently wealthy retirees because what we ask of our volunteers is way too complicated and way too much for most of them to put in.

That said, that probably means we need to look at different types of support and working – I'm going to say it because you know I have to – smarter not harder. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl, and I think that's one of the things that if we don't solve immediately we will certainly have to highlight in the report saying… and perhaps even saying to RALOs, "Look, this is seen as a chore. What you need to understand is this is information everybody wants to know. And in fact if we are going to collaborate with each

other, it's very useful to know what the rest of us are doing and how so we can be seen as a resource and not just a chore." But certainly we need to understand the limits of people's time and energy, particularly since everybody's a volunteer.

Alberto, go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Right now I'm sending an e-mail requesting all of that information that you are mentioning. We have done something very simple that... I mean we do have some activities so there is time to conduct those activities especially in those areas where ICANN did provide money and funds we created a report on what we did, who did that, who was involved in that, etc. and the speakers are in that case responsible – and I was one of those many times – of everything that we had to do and to collect all that information.

So I believe this implies modifying some procedures a bit and perhaps we can continue organizing this information on our history. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alberto, and indeed having that kind of information available will be really useful to the rest of us and perhaps give the rest of us some ideas as to what we and the other RALOs could be doing.

Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is a really productive talk for getting our act together but it's somewhat off topic for this meeting and we're down to another 12 minutes before it ends. So we may want to go back onto topic. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: And what topic would you like to talk about?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do, as you pointed out at the beginning, have one week left before we start getting on planes so I would like to suggest that if nothing else we spend three minutes looking at where I am in the trying to draft the final document and I'll point out what my next steps are and then we can suggest how we go about this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead. Start, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. If we can pull up the clean pdf please on the document and give people scrolling rights. Thank you very much.

What you saw last week has now been somewhat refined. I've added a few more sections. I've cleaned it up a little bit. I haven't proofread much of what I've written in the last day or two and I will be doing that in the next hour or two and then I will send out a clean version and I would suggest that it be posted both on the wiki – the Word document

made available for anyone who wants to play with that – and put onto a Google Docs for people to comment. There are still a number of sections which haven't been filled out and a number of areas where I specifically need input before I can finish because I were not finished before I can even put text in because I just don't know enough about what's going on in some areas. It's up to 13 pages now. It'll probably be 20 before it gets anywhere near complete.

The real issue at this point is less refining wording and identifying are there things there which in my wisdom, so to speak, I've just gotten wrong and are not positions that other people agree with, and that's fine. And perhaps more important, are there other things that are simply not mentioned at all that we need to be able to capture?

Holly had today mentioned that perhaps some Appendices – I will certainly be adding one which shows the turnover in staff and things like that but we may want another one identifying all of the other activities we go through that they're suggesting we start. So let's try to start figuring out how do we get from where we are today to a final document that we can sign off of in Copenhagen.

I've gone through Holly's template and on the wiki and the Google Docs and tried to make sure that every comment there that seems to apply is reflected somewhere in the text. I'm sure I've missed some. So I would suggest that going forward that's not a bad way if we can start looking at comments on this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, I have a question –

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

HOLLY RAICHE: And that is, this is listed recommendation by recommendation by recommendation. This is not topic by topic. So I gather you're basically saying that the outline that I've put up is not one that you're going to follow or not one that you've followed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we decided two meetings ago and again last meeting that in addition to other topics that we have to raise, that we must respond to recommendation by recommendation. And part of this document – currently the first nine pages or so – are recommendations. The other parts are addressing all of the other issues – both the implementations and specific subjects that are identified in your template and other people have identified.

No one is bound to use this. I've just tried to put pen to paper, so to speak, to make sure that we start having something that we can submit.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alright.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can't submit a multi-column table as our comment. It's got to be something that's cohesive.

HOLLY RAICHE: I understand that. I think what I'm asking is, I'm quite happy to work with this document and turn it into an outline because right now what you've got – you've got recommendations and you've got responses to recommendations. There are also implementation statements. There were 12 of them that are raised. And my concept originally was we deal topic by topic so that we can have a discussion and at the end of that discussion say clearly these are the recommendations and we agree with them or not, and these are ours. If we do this recommendation by recommendation, the recommendations are all over the place when it comes to a topic. And it doesn't make for cohesive reading frankly. [Inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, all I can say is, several meetings ago we decided among anything else we must address recommendation by recommendation and implementation by implementation because that's what the Board will ultimately be looking at. So I don't think we can avoid it.

HOLLY RAICHE: My question is not, do we not respond to each, but do we respond topic by topic so that for instance there are some headings that I have suggested where there would be one or two recommendations and an implementation. There would be other headings where there is a lot, but we simply group them together so that if we're talking about for example, structure and process, we talk about the relevant recommendations and implementation in that context so that we have

a context because the flow of recommendation by recommendation does not make for a coherent response frankly. That's my concern.

ALAN GREENBERG: I may suggest you want to look at what I have –

HOLLY RAICHE: I have.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if no one thinks it's a good thing then so be it. There are some sections as you'll notice towards the end, some of them not written yet that do look at the topic by topic and try to bring together the various ideas that have to be brought because they don't quite fit under the recommendations and implementations.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know. That was the concern I had.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will stop speaking and let other people speak. Last time I thought there was general agreement that we had to do them by recommendation and by implementation in order to be able to respond to what was being asked for. Anything else, we have to add we also have to fit in. That's my recollection of what we decided.

HOLLY RAICHE: Cheryl, we need to do both and that's what I'm suggesting. I have never suggested we don't deal with each recommendation. I'm just saying we do it in a coherent order, not 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. But we need to do both. Your text is not wasted, Alan. I'm just saying that I suggest we do it by our topics not just numbers 1 to 16, so we do both.

Glenn, he's going to look at the document after dinner. That would be terrific. We can spend the next call which is coming up very soon in terms of the RALOs to actually make sure that the RALOs are actually inputting into this, and we can work through some ideas from the RALOs as to how we respond.

Vanda [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, Holly. That was one of the reasons I was pushing… I was doing a lot of work which I have better things to do with my life to be quite honest, but I thought that it was important to get the text out that people could look at and start saying, "Yes, we agree," or, "No, we disagree." Because we may not all agree on everything.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's fine. And in fact, there is very useful text here. What I will probably do – and I will not have time to do it today but I will have time to do it over the weekend – is have a look and see if we can group the texts together so that we have a coherent story to tell. And maybe we've only got about five minutes left on this call. I think we've got another call tomorrow morning which is with the RALO Chairs, and I

think we can actually work through with the RALO Chairs how to input and in fact the ways in which – which is what I said in the very beginning – which is, I don't care how people contribute frankly because we have to put it into a coherent whole at the end.

Vanda, yes – "Contextualize both responses is the best solution." We certainly will. I don't want to lose any of the thoughts that people have. All of it's constructive.

We've got five minutes left. Cheryl, go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. As exciting as it is because I actually work with authors to look at style wars, I think we really need to move past this. Both documents, both approaches, at this collection of information are going to appeal to different parts of our community that we need input from. So while, as Alan suggested, he'll have his document revised before tomorrow morning's meeting, put it up as a Google Doc, put it out as a Word doc, and ask on the wiki and ask for input to whatever the larger grouping feels comfortable. And then guess what? We're going to have to bludgeon it and it will be bludgeoning it into a single coherent document. And I would suggest we probably need fresh eyes on that Drafting Team. Otherwise, we're going to have the Holly style versus Alan's style going on ad nauseam.

Let's not do that. Let's make sure we give opportunity and options for everyone to have input. All of these methodologies have great merit and then we will have to hybridize it. And I'm going to be very, very, pushy – like you've noticed I can be from time to time – that we get

some fresh blood into the small final Drafting Team that helps you with the hybridization because you spending a weekend doing a makeover isn't going to be as useful I think as getting the makeover done in a true editorial fashion later on. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. I couldn't agree more.

Olivier, go ahead please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Just for tomorrow's call with the RALO Leaders I think we need to be quite clear on two things. First, what input we need from them on the documents which you and Alan and the ALAC inputs into the process. But secondly, the RALO Leaders have admitted a wish to have their own RALO submission as well, and so we need to make sure they're well aware that they are expected – not just promoted to do so but expected – to comment on both documents so that they don't just concentrate on one and think that that's it, they've ticked the box. It really is a case of having the input from RALOs and, of course, the input from ALSes – which is probably going to be the real challenge here – the input into both documents. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. And I'm going to disagree slightly with you and agree more with Cheryl, which is I'm not going to tell them how to do it. I will say what is required is that we have input. And if people are more comfortable inputting from one document to another, I'd be very

happy. Basically I think the important thing is we have input from all of the RALOs and we have buy-in from all of the RALOs. And different RALOs are going to have different styles. I'm really happy to live with whatever they want to do as long as we actually get input from RALOs.

That said, it's 59 minutes and we've got one more minute. So can I just say thank you to everybody. I think it was a really good discussion. The meeting time tomorrow – Heidi, what time is the meeting tomorrow? I know what time it is in Sydney, but haven't got it in UTC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Holly, it's 18:00 UTC tomorrow.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. And thank you, and I will be talking to everybody within less than 24 hours. But thank you for your time and we will talk tomorrow but focus more on RALO input and how we make sure that we hear from everybody.

Thank you and talk to everybody tomorrow.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Holly. The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much [those who] joined in. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]