
EVIN ERDOĞDU: ...and RALO Input on Thursday, the 23rd of February, 2017, from 18:00 UTC to 19:00 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, [inaudible], Holly Raiche, Cheryl Landgon-Orr, Wolf Ludwig, Javier Rúa-Jovet, Andrei Kolesnikov, Glenn McKnight, Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Vanda Scartezini.

On the Spanish channel, we have Maritza Aguero and Humberto Carrasco.

For apologies today, we have Judith Hellerstein and Satish Babu [inaudible].

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, and myself, Evin Erdoğan. I will also be managing the call.

Our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and David. Our French interpreter today is Claire.

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

With this, I'll turn it back over to you, Olivier. Please begin.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evin. Have we missed anybody in the roll call?

Okay. Well, welcome, everybody, to this call. It's a special RALO Leadership call with the leadership, the co-Chairs of the At-Large Review working party. As you are probably aware, there is big consultation going on right now that is affecting all of us, from the ALAC to the RALOs, all the way to the At-Large Structures. The review has been met with quite some surprise by our community due to the depth of the changes that are being suggested in the review itself. It's not just a review. It looks like a total turning-upside-down of the whole process and the whole community and a number of recommendations that actually affect absolutely everyone in our community.

It was felt that, because there's such a little amount of time until the responses – I'm saying "responses" because there might be more than one response – are given in that we need to basically synchronize ourselves and then work out a plan on how we are going to get our At-Large Structures to be vocal and to contribute to the input.

If you look at your agenda, you'll see there are two proposed responses. There is an ALAC response on the one side, which is prepared by the ALAC directly working with the working party co-Chairs. There's another one, a RALO response, that is proposed to look solely at the questions which are affecting RALOs directly and to provide a RALO perspective, if you want, on the responses.

So that's been the two parallel tracks. Why two rather than one? Well, as I said, it's on the table. We could decide that we might just one at the end, but I would personally suggest that we show two. I don't expect the responses to be very different from each other, but at least going at the level of the RALOs submitting a response does show that this is not

just the response of the ALAC leadership and the ALAC top-tier – the elites, as some people might call them – but it shows a very strong bottom-up component into our responses. I think it’s important to show that, and it’s important to show that there is a connection with our ALSs and that they are quite concerned about what’s going on.

That’s my quick intro. I was going to give the chair to Holly Raiche and Cheryl Langdon-Orr to give us an intro from their point of view as well, from their perspective.

Holly, do you want to take the floor?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Very briefly. First of all, I thank everybody for this particular meeting. I just want to remind people about the urgency of the time. There’s a public comment period that ends just after Copenhagen, and we have to have a full response by that time. We, as a member of the working party for the Review Team, have been meeting weekly. Our last meeting is coming up next Thursday.

A reminder on the 27th of February at 13:00 UTC, there is a community-wide webinar for the ITEMS Team to present their report. As many of you as possible should be there. That’ll be very welcome.

A couple of things. First of all, given the report itself and some of the feelings in the report, as well as a couple of the recommendations, [makes] the point or at least [suggests] that there are only a few people who participate in or contribute to the work of ALAC. It is really critical to be able to say, “No, I’m sorry.” But the response that you’re getting is

from the whole community, and that is a lot of people and they're all interested. So this is a really important initiative.

The other thing I would say is, yes, it's a long report. There are many – in fact, which I think Olivier should go through or I will go through – document that you can contribute to on Google Docs, on the wiki. My concern was responding only to recommendations is that, apart from the 16 recommendations, there are what's called implementations – 12 of them as well – and they raise different points of view. So just to respond to the recommendations does not actually cover the field.

That said, the most critical and perhaps the greatest change being suggested has been to the actual structure itself, to the role of the RALOs in respect to their relationship with their members and, indeed, a membership class, and their roles in ALAC. It's the most radical change. In fact, it's really important that there is a very concerted response from the RALOs themselves to make comments about the proposed structure and what you think of it and what your suggestions are.

That's all for me, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Holly. Very helpful. What I suggest then is that we go – oh no. I do see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up, so let's first go to Alan Greenberg and then start going through our agenda.

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I support pretty much everything that Holly just said. The recommendations are key because that ultimately may be what the Board decides to implement or not. There's a long procedure before then. But there's a lot of other things in the report, many of them based in misinformation and the misunderstanding of some issues that I think we need to be commenting on also. Keep that in mind as you go through it.

That being said, of the recommendations, about two-thirds of them are acceptable. Many of them are acceptable because they're recommending things that we're already doing. I think that's something that we have to note as we go along.

They are also making recommendations that are completely counter to the way ICANN does things. It's interesting. Last night we had a meeting of the AC/SO Accountability Group, and one of the recommendations is that ACs and SOs should form working groups to coordinate outreach. The ITEMS report is recommending we abolish our Outreach Working Group. So we have a lot of things to address.

I agree with what both Olivier and Holly said in that the more submissions we get, the less likely they can say that this is just one person or three people talking. Unfortunately, RALO leadership is also included in the elite, who they believe should be not the focus. But we don't have a lot of choice but to make sure that the leaders do participate in this.

One of the things I will highlight is, to the extent that there are multiple submissions, we really need to identify soon any areas of disagreement.

There's little point in us submitting multiple submissions that disagree with each other and give them opportunities to say we are not all speaking with a similar voice. So although they don't have to be identical, we at least have to know where there's disagreements so we can try to address that with proper wording.

Lastly, just to re-echo, this is a really tight timeframe. Some of us are getting on planes in less than two weeks, and we have to come into Copenhagen with statements that are very, very close to final because there's not going to be an opportunity, either in Copenhagen or immediately afterwards, to do much refinement. There will be time to talk about them, and we will be putting time on the various agendas for that. But there's not going to be a lot of opportunity for writing. Thank you.

OLIIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. What both Alan and Holly have said, as well as, obviously, your introduction, Olivier, is things that I absolutely agree with. I must say that the one thing I'm particularly keen on, from a RALO leadership point of view, is that whoever is working from the individual RALOs and the joint RALO leadership approach – I'm assuming that, as leadership, you will be doing both; you'll be working jointly as well as severally because you'll need to be reaching out to your own At-Large Structures, as well as working in form of cohesive methodology – would be really

wise if you worked closely with whoever it is that is from your region on the review working party.

It's quite possible, for example, that your regional membership of the review working party – the review working party has two people that you actually appointed onto it from each of your RALOs – don't isolate them from your regional approach. They're perfect conduits to and fro for what will be the ALAC response, but they're also a very valuable resource for you because they've already been immersed in all of this discussion and to-ing and fro-ing quite deeply. They'll certainly a strong understanding of where the ALAC responses are heading and certain nuances, such as Alan alluded to, where it's going to be advantageous – at least the working party believes – for us to recognize that significant numbers of the recommendations and implementations are things that we can easily agree to and support because we already do them but just didn't notice it or didn't notice it effectively.

So we are being too negative. We should be able to find a quite positive spin on this, but there are, as Alan pointed out, a couple of significant points of recommendation and implementation which seem to be astonishingly out of step with what ICANN would expect from us as a grassroots community movement.

Most importantly, there are some assumptions – statements such as, “Working groups should be open to everyone.” Of course, what they're referring to is that PDP process and non-PDP process working groups within the support organization should be open to everybody and that the Empowered Membership Model is very much based on individuals,

perhaps even thousands of thousands of individuals from each of the regions should be having specific and direct input into those.

Of course, anyone can. That's already a standard operational procedure in that. So it's almost as if they haven't taken a deep enough understanding or [tour] of how we already interact and what possible interactions there are with the Support Organizations.

So that's the rationale for the get-rid-of-our-own-work-groups and spending all that energy on the GNSO and cross-community and ccNSO work groups.

Of course, we – Alan also pointed this out – are undergoing a very important Work Stream 2 activity, where we are looking among several topics for how we can strengthen and avoid capture of the Support Organizations and Advisory Committees. It's probably quite appropriate for you to all recognize some of the points, as Alan just said. That we will be recommending as ICANN-wide best practices for all ACs and SOs is the exact opposite that this independent review is doing.

Thanks for taking the time for listening to us today. We're particularly keen to help you in any way possible to get your At-Large Structure's individual members – the rank and file of your At-Large Structures, of course – having direct input and a coordinated or several or both regional approach. Thanks.

OLIIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Whilst you were speaking, I put the link for the At-Large Review Working Party top page that has the list of all of

your representatives from these working parties. Please work with your representatives and get them to relate back to the Review Working Party, which meets weekly, so that we're always aware of what's going on and there's a good coordination across the community, not just going off attendance.

Let's recognize that the time is already 20 minutes past the start of the call. Let's then dig into the first of the responses, and that's the ALAC response.

This one has two parts to it. On the one hand, there is a link to the At-Large workspace ALAC response to the At-Large Review draft report. On this, there is a – is that a proposed text? Let me just hand the floor over to either Holly or to Alan – I'm not quite sure who of the two is to work on this – to let us know about this. So, first, the At-Large workspace ALAC response to the At-Large Review draft report. There is also a link to Alan's start [of] the draft in the agenda.

I see Alan Greenberg – oh, is that Holly? Okay. Holly first and then Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE:

What Alan has done is start a draft, which is, as both Alan and I have pointed out, is critical because we have to have something pretty close to finished by Copenhagen, which is rapidly upon us. What we have done is basically, very early in the piece, realized that the way people contribute is different, depending on the skill base, depending on the capacity of the broadband. We have a wiki and we have a Google Docs.

We figured out that, however people want to contribute – we have seen contributions various ways – is terrific. I also note the specific space for RALO contributions, and that is also terrific and probably will form the basis of, if not a full response, different responses, which is just terrific.

Alan has also just recently gone beyond the text of the recommendations to start to draft a response. That has also gone out.

So, yes, Olivier, I agree it's a little bit confusing, but it is confusing simply because we had feedback that different people want to contribute in different ways. Rather than tell everybody that they have to contribute in a particular way, we just said, "Every contribution is welcome." So use Google Docs if that's the way you want to contribute. Use the stuff on the wiki if you want to. Also, contribute to Alan's text, which is moving the discussion further from just commenting to draft form. Alan, you're next. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Certainly, the way I look at it is that the tabular documents, whether they're on the wiki or Google Docs, are really excellent ways of capturing people's ideas because they're focused on the issue by issue, not necessarily in the way the report is written.

On the other hand, we do have to respond to the recommendations and the implementations in an orderly manner because that is how ITEMS is going to be analyzing them. So we can't avoid both.

But there are plenty of things also in their paper which are not at the level of recommendations. They're implied within the implementation

but not even strongly there. We don't know what form they will take in the next version; whether they will be recommendations, implementations, or dropped. Therefore, we need to make sure we comment on everything which we find support where we support things and where we don't support them.

The report is full of what I believe are misunderstandings. I'll give you a specific example. There is one statement in the report – let me try to pull it up very quickly – which says – and I'm quoting verbatim from the report; it's page 27; this is on the discussion of whether staff should be involved in policy issues or not; that is, should staff help draft policy statements for us, or should they be doing research for us – “Staff should remove themselves from the decisions that are community's own” – former LACRALO leader.

Now, I'm pretty sure I know where that comment comes from – not which person it is, but what the issue is – and I believe ITEMS misunderstood. This was not a statement from a LACRALO leader saying, “We don't trust staff to help us draft statements.” This was a statement saying they should stay out of administrative issues that are the property of LACRALO. I may be wrong, but I suspect that's what it's about. They completely misunderstood and therefore it took on a completely different persona.

So as you go through the report, if you see things attributed to your own region that you think are misunderstood or misrepresentative, those are really important to counter because they're using these direct quotations as rationale for some things which you may or may not support. So certainly focus on those.

I don't have a lot else to say. I didn't write the document because I wanted to take custody of it and own it. The current document is 16 pages long. It's not finished yet. This is a lot of writing that has to be done, and we have very little time. It's a lot easier, from my perspective, I thought, for people to comment and say, "You're wrong here," than to just come up with ideas and hope that they will somehow make it into a paper.

So do look at it from that perspective. There is more to come. Time just hasn't allowed me to finish it, but it covers most of the issues. I will be commenting myself on my own document to identify the places where I think I left things out or got things wrong. I encourage everyone else to also. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, quick question. I haven't had a chance yet to look at your draft response, but does this answer each one of the recommendations, or is this a more general response about a number of points that you're making? How does that fit with that work that Holly has done in the Google Docs that we will be looking at a moment as well that has the rejigging of the recommendations into a different order and then another column with potential answers?

ALAN GREENBERG: You started off by asking, "Is it addressing the recommendations or is it a more general document?" and the answer is yes. If you look at what's on the Adobe Connect pod right now, you'll see Section 3. Section 2 is

addressing the recommendations. Section 4 is addressing the implementation guidelines.

Then there's a whole bunch of other things, where they contain things that don't fit into an answer on recommendations but I think are important to say. There are likely others that people think are important to say that I haven't captured. So the answer is it's both.

In terms of the relationship, the documents that Holly has created – again, both in Google Docs and the wiki – is a large tabular thing. It's a great way to capture ideas and capture people's input, but it's not something we can submit, saying, "Here is our formal response." If we were to use that order, I personally think it would be confusing to jump around the recommendations. But if we were to use that order, there's going to have to be a very extensive amount of writing done and then a verification that we haven't left anything which wasn't captured initially in that original spreadsheet and table. I haven't tried to do that. There may or may not be things like that.

So I'm not pushing one form or another, but time is really short. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: I agree with what Alan says. There are observations and remarks I made at the time which were not considered by ITEMS. Among them is the fact that they have taken comments that are not like – there's

somebody who doesn't like how ALAC works or the RALOs work. I'm not saying we're perfect, but we do bad things as well.

The first remark is that many of those comments with words that are offensive many times seem fully drafted by the same person, and there are no other comments like those. My claim was that they take their comments from one person – nobody says that I am not right. I don't even want to know which person that is. But all of the very bad comments were drafted with the same words, always with the same insults, etc. I think we need to consider that as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alberto. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. The reason I suggested a different form was because, when I looked at the actual recommendations in implementation, the way that they have drafted them is very piecemeal. If you look at themes – what about structure? – then you say, “Well, we just want to talk about structure,” you find that you pick recommendation so-and-so from here, so-and-so from there. There's an implementation there. I thought to at least group stuff together in a way that it actually makes more sense because the actual document doesn't have the kind of sensible grouping, so you wind up saying the same thing two or three times in response to different recommendations that have the same theme. Then somehow you have to weave in the implementation.

My way of thinking is to just say to people, “Look, if you’re really concerned with the issues about structure, these are things you need to highlight. They’re scattered throughout the report, but concentrate on this area. Or if you’re thinking about another particular heading, these are the implementations and recommendations that deal with that.”

Yes, it may be a little bit confusing, but that, when I found I was trying to formulate a response for the report, if I was thinking about responding to the structure, I was going from one recommendation to heaven knows where and then back again. So the recommendations are not in the logical order, addressing different things that I would have hoped. The implementation is also is a bit out of order. So it’s a different way at looking at that report and hopefully a bit more of an organized theme-based response rather than just numbers 19.

That said, it’s very clear to me – and it’s been made very clear to all of us – that every single recommendation must be specifically replied to, which is why I have included in my response every single recommendation and every single implementation because we must respond. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. What I would suggest then is, because we’re really now dealing with the format of our response and in what order we will provide a response, we focus on the contents of Alan’s paper as a first step. Closer to the time when we got all of our ideas and all of the input from everyone, we will then decide on how we want to structure the response – whether we want to cluster the like-minded or the similar

topic responses together on one side and the others on the other side. We'll focus on the actual content for the time being. Is that okay?

HOLLY RAICHE:

You're asking everybody. I think Alan has done a lot of work, and it's always easier to look at and comment upon words that are on a page as opposed to no words on the page. So whatever is the most helpful.

I think, for the purposes of this group, it is perhaps more useful – Alan's response does go recommendation by recommendation, which probably is the way we have to go before we then stand back and say, "Now, how do we order our response?" in a particular way or not. That's just my suggestion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Holly. Turning over to Alan then, and bearing in mind we are already half-an-hour into this call, could you, within the next five to ten minutes, take us through your draft, please, response by response, just summarizing what you have put there so that it gives us a first reading so that, for the RALO Chairs and RALO leaders, it takes us through the contents of your document? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I would be pleased to. I'll note that the responses to recommendations are only half of the document that I provided. There is another half which is not focused on the recommendations, per se.

Okay. Recommendation #1 is that At-Large should be encouraged to participate in IGFs, RIRs, ISOC, and other things. The answer is, yes, we support this. We already do it to the level possible with the funding we have. So I don't think there's going to be a lot of controversy on that one. Maybe there will be. I may be wrong. They seem to have not understood that we're doing these kinds of things.

Recommendation #2 – I'm not going to try to scroll the document. People can scroll it themselves or perhaps staff can do it. Recommendation #2 is on page 2.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, if I can just jump in. If anybody has questions or comments about any of the points you're making here, could they just put their hands up, and then we'll interrupt you going through the document, and we'll bring that question in?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Otherwise, you can just continue going through. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm not focusing on the hands, so please intervene if a hand comes up and I don't notice it. Recommendation #2: At-Large should be

more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it seeks to offer and focus on quality rather than quantity.

The answer basically says, yes, that's what we're doing. It shows a chart going from the last five years, showing that we used to answer close to 60% of the public comments. We're now down to 35. The count for last year was 16 out of 46. That's a little bit more than one per month. Some of those comments are very short ones, saying, "Yes, we support it" – things where we felt it was necessary to weigh in but we didn't spend months writing the document.

So again, we're supporting that. We're agreeing and pointing out we're already doing it. There's no need for a recommendation.

#3 is the critical recommendation of the whole report, saying that we should focus on members essentially at the expense of ALSs. Now, they came back and added an FAQ, saying, "No, no. We didn't mean that. We still value your ALSs." But throughout the document, they only talk about ALMs (At-Large Members). Essentially we are pointing out that three of the five RALOs already have individual members. The other two have no choice but to eventually get them, and hopefully sooner rather than later because that's a recommendation from the first At-Large Review.

The only difference, really, between the two is that, for RALOs where the members have votes – I'll point out that some of RALOs virtually never take a vote – the individual members would have votes equivalent to an ALS vote. If that's the only thing that's going to

motivate people and get them to flock to us, I think we're getting the wrong people. So we're basically rejecting Recommendation #3.

Again, in my document, but this goes along with the discussions we've been having – Recommendation #4: At-Large staff should get more involved and engaged in policy work. The answer is: we agree with it. We're already doing it to some extent. We are proposing, in the engagement communication plan that we're working, that staff will have a much larger part in this. Of course, we have no control over that. It's staff who makes the decision on staff allocations. But, yes, we're supporting the concept.

Recommendation #5 – I'll quote this because it's important – “We should redouble our efforts to contribute to meetings between ICANN's senior staff and executives and ISOC and other ISTAR organizations.” Well, to the extent that executives of these groups meet together, we've never been invited. So it's not a matter that we should have more involvement. It's not our call. Certainly the last meeting of the ISTAR organizations that I'm aware of we found out about in a press release afterwards. But we certainly support the concept, if someone would like to include us.

Notwithstanding that, although we are not privy to discussions between executives, we do our best to involve ourselves with these various organizations. We have plenty of examples to demonstrate that we do that already.

Recommendation #6: Our Board members should be – people should apply. The NomCom should pick the best director they can find – the

director candidates – and then we should do a selection by random selection.

I cannot disagree with this one more. How someone selected with triage by the NomCom and random selection is a director selected by At-Large I just don't comprehend. I took great offense at this. The procedure we have, although it is more complex than the ones the other organizations use, is one that was developed by a bottom-up process within At-Large. Maybe it should change. Maybe it should be simplified. Maybe it should be eliminated. But that's our call.

Ultimately, if this goes all the way to the Board and the Board directs us to change how we select the Director, that is a great conflict of interest. That is completely out of scope for the Board to tell us how to select our Director. So I am categorically rejecting this one. That's my personal perspective.

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. I'm not commenting on Rec 6, although I might take a comment to do so. I want to take you back very [inaudible] to Rec 5 because this is one where the RALOs may find an opportunity to make a particular point. I'm certainly aware that many of the Regional At-Large Organizations have strong informal – and in many cases, quite formal – on the memorandums-of-understanding relationship with the key stakeholders in the ISAR organizations within their regions. Of course, in some of those regions – Asia-Pacific in particular – that I am aware of – but I do note North America and others as well – there is a very close

relationship and meeting of the leads and representatives at a regional level in. In the, for example, APSTAR context, the regional leadership is simply a natural part of the APSTAR meeting process.

So I think what they have suggested is an opportunity in Rec 5 for the regions to say, “Well, duh. We may not be sitting in the C-suite meetings, but we are actually sitting and are deeply involved at the regional level,” which, in a grassroots system, is the place for it to be. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. Did you want to comment on 6?

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR:

Very briefly. I’m less emotionally involved with the selection of Seat 15 than perhaps many people who’ll be putting pen to paper on this. I have obviously served on the NomCom and understand the degree and professionalism that they go through in their vetting process. So I’m less inflamed by this particular recommendation, while I do wonder about how a global set of stakeholders within the At-Large community would ever feel confident or comfortable from a random selection process.

All I said is that Rec 6 is effectively saying that the BCEC shouldn’t do any work. We should have a BCEC that doesn’t exist. What it does now in our model should be done by the NomCom. If that’s a change that comes in later on, frankly, my dear, I don’t give a damn. I think the BCEC does fabulous work – well, certainly the ones I’ve served on have – to a great extent with very close levels of professionalism, if not higher

levels of effectiveness, as the NomCom. So whether the NomCom or BCEC does the vetting process, I'm in the "Frankly, I don't give a damn" camp.

But I do [sign] a degree of discomfort with the suggestion that a random selection is all that is being required. I just don't think our community is ready for that. Perhaps one day in 2055 but not in 2017/18 or in the near future. So that's just an opinion piece from me. I just really think that this is one of those bizarro recommendations. They seem to have not even noted that the Nominating Committee is the equivalent of the BCEC process. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And, yes, we did pattern it after that rather closely. I think this is completely out of scope and it's just wrong on so many levels. But I may be emotional, partly because I've invested a fair amount of my life in working with the ALAC and many people from the outer parts of At-Large to create the process.

Recommendation #7: At-Large should abandon existing internal working groups. This is wrong on so many levels. They are continually, throughout the report, recommending we do things that our working groups but are saying we shouldn't have them done by working groups. It's not clear who would do them in their place. They really do not understand.

Now, having said that, we have a whole bunch of working groups on our books that are not particularly active, and it makes it look like we focus a lot more on these things than perhaps we do.

I see Alberto's hand is up. I'm not sure which question it's for.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I'm referring to something that I believe Alan said. You said this is completely out of scope of ICANN. Can we read exactly what the scope is? Maybe not now. But in this [case], what is the scope that they actually do have? The scope that this audit has. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

This is certainly not listed, but I said it's out of scope not because it wasn't listed – because many things that are not listed might be in scope – but this was designed by the community. It's something which the Board should not end up dictating to us, regardless. I just don't believe that it's important enough. It's something we do every three years, and I don't believe it's important enough to warrant this level of recommendation or this level of intervention. But, no, I can't point to a specific sentence.

#8: At-Large should use social networks more than we do to gather user opinions. The answer was: we have a social media group, which we're supposed to abolish, according to you, and that's where this group looks at how we can use social media. Certainly, we could use social media, and we probably will as we go forward.

I don't have a lot to say. Other people, I'm sure, can add more words to that one.

Recommendation #9: At-Large should consider a part-time web community manager position. The response points out that A), it's not

our discretion – it’s a staff decision to appoint staff members allocated to things – and B) we are already have staff working on the web. That’s how it was created. They seem to be under the impression that the web had been created by volunteers. I point out that we don’t even have access to change things on the web. So, yes, we support more resources going into that, but it’s not our call.

#10: Consider the adoption and use of a Slack-like online communication method. They go on to talk about mailing lists and Skype and things like that. The answer points out that, number one, it’s not our decision. We can try to influence ICANN, but we have to rely on ICANN technology support. We cannot put up tools which were supported by a volunteer who disappears next week. These are not fully are decision. We have community members in parts of the world where bandwidth is very limited or expensive, and we have community members in parts of the world where their national governments block certain tools. All of that has to be factored in. And we do have a committee that looks as such things – again, one of the committees we’re supposed to evolve.

#11: At-Large should replace the five-year annual global ATLAS meetings with the alternative model of annual general regional meetings. Well, I think we could argue that the annual meetings might be just a bit too much. They take a lot of organization, and we’re don’t rotate around the regions annually.

They seem to have missed the point completely that between the five-year ATLASs we have five general assemblies, one per region. They curiously made reference to this much later in the section on the

Westlake report. They claim that the recent budget approval we got from Multiyear Planning and Budgeting for GAs and assemblies was a direct result of the Westlake recommendations. I'm afraid I don't see that whatsoever, if for no other reason than there were eight years or seven years between the two.

In this section, when they're talking about meetings, they seem to not be aware that we hold general assemblies, so my response was that we partially accept this in that we think the ATLAS meetings are good but there are other meetings that we hold. By the way, some of them, like the North American one upcoming, is at an ARIN meeting – people we actually talk to.

Recommendation #12: As part of its strategy on outreach, we should put a higher priority on the organization of regional events. It talks about using CROPP funding to go to places so we can do outreach. Basically, I said we support the recommendation, but we would add the word "continue" because it's exactly what we do right now. I'll also point out that, although At-Large people may be organizing regional events, in general they're funded by other people. At-Large doesn't have fund to do that kind of thing.

Recommendation #13: Work closely with ICANN's regional hubs and regional ISOC headquarters to set up more Internet Governance schools and things like that. I don't have an answer for that one. I have some notes. I do point out in my bullets that there are only two regional hubs, and I believe only the APAC hub actually works with At-Large. I don't think the Istanbul hub does anything in that context. The Los Angeles

headquarters doesn't do anything in that context, other than through the staff that are there supporting us.

But I think I need some more words to make sure that this actually matches what is happening. I think, to the answer to "Does anyone want to work with us?" we'd be willing to work with them. It just may be not quite what ICANN does.

Recommendation #14: In the interest of transparency, there should be a single place where all At-Large travel funding is documented. My answer is we support that. We presume that this will be done for the other groups as well. It would be nice if it was done for the Board.

Recently, I asked the question of "What does the Non-Contracted Parties intercessional meeting" – some of you may know they just held a meeting in Iceland, and they've been holding these meetings for several years – "cost?" Because it's not documented anywhere. ICANN only published costs of things that happen at ICANN meetings.

It turns out that the costs are available because the Registrars Stakeholder Group had to submit a document disclosure request because the information was so private. So we support the concept.

Just about finished. #15: At-Large should get involved in the cross-community working group on auctions. Well, that's an interesting statement. We are one of the chartering organizations. I was Vice-Chair of the Drafting Group, and we are obliged as a chartering organization to get involved with it.

That being said, they also say we should approach the Board and lobby for the Board to allocate money from the auction funds to At-Large. Number one, the Board does not have that discretion. That's why we're setting up this group: to set up a process. Number two, if indeed our intent was to get a fraction of that money, we would have to disclose that in the CCWG, and we would essentially be disabled from actually actively participating in large parts of it because of that disclosure. So, again, just a misunderstanding of how ICANN works at many different levels.

We should adopt a set of metrics to see how the EMM is successful. I said, although we're not supporting the EMM, we do strongly support metrics.

I don't think there's any time to go over now the details, but that gives you the overall gist. Olivier, if I may have one more minute, the next section –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, Alan, because we are running out of time. I have asked if we can have an extension of time because it took a little more time than expected, but it's [inaudible] answer that you got [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Okay. There's a comment on a recommendation not made, specifically on whether we should have one Director or two, and what I answered there is pointing out that all their negatives are not valid. Saying things like, "We don't need two Directors because we already

have five people on the NomCom”? Well, GNSO has two Directors and seven people on the NomCom.

There is a section on methodology and commenting on just bad practices that they have used in doing this work. Part of it is quoting people and presuming the quotes are valid. There’s a number of other methodology things. [IEDA] did a really good little document on that, and that was a good basis on which to write this section.

There are a number of things where I go into more depth. They’re not recommendations but they misunderstand the current processes. There’s little logic between their conclusions of what the situation is and why their recommendations will fix things.

Surveys – a bad design of their survey. And there’s a comment on the analysis of the prior survey. They spent an awful lot of time focusing on why At-Large changed the Westlake report, where in fact it wasn’t At-Large who did it, and it’s none of their business. What they were supposed to comment on was whether the recommendations were implemented or not and whether they were effective, not on how they came to be.

There is, lastly, a section on travel issues. They’ve done a large part of the reorganization to get more travel slots, and there’s a section on that, and lastly, a section on volunteer turnover. Essentially, it’s taking the charts that have been created over the last few weeks and showing them to show that we indeed do heavy turnover of volunteers. People just don’t seem to realize it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Just one last question on this. When and how are people going to be able to comment on this document?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a Word version which you could put comments on if that's your method of choice. I believe that's already online. And there's a Google Docs version which people can also comment on. As this document is revised, there will be updated versions placed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. May I just please –

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that all of that's in place right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: May I please ask staff to take note of this and to, after this call, publicize these documents? I guess the Google Doc will need to be in Suggest mode rather than in Edit mode or Comment mode, somehow. That's one.

Now, you've noticed we've spent the whole hour and we haven't even touched on the RALO response. I'm hoping we can get about a 15-minute extension to go through the RALO response. If we can quickly go now to the RALO document, please.

Somebody's phone is beeping, by the way, at the same time. I'm not quite sure whose that is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry. I've got another call coming in, even though I got that call in the AC room, in my other ear. I'm doing my best to get the staff to stop dialing out to me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. Okay. At-Large Review issues topically pertinent to RALOs and At-Large Structures. This at present is just a document that Glenn McKnight, Satish Babu, and I have been looking at. We were looking at having the other RALO Chairs have a look at it before presenting it. At the moment, it's in Edit mode, so anybody can type their details in there. What we were going to do is leave it open in Edit for the next 24 hours, and then after that put it in Suggestion mode and have each one of the RALOs put this over to their At-Large Structures and ask for input on the comments.

Same thing again, looking at each one of the recommendations. Having heard from Alan about the ALAC response, I think that in general we are rowing in the same direction. I think that the comments are all pretty much very similar.

The first recommendation: At-Large members from each region should be encouraged to participate in Internet Governance and policy-related conferences. We've all said yes. There is an interest in this, but obviously there's just so much to do out there. In general, we are in agreement with this.

Secondly: At-Large should be more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it seeks to offer, focusing on quality rather than quantity. The response from Satish, Glenn, and I – well, my comment was that they have no specific effect on RALOs, but Satish and Glenn believe that this really is something that you shouldn't be doing because ultimately you can't put quantitative caps on advice.

#3: At-Large should encourage greater direct participation by At-Large members and ICANN working groups by adopting the proposed Empowered Membership Model. Of course, we've pushed against the new Empowered Membership Model, but we also point that we have already spent some time sending members on PDP Working Groups. We have encouraged people to join them. We haven't had so much success because it needs a certain amount of knowledge and capacity-building for volunteers to go into these working groups. I think that all three responses are going quite in that direction.

We go into the EMM (Empowered Membership Model) guidelines in a different color, in green, because the feeling was that there were really all derived from Recommendation #3. So each one of the points of the Empowered Membership Model are listed again with responses. I don't think we have time to go through all of those responses, but you can see that they're all there.

The most significant ones are the scope for further cooperation with the NCSG. Well, we're definitely interested in doing this, but at the same time, with the whole point of this implementation #4 – in the Empowered Membership Model, individual users will be encouraged to participate in At-Large – there is some misunderstanding, as Alan was

saying. Many of these recommendations are made with similar misunderstandings about how the whole thing works.

Implementation #5. Unaffiliated membership replacing At-Large Structure membership. That's something that really affects our At-Large Structures, and I hope we have captured somehow the points that our ALSes would support.

#6: Adopting the EMM would change the function of the RALOs. Again, here, according to the MoUs of RALOs – this really then goes back to the organizing instruments – the RALO has two functions: outreach and policy statements, not just doing the policy side of things. If one was to change this and change the function of the RALOs, then it would really change the way that the ALAC works.

#7: As part of the Empowered Membership Mode, RALO representatives would become ALAC members. I put that there is an outright rejection here. I'm not sure if my colleagues, RALO Chairs, would agree, but certainly as a RALO Chair I find that it's a lot of work to already do all the RALO work and do all the outreach that is needed in a RALO, in addition to then becoming full ALAC members and then having to deliberate and provide advice to the Board. For volunteers, it's just something that's quite unreasonable and certainly would overload the work of RALO representatives.

#8: The ALAC membership –

ALAN GREENBERG:

Olivier? It's Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm flying through. Yes, Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to get in for a second. On that last one, they're going to come back on that and say, "Ah, but in our new version, the RALO leaders will not have all that work to do, so it's a lot simpler."

My counter to that is: but you're now asking the RALO leaders to be the mentors of all of these new members. That is a non-trivial thing based on skills and time. So you may want to add that in to your comment because they've already implied that, because of the new model, the workload changes. I think it goes up. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. So that's to be added.

#8: ALAC members should have a maximum of two terms, each with a two-year duration. Of course, that's something really for the ALAC to discuss. If we go back to Recommendation #4 – oh, yes. That's another question. In here there is a [inaudible] here for Heidi to ask for term limit information from other team leaders. That's basically to find out what are the term limits in GNSO and in SSAC and in the GAC and in other parts of ICANN? That might be something that the ALAC might be interested in pursuing.

Recommendation #4: At-Large member engagement in policy work for the ALAC. We thought that this was something for the ALAC to discuss.

#5 deals specifically with the meeting of the ALAC with ISOC and other ISTAR organizations, etc. This actually says that there is already a lot of collaboration with Global Stakeholder Engagement but also with our MoUs that have been signed between the RALOs and the Regional Internet Registries. I think we can even add on there that there's been a lot of collaboration between At-Large Structures – well, in their own individual sense.

#6: Selection of Seat 15. Again, this was the one with the random selection [inaudible] outright rejection that mentioned that the recommendation completely disenfranchises end users to select a Board Director as it doesn't look as though At-Large Structures will have any say at that point on who the Board Director would be.

Recommendation #7 is the abandonment of working groups and discouraging the whole point of working groups. Of course, the reply is that the working groups are a suitable way for At-Large Structures and members to get involved. That's the whole reaching of consensus locally with grassroots input. Of course, we've also had: "This lack of any questions in the survey illustrates the lack of understanding of the role and contribution of the working groups." That's what Glenn McKnight was saying on this.

#8: At-Large should use social media much more effectively to gather end user opinion. The responses that we provided say that we've done a lot of work in social media – Twitter, in Facebook – making use of several different tools. There might be some improvement required, but this is not just a case of "we were not using it today."

#9: At-Large should consider the appointment of a part-time web community manager. I think there was support from everyone on this.

Recommendation #10: The use of a Slack-like communication platform. We remind that we have a Technical Task Force that has been actively looking at these systems. In fact, Glenn from NARALO mentioned that NARALO has been using Slack and other tools to share knowledge. But most people prefer using Skype. So it really is a response as to what people prefer using as such.

Recommendation #11: At-Large should replace five-year global ATLAS meetings with alternative annual regional At-Large meetings. The response is [inaudible] that current system worked and was approved by the RALOs themselves, so it would be a bit surprising to change it again. The other concern was that, if we have only annual regional At-Large meetings, we're likely to create silos across the different At-Large communities, which is not a good thing. In fact I think the silos are not listed there, so maybe we might need to add this.

#12: The regional outreach and engagement be high priority on the organization of regional events. On the whole, we welcome this recommendation. Of course, we mentioned the CROPP funding that has been used. But there's probably a requirement for substantially more money if one needs to sponsor this panel, [the placement], and speaking opportunities and the travel and so on to go these places.

#13 talks about the reinforcing of global outreach and engagement working with regional hubs and regional ISOC headquarters. The RALOs would support this as long as the Internet Governance Schools are in

line with the ICANN mission and mandate. So there are a few points which are made on that.

Recommendation #14: At-Large travel funding should be published as a one-stop-shop contribution to the At-Large webpage. Apparently, this dashboard is already available, so it's somewhere. It touches on absolutely everyone in ICANN that is funded. So it's a bizarre thing that this recommendation is there.

#15: At-Large should be involved in the Cross-Community Working Group on new gTLD auction proceeds. We mention here that the RALOs cannot lay claim to auction proceeds at this point in time. It's really the work of the CCWG to work on this.

Finally, Recommendation #16 – I thought we'd never reach the end of it – is to adopt a set of metrics that are consistent for the entire At-Large community to measure the impact of the Empowered Membership community. Of course, we're rejecting the Empowered Membership community, but we are in general agreement with a need to keep metrics to measure the continuous improvement of ALAC members, etc., including RALO leaders and so on. But of course, doing this manually is completely unreal due to the workload that staff would have to do. So that would have need to be done somehow with some kind of automated system.

So that's the response. Any comments or questions on this? I didn't see anyone jump in.

What I was going to suggest then is that the people who are on this call – RALO leaders – would be looking at this RALO document. Please add

your points on there. We then close it for direct editing, and each of the RALO leads would then be proposing it to their At-Large Structures for support or for commenting. So people can comment on it – no editing but just suggestions and commenting at that point. Once we’ve got that – I don’t know what the timing would be, and I would have to turn around over to Cheryl and to Holly to find out the time when this should be really finalized – then we can come back with a document from the RALOs.

HOLLY RAICHE: I’ll go first, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. In terms of drafting, Alan is absolutely right. We have to arrive at Copenhagen with pretty much the first draft done or close to done. That said, there is nothing to say that the RALOs cannot in fact have their own submission. We certainly will be looking at what is in the RALOs’ submission. Most likely, in the final ALAC submission, I will imagine that we would be referring a lot to the RALO document, if nothing else than to say to the powers that be that, in fact, we have gone out – we’ve gone out to our RALOs and our ALSs; this is not the Gang of 5 or the gang of however many.

So when we are going through the discussions that will happen in Copenhagen, it would be really useful to have as much as possible from

the RALOs available so we can work those comments into a close-to-final draft.

Cheryl, if you have any further comments.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Not at this stage, Holly. Thank you. I'm just keen to see that this work progresses. I also think that one thing that I noted Olivier had promulgated on an e-mail list that I would like to just reinforce is the option and opportunity to ensure that you get a degree of sign-ons, for the want of a better word, from the At-Large Structures and members for the outputs here. It's one of these times where I think a signatory list and a supporters list could be quite useful in your endgame. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Olivier, if I can add something to that before Alberto.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to ask Alberto Soto next and then Holly and then we need to close because interpreters are running over time at the moment.

ALBERTO SOTO: I think the RALOs will not really differ much on the different opinions. Something that we heard in yesterday's meeting is that I sent an e-mail requesting ALSs during the meeting and after the meeting. I was surprised by the number of responses; that is, the number of events and

[tasks] that they have one within our RALO is extremely important. And this is a history of only four or five years.

So I would suggest, because they're saying that they're things we haven't done and we have done these, that the other RALOs do the same thing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alberto. That's very helpful. Holly, a few last words.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a couple of last words. Yes, the more people can put into it, the more signatures are, the more effective this is going to be as a document, not from a few people but from the genuine At-Large community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Holly. Just to be sure, how long do RALOs have to ask their ALSs for input? When should all that be [read]? By Copenhagen or before?

HOLLY RAICHE: I am prepare to sit down at Copenhagen and put into the final draft any last comments. But clearly, the earlier we get something, the better. To remind people, there will be a drafting session. We will be working on what I hope is pretty close to the final draft at Copenhagen. So there is still an opportunity. The more we hear, the better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Alan Greenberg, last words.

ALAN GREENEBRG: Specifically, if you disagree with things or want an alternative opinion put in, the earlier the better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Last thing to check is the action item I see here: Staff to publicize Google Doc. Change Google Doc link to View Only.

No, it's: Change it to Comment Only. If you put it in View Only, people will not even be able to comment.

So that's it for the time being. Thanks to our interpreters for having exceeded their time by 18 minutes. Thanks to everyone who's been on this call. If you have any questions, comments, and so on, we're going to follow up by e-mail now with the links to the Google Docs. As I said, we'll leave the one for the RALOs completely open for editing for the next 24 hours. After that, we'll put it in Comment Mode Only, and then we can send it to our At-Large Structures.

Please follow up with them. If you have any questions on the document, don't hesitate to ask, both on the Secretariat's list, but also if you want to e-mail me privately, that's fine, too. Or e-mail any of the people, like Alan and Cheryl and Holly.

Thanks very much, everyone. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you all. The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]