
GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party call on Wednesday the 1st of March at 21:00 UTC.

On the English channel this evening we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Barrack Otieno, Alan Greenberg, Vanda Scartezini, Avri Doria, Andrei Kolesnikov.

On the Spanish channel – or soon to join the Spanish channel – we have Alberto Soto, Aida Noblia, and Harold Arcos.

Apologies noted from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Bastiaan Goslings, and Aziz Hllali.

From staff we have Ariel Liang, Heidi Ullrich, Lars Hoffmann, Negar Farzinnia, Charla Shambley, Silvia Vivanco, Larisa Gurnick, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

We have Spanish interpretation this evening with David and Claudia.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking not only for transcript purposes but to allow the interpreters to identify you on the Spanish channel.

Thank you very much and over to you, Holly and Cheryl.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Gisella. Good morning, everyone. And the first item on the agenda that I am adding is just a reminder of the timeframes that we

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

are under which are actually very tight. As you all are aware, ITEMS's draft document for public comment has been released and the webinar was held on the 27th of February. We're now into March and this will be the final call on the working party before everybody heads to Copenhagen. So just a review of Copenhagen and then when our comments are due. We will be meeting – there are really two meetings scheduled as part of the ALAC schedule. The first will be on the Sunday the 12th at 11:00 to 12:45. We will be meeting with ITEMS on that day. We have a further meeting on Tuesday. It will be from 11:00 to 12:45 again, and that will be just a session for the At-Large community. It's not a closed but this is when we will be finalizing our comments, the ALAC comments, as a response to the review.

The dates from there – there will be the public comment closes on the 24th of March. So really the Copenhagen meeting will be almost the last opportunity we all have to work together for a final At-Large response to the review. After March 24th, ITEMS will issue a draft version of the final report to this working party. We expect mid-April but it obviously will depend on the public comments received. They will then issue a draft version of the final report which we will review and then ITEMS will submit a final report to the Board.

If you remember from the lovely schedule that Larisa has circulated, or rather I circulated on her behalf, that's really the beginning of the process. I've been saying this for some time. I'll say it again. After the Board receives that, then we have the final report. The Working Party Review will develop a report outlining its views which is why it's important for us to have a solid document we are comfortable with, with a way forward because that's going to be the basis of our review.

What will be included in our response to the Board will be some comments on whether the independent examiner identified procedural and structural problems based on fact. Do we agree or not? Does the report provide recommendations that address identified problems? Do we believe the different recommendations address identified problems? And are there any issues?

So a lot of that material is already in the draft that Alan has developed that is available and a link to that has already been provided to the working party. But all of that has to be drawn together first for our response which, as I say, we'll be finalizing in Copenhagen – or rather, we'll be close to finalizing. Clearly there's going to be some minor, probably just logistic, changes but we have to have something by the 25th of March.

That said, just a reminder of the timelines, we can now go into the actual discussion of the draft. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I wasn't planning to actually discuss the draft but I do want to elaborate on the timeline a little bit more. There have been a very large number of comments so far. Not from a large number of people but a very large number of substantive comments – some editorial and probably some substantive. I haven't looked at them in any great detail. And I'd like to propose the following: that is, specifically it's Wednesday right now, that we leave the document open until Friday morning and then lock it. I'll spend the next day or so integrating all of those comments into a new version and post it. Hopefully we'll get it posted

late Friday/early Saturday for another round and then do the same thing probably sometime Monday or early or late I'm not quite sure, for an extra revision. So we'll have a third version as we go into Copenhagen.

We have several sessions scheduled as you've already outlined, and I know Cheryl has a proposal. You weren't on the ALT meeting a few hours ago but she made a proposal which I presume she will echo here. Is Cheryl on the call?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes she is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I certainly am.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see you on top as a host, so I'll let Cheryl go into the details but essentially try to find some time late in the week to do a semi-final clean-up of the document and go from there. So if that sounds good, my only question is how are you coming on the draft of the introduction?

HOLLY RAICHE: I have outlined my draft but I want to actually finish reading what we're saying before I finalize it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Because the summary actually has to summarize what's in the report so I thought I'd actually figure out what was in the report first.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Using the term "finalize" at this point is maybe a bit premature but finalize the first draft.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Basically summarize and think through what is actually going into the submission and what should be saved for later. Cheryl, if you can report back from the ALT meeting?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Holly. That's fine. [Inaudible] actively and a volunteer within the At-Large community. Anyway, Holly, what I discussed with the ALT this morning – our morning – was towards the end of the Copenhagen meeting gathering two sets of new eyes to work with those of us that are engaged in the document drafting to date. Obviously yourself, Alan, Olivier, probably Glenn because Olivier and Glenn bring in particular skill sets from their regional work. I've spoken from Sarah from AFRALO. She's very keen to be a fresh set of eyes, and I would suggest Maureen because after all she's a published author. That we take probably about three hours which Gisella and I will somehow find, be creative, in Copenhagen towards the end of the meeting so that we can edit and

synthesize a document with a degree of not only readability but to certainly not look like a patchwork quilt but look like a uniform document. I think that's important at that stage to not [cut out] those of you who have invested significant amount of time in either text drafting or commenting, but to allow for an avoidance of the whole forest and trees thing.

I also think it's a good way of showing that the documentation is not the product of the party faithful – whatever it is you want to call the apparently intractable set of leaders who won't budge out and let anyone else do anything.

ALAN GREENBERG:

“Activists” was the word that was used.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Was that it? Yes. Sorry, my disdain keeps bubbling to the top. I'm trying to hold it down. I think it's also important to see that we have some fresh view on the document and ALT was supportive of that and I think it's something that I would like to suggest the Review Working Party ought to adopt.

You'll note the balance of people there say I didn't mention Leon. The balance of people there is a mix of Nominating Committee appointees, regional leadership, relatively new people, and those of us who are apparently entrenched and fossilized. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. My one comment, and that is the more people, the more words, the less gets done. I think [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, an editing and not a drafting exercise and you know damned well that the work we did with the single contract for the Mobile Telecommunications Industry that we can do it as a group. It just has to be driven properly, and I'm happy to bring my whip.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think both of us will need our whips. Thank you very much. And I would say probably I'm looking at the schedule myself, I rather suspect Wednesday or Thursday looks probably –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, don't try and second guess the schedule. That's a Gisella issue. That's very much... She is the magic.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. I would also, given that the item now is about discussion of the main comments. This is a question to Olivier. Have you heard back – because I've been watching what's been on your RALO website which actually looks very promising. Do you want to make a few comments on that before we go into discussion?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No. I have really nothing to say. We've got that first draft of the statement, and we've now pushed it over to our At-Large Structures. I understand that all RALOs are doing the same thing in their own way and we're now starting to see input directly from At-Large Structures and from our community.

I'm a little concerned of the timing, of course. We started I guess a little late but it's always too late [inaudible] but I'm hoping that our ALSes will also be looking at this over the weekend. I might fire another e-mail to EURALO mailing list towards the end of the week to remind people of this and get some more input. And I hope that other RALO leaders will do the same with their own community.

But the process, as I said, it's only this morning. I think it was this morning or was it yesterday that I told our ALSes – I'm losing the concept of time as well [inaudible]. So that's the current situation really and I've sent a copy of the e-mail to the Secretariat mailing list so if any of the Secretariats have not pushed the document yet to their own community, they can do so with the least amount of work and redrafting and so on.

That's really the only status that we're in at the moment. And, as I said, we're looking at purely a RALO perspective. So it will be very, very, useful what Cheryl is suggesting because obviously if we're going to have two statements sent to the public comment, we need to make sure that on the one hand they are aligned but we also need to make sure that they don't just repeat each other verbatim. That would just defeat the purpose and so being able to coordinate the two in parallel would really be great because we can certainly maybe address specific

points or emphasize specific points with one and emphasize specific different points with the other.

That said, I'll have to have a look at the timeline again because ultimately the RALO statement ideally we should get each RALO using their own procedures to endorse it. And as far as EURALO is concerned I'll try and see if we can have an actual vote on it so as to establish a very rough idea of how many people does that actually mean looking at the size of our ALSes, etc. So thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Olivier, and I suspect probably it's going to be very useful to have as a total submission something that is clearly ALAC but something that's clearly RALO to make the very strong point that it is RALO and that we have listened to the ALSes.

The final document will have that much – and when I say “the document” it clearly will probably have two parts. I think we can work through that but it heartens me that in fact that's going ahead and it can emphasize points that then we can deal with and perhaps just refer back to as long as we're not contradicting each other.

Is that a new hand, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It is. I try to take down my old hands even though my –

Anyway, two comments. One on Olivier's comments. It is important – I think he's correct – that the RALOs present a RALO perspective, but I

think it's also important that as we're crafting the ALAC document that we make sure that we have a perspective in the ALAC document of the RALO issues. I don't believe we want to present something as if the ALAC and the RALOs are living in different worlds. We certainly don't want them verbatim and just saying exactly the same thing. It's important that the ALAC one be aligned with the RALO one and have a couple of vignettes in it that are clearly RALO specific. And I think it already has some of that.

In any case, the other thing is – and I don't want to try to find a time here because that is something Gisella can do – but I want to put some constraints on it. The editing path clearly has to be with a reasonable gap of time after the final meeting that the working party and others will have – and that's Tuesday afternoon or Tuesday morning or possibly afternoon. We have a slot in the afternoon which could be used for it if necessary if we have to go over. And it probably should be, if at all possible, before the wrap-up session which is Thursday afternoon or late Thursday morning just before the Open Forum.

So Wednesday hopefully is a time. We don't have any meetings scheduled unique to us as working groups and RALO meetings scheduled. But there's no ALAC formal meeting scheduled, so hopefully if we can find a few hours there, that will be optimal.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just let me finish for a moment.

GISELLA GRUBER: No. This is Spanish interpretation. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm sorry.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry. Technical issues here. I'm sorry to interrupt you. If we can just have one minute just to redial the Spanish channel. They are hearing the interpreters very faintly and the interpreters are having issues. So we're just going to drop the lines and redial the Spanish channel and we will be back with you in a few seconds. Thank you. Apologies for the inconvenience.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will keep quiet until then.

HOLLY RAICHE: Hum your favorite song or something for a little while, while we wait.

GISELLA GRUBER: I was humming a very nice African one just now.

There we go. They're all back. I'll spare you the African [inaudible] and you may continue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can go on to my favorite African song since we're going to Johannesburg in a few months, but I won't sing it for you all right now.

And I was going to suggest that probably optimally, Cheryl, I think you were talking about several hours and two sessions with a sort of gap between them are probably optimal than trying to do for three hours in a row.

Anyway, that was my only comment on constraints and I will be quiet now for a little bit.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Now we don't have any further hands. I would be interested to know from anybody if you've read the document and how you think the document reads, and if you have any further comments. I know that Vanda has had some further comments that I have just seen recently. I'm not sure that there's any more.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a new hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: Shall I turn the meeting over to you?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

HOLLY RAICHE: Why not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Because I've already run too many meetings today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Holly. Just a second. If I may, Holly. It's the difference between contributing to the meeting and chairing the meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't remember the question anymore now. What would people think of the document? If you've looked at the Google Docs recently, you will see there are an infinite number of comments. So I'm not sure people can make comments on how well it reads right now. The number of changes is vast, or suggested changes anyway. It's the content at this point we really need to get. So from my perspective, I'm less worried about people editing the document than putting comments in saying, "You didn't mention something, stupid." We need to mention it.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think this is a call for saying at the last minute, if anybody has not put their hand up... Well, hasn't actually contributed, please do so. That's really why I'm also very keen for Olivier to continue with the RALO because I think there's some really good comments coming out of there and I think that will be a really useful perspective to gather that will give an added dimension to what we have to say. So I'm very keen to see what they have.

Is there anything else that anyone else would like to comment on? And when I say the "draft report" which is in the agenda, remember we've got a Google Doc and we've got what Heidi has done very happily is you've now got links to both the Google Docs and the other Docs. There now can be accessed at the same time. There's also the RALO document which is coming along nicely. Thank you.

So we are actually fielding an awful lot of comments and I think the challenge is going to be as much getting our heads around what everybody has said and making sure that it's all reflected in either the RALO document or the ALAC document.

I don't see anybody having any further comments to make and I suspect everybody is just... It's more important that you contribute to the comments than actually we talk about them. So we can have a really short meeting and I can just say, "Look, spend the rest of the time going through the documents and seeing what you think needs to be said further. Is there any point that has not been made? And I would say that I have been assiduously collecting all of the e-mails where people have made comments that aren't reflected in either of the documents. So I think all of that will wind up in one of the documents.

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was actually trying to stop clapping, not raise my hand, but I'll talk anyway since you've called on me. I'll just echo what I said in the chat. What we really need right now is what's missing. What strengthens our argument? And if there's anything blatantly wrong then we need to identify that. If there is anything in our comments that the reviewers, the ITEMS people, can identify as, "We don't know what we're talking about," no matter how small, if we use as the thin edge of the wedge to discredit a lot of the other things we're saying.

As an example, there was something in the RALO document about, "We don't need a Travel dashboard because it's already there." But the Travel dashboard that's already there doesn't have certain things in it. So I added a comment just to make sure the people drafting it were aware of that. And we really want to make sure this is absolutely iron clad. Thank you.

And to the extent people can come up with wording that makes it sound less like we're being defensive, that would be useful, too. I'm not really good at that.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Gisella, you have your hand up? No. She doesn't have her hand up. Okay.

I agree with Harold to propose new alternatives or improve on them. Do have a look at what we're saying, and if you can have a better response, please put it in.

Vanda, go ahead please.

Vanda? Is Vanda talking? It's down now. Okay.

If we've got no further comments, my... Vanda and Harold are typing.

If we've got no further comments, I would suggest that aside from working on the draft it's really going to be important for those who are involved in the RALO responses that Olivier, if you can oversee that so that we have a very strong response from the RALOs that we can look at, work with, as part of the ALAC response. When I say "as part of," clearly [a] separate from but the points that you made are absolutely correct, that they are sympathetic to that they don't completely contradict each other. So we'll probably need to have a look. What Alan suggested was we close the ALAC response on Friday but Olivier, from what I'm hearing you'd like to keep the RALO documents open for longer than that. Is that right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Holly. I think that if we can leave it over the weekend that would be helpful because we've only shared it in the past 24 hours with our wider ALS membership, and it would be for those ALSes that have not been paying much attention to this, it would probably be a good idea to send them a reminder on Friday and then give them the weekend to spend a little bit of time on this document until we close on Monday.

HOLLY RAICHE: Good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: At least freeze on Monday and update the document according to what we have there.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Thank you. We've got Alan and then Cheryl. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear, I was suggesting that we freeze the document, close it, whatever, but then it would be reopened again once we got a clean version out of it. Hopefully 24 hours or not too much longer than that afterwards and then there'd be another gap of perhaps two days where it was open again. Just to be clear.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Cheryl. Go ahead please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Holly. Yeah, Alan's picked up on one of the points I wanted to raise and that was [it's a] freezing and thawing activity and I think that's a very important part of final production on this type of documentation. But I'd also want to note is some concern from the regional perspective

this opportunity for input and reaching out to the At-Large Structures for APRALO is particularly badly timed because of the APRICOT meeting running throughout this same period. Yes, APRICOT doesn't technically finish until Thursday this week with the APNIC meeting. But then there's extensive travel, etc. By the time people get to their e-mails, this is going to be reminder somewhere in 600 or 700 e-mails, a lot of people's mailboxes.

That timing does concern me as well specifically from an Asia Pacific point of view. That said, if we just recognize that limitation and I'm sure Olivier will be very sensitive to that as well, this is not the last bite of the cherry. So we just need to make sure that we can do as much as we can when we can while we can. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl. Heidi's question in the chat: "Should the original plan for freezing and thawing continue as initially stated?" And the answer is yes. And if that can actually make its way into the action items, I'd be very grateful. Thank you.

Cheryl, is that an old hand or a new hand?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's an old hand and it's a hand that's seeming to be resistant to me [setting] down. I'll keep working on it though.

I think I finally bludgeoned it into submission.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Well done. Okay. I think at this point in the meeting we're really [up to] the next steps – the expectation for Copenhagen. I think I've gone through the timeline. We have got, as you know, there are two meetings on the ALAC calendar and there is the public meeting as well. I didn't – which I expect everybody will attend – but the actual things on the ALAC calendar will be our meeting with [them] on the Sunday and then our own meeting to work through with a draft and we will be in, as we've agreed this morning, we will also be looking at drafting and the action item on Gisella is to find some time for actually working on and drafting a response. A reminder that the comments are due the 24th of March. So we don't have a lot of time left.

If there is nothing else, all I can say is everybody spend the spare time you've got which is... Alan, okay. Go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. With regard to the public meeting, you said you hope we'll all attend. As it is currently scheduled, it conflicts with the Auction Proceeds CCWG which means five of us will not be there – four ALAC members plus Vanda. I have suggested that it might be able to be moved to a Monday session. I don't know what the status is but maybe Larisa can enlighten us.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Alan. Yes. I can provide an update. A formal request has been made to do exactly what Alan suggested, is to move the session from Wednesday to the recently opened up slot on Monday. Because of the timing and how late it is in the process, the meeting strategy

requires that this go through a set of processes and approvals, and that's where it's at. We expect to have an answer hopefully by end of day tomorrow. And as soon as we know we will let you all know.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is a slightly shorter session if I remember correctly, although maybe it's extendable. I'm not sure.

LARISA GURNICK: It sounded to us like the priority was the more visible, less conflicted, session on Monday. So we'll [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The session cancelled was a high interest topic so it has particularly little, a few things against it.

LARISA GURNICK: Exactly. So that's the game plan and as soon as we know, we will confirm what the outcome is. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, and for those who are not reading the chat, Lars is suggesting 11:00 to 12:45 which would be a really good slot. So if that's possible, that would be great. And Larisa, if that's confirmed, that would be excellent to let the working party know so we can simply put that in our diaries as yet another time. And Gisella, obviously we'll be looking

forward to whatever time you can find for drafting which is really going to be a task for all of us in the working party.

Okay. If there are no other items – Cheryl, do you have anything else or can we give people a 20 minute break?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm happy to wrap it up, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Larisa, is that an old hand?

LARISA GURNICK: Yes it is. I'm sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. That's okay. Thank you.

Thank you, everybody. We will see everybody next week and in the meantime, particularly for the RALOs, if you can – Olivier just oversee any final contributions that would be really useful so that we can arrive in Copenhagen with some really good input – and if you haven't inputted, please do so. Otherwise, you've all got 20 spare minutes. Thank you. And thank you, Alan. Thank you, everybody. And the meeting is adjourned.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, everyone. As Holly said, the meeting is adjourned. We're giving you 22 minutes of your life back. Thank you to the interpreters and the audio will now be disconnected. Thank you for joining today's call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]