
LARISA GURNICK: Good day, all. Thank you very much for joining today's webinar on Draft Report by ITEMS. I'd like to remind everyone to please mute your phone when not speaking by pressing *6. If you do need to speak, you may press *7 to unmute your phone. Once again, please mute your phones when not speaking by pressing *6.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I cannot mute myself. That's why I ask the operator to mute me.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Tijani.

Today's conference will be recorded. Welcome, everyone, and I'd like to turn the call over to Mr. Tom McKenzie for the presentation.

Mr. McKenzie, please begin.

TOM MCKENZIE: Hello, everybody. Before we start, I can see on the WebEX list of presenters that Tim McGinnis and myself are listed. It's Nick Thorne and Rosa Delgado who are the other two members of our team will also be speaking. So if necessary, can they be added to the list of presenters?

Welcome, everybody. Thank you for being here. This is webinar presentation for the ITEMS International 2016-2017 Review of the ICANN At-Large community. This presentation is primarily intended for the members of the At-Large community who have not yet had the

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.

opportunity to learn about or to comment on – if you’re watching this on the live stream – on the ongoing review process.

Over the next 40 or so minutes we’re going to present to you the main findings and recommendations of our review. The webinar will then be opened up for a Q&A session, and we particularly welcome your input, as I say, especially if you have not yet had the chance to comment.

I’m now going to go down –

Very quickly, just a quick reminder of what it is that we are doing as part of this review. There were two things which I think you need to bear in mind or it’s good to remind everybody, and the first is the purpose of reviews which is defined by ICANN Bylaws. Here today are three main questions which all organizational reviews have to answer, and they are, 1) whether that organization, council, or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure, 2) if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness, and 3) whether that organization, council, or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders. That’s for the purpose side of our review.

On the scope side, we were given more details in the contracts that we signed with ICANN, and so there were two additional items that were added, and that was that we should focus on the improvements resulting from the recommendations of the previous review which was conducted by Westlake Consulting in 2008, and 2) that we should focus more on the At-Large community – that’s to say the ALAC Regional At-Large Organizations, the RALOs, and the ALSes – which weren’t as

developed as they are today when the last review was being conducted. So the last review was on the ALAC per se. This review is much more focused on the At-Large community.

Our review process so far: What have we done? Starting in May last year we have conducted over 100 face-to-face interviews. We've also conducted a global survey for which we got 240 responses. And we have produced two reports: a draft report which we submitted on the 5th of December, 2016, which was for working party consideration. That then resulted in a period during which that working party had a few weeks to provide input and comments. And then on the basis of those comments, we submitted a second draft report for public comment which is the one that you should have been able to read. And if you haven't, then we'll provide you with the link. And this second report takes into account the comments of the Review Working Party.

Independent Reviews are a critical part of the life of the ICANN multistakeholder system and we are very pleased to have had this opportunity to engage with so many members of the At-Large Community and to carry out this review at a key juncture in the history of the organization and ICANN as a whole. As independent outsiders to the At-Large community our views are inevitably going to contrast, sometimes even clash, with the views of established members of the At-Large community. But that's, as far as we understand the system, is the point of the system. Some might say that it is about seeing the woods from the trees. We see this as a natural and healthy part of the review process – to challenge. That's our role.

What we would like to say is that what we have in common with the members of the At-Large community is a commitment to upholding ICANN's multistakeholder system, and at this stage in the review process we can unequivocally assert that we are also resolved to ensuring that the At-Large community is strengthened and assured of a secure and long future within ICANN.

That's where we are in the process. Now I'm just going to move the slide forward.

We would also like to say that as part of the review process as well as documenting input from members of the current At-Large community, we have also conducted a very significant amount of documentary research into the origins and development of At-Large community. And in particular, we have paid careful attention to previous attempts to organize the community to boost the membership levels, and we have paid very special attention to taking into account the lessons learnt as a result of these experiences.

That's there just a list of some of the documents that we have researched, including the one in the middle which is the Westlake Consulting 2008 [report].

Somebody's got control of the slides –

So, what have we heard during this process? To sum up what we have heard I would say that there is a very strong consensus, there is no question that At-Large plays a very central and important part within ICANN. This is a role that should be upheld and it should be preserved. However, there is also wide sense that we have heard that we have

been told repeatedly that the At-Large community has to a certain extent struggled in its mission to really, genuinely, represent the interests of end users within ICANN.

There's a sense, if you like, that the At-Large organization is run by an unchanging group of volunteers whose dedication is not in question – there's no question there – but who have been unable to build an organization that allows the significant numbers of end users of the Internet to become involved in ICANN policy processes.

What you see on this slide is just a small sample of the types of comments and stark differences of opinion that we have heard over the past 9 to 10 months. You can see from the red that the most sort of hostile comments through the yellow/orange where the sort of neutral statements about the community to the green who are the frankly enthusiastic comments about the organization. Some very stark differences of opinion from the different people we've spoken to.

Moving on... It's a little bit fiddly. Sorry.

One conclusion I think that we can draw from all these different statements that we have heard is that perhaps it would appear that At-Large has not performed as well as it might have been hoped originally. Genuine end user engagement in policy processes – we'll call it the "bottom-up" part of the organization – is scant. And global awareness – the "top-down" part of the organization – is poor. There may be different reasons for this and we have considered three hypotheses in our preliminary assessment of the organization.

The first hypothesis is the green square on your slide which is that the ICANN Mission – the ICANN narrow technical remit in connection with the DNS and the legal and technical complexity of the issues that are discussed within ICANN – may in part explain the low level of effective end user engagement within At-Large. It is such a technical set of issues that we are dealing with within ICANN that there simply aren't that many people around the world who are qualified to take part in these discussions. That is an entirely possible hypothesis.

The second is that At-Large has not attracted high levels of end user participation because established leaders have monopolized positions of power, blocking rotation and severely limiting the introduction of fresh thinking within the organization. That is another hypothesis, as I say, that we have taken into account.

The third hypothesis is that the At-Large organizational structure has just become too complex, and it's the structure of the organization itself that has become a barrier to effective end user engagement. And so we have had to ask ourselves the question: "Is the current ALS/RALO/ALAC model that is currently in place fit for purpose?"

To summarize our thinking about the hypotheses, is that most likely it's a combination of all three of these hypotheses and hence, our review – if you have been able to look through it – as you have seen, focuses on organizational, mission-related, and structural, aspects of the At-Large community.

So what have we concluded? These are our answers to the three questions which I referred to earlier that are the ICANN Bylaws

questions. “Does the At-Large community have a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure?” Our answer is yes – absolutely, unequivocally yes – it does have a continuing purpose.

“Is any change in structure or operations desirable to improve the effectiveness of At-Large?” Here again, our answer is unequivocally yes. And we will come to the details of what we are proposing a little bit later in this presentation.

Thirdly, “Is At-Large accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders?” And here our position is, “Not yet.” We are aware that a lot of work has been going on in this area but we are not yet convinced that At-Large really is truly accountable to these different constituencies. Again, our review looks into ways in which we will help to enhance the accountability of the At-Large organization.

Now, what we have produced is an extended draft which includes 16 recommendations and one overarching recommendation, which we call, “The Empowered Membership Model,” and which is a proposal, if you like, for a bold, structural, reform of the At-Large community. It’s a reform which is aimed at facilitating end user input into At-Large processes and increasing the overall accountability of the organization. We have coined our model “The Empowered Membership Model” and Tim is later going to give you an overview of the main functional aspects of the model in just a few minutes.

There were 16 recommendations. It would take far too long – more time than we’ve got as part of this webinar – to go through all 16, so

what we have decided to do is to take out the four most emblematic recommendations that we have proposed and to present them to you. That is what Nick is going to do now.

Nick, over to you.

Nick? Can you hear me? Hello?

[LARISA GUERNICK]: Nick, if you're trying to speak, we cannot hear you.

TOM MCKENZIE: Okay. We'll just wait a second. Otherwise we will be [inaudible].

NICK THORNE: Tom, I've just dialed in. Can you hear me now?

TOM MCKENZIE: Yes, we can hear you now. Good.

NICK THORNE: Good. I'm having to do this on the telephone. Forgive me. My Adobe seems to have gone wrong.

Tom, I followed what you were saying and thank you very much. First of all, a little preface to our main recommendations and my introduction of them. To repeat and re-emphasize some points about the approach that the ITEMS Team has adopted. We went to considerable lengths to

listen to, and where appropriate, take account of the large number of comments received upon the first draft of our report from what turned out to be an enlarged Review Working Party. Most of these comments came from a relatively small group of very experienced individuals with strong views on a variety of subjects, with great [thought] for their input. And you will see from this second version of our report just how many of their comments we have taken on board.

We are conscious that a similar process has been going on in parallel with this public comment period led by the same group of individuals with the same strong views and well-entrenched interests that [promote] so much criticism during our interviews and the survey.

We also note that this process has been driven from the top down rather than led from the bottom up. We continue to hope that this public comment period will elicit input from a wider ICANN audience, but the current process leads us to reiterate a few key points about our own role.

First, we are independent and have done our very best to be objective. Our recommendations are based upon what we heard in our interviews and the results of our survey enhanced by our own quite broad experience. So please don't shoot the messenger.

It was always unlikely that we would agree with those who have been debating many of these primarily organizational issues for years within the At-Large community without any great reforms being agreed let alone implemented.

This is the first time the overall structure of At-Large has been reviewed. The previous exercise conducted by Westlake in 2008 looked only at ALAC proper. Westlake made a significant number of, in our view, valid recommendations a majority of which did not make it past the combined influence of the then At-Large Leadership and the Board Committee. In short, that report was emasculated. Indeed, some recommendations were added including the creation of an At-Large voting member of the Board which was not recommended by the Westlake Review Team.

Within ITEMS, our overriding objective has been to increase bottom-up participation in At-Large while imposing a more healthy rotation among an entrenched leadership group through the imposition of term limits – unpopular with some but hardly radical.

In order to implement these recommendations we suggest the creation of a new mechanism – the Enhanced Membership Model – which among other things removes many of the barriers to initial entry which feature in the current system. Tim will explain this later.

There's always a balance to be drawn between new blood and experience. We value experience and have consequently created the mechanism of an "Elders Council" to pass on wisdom to the newcomers who we believe will more accurately reflect the views of current grassroots opinion.

Of course there are dangers when you bring in new blood and open up possibilities for a wider membership. And yes we are conscious of the potential dangers of so-called "capture," but new blood and ideas must

be allowed and indeed must be encouraged to keep the system healthy. We believe the mechanism we have proposed is unlikely to be captured by any one group.

So Tom, if you could move on to slide #9 please and Recommendation #7 where we are recommending that the existing system of internal working groups should be abandoned. Too much time is currently wasted on procedural matters. We believe that a revitalized ALAC should discipline itself to focus upon core policy issues where its advice is needed and can have a real impact. Internal working groups are a distraction and we believe they should be abolished.

When necessary, a volunteer should take responsibility for lead drafting on subordinate issues, but it's important to rotate this role. It should not always be one of the same small group which starts a draft.

Next slide please, Tom.

Slide #10 and Recommendation #11. We believe that the current system of ATLAS meetings at a global level should be discontinued and replaced by a rotating series of annual meetings around the regions. While ATLAS meetings have been generally welcomed, our survey shows that the organization and output could be improved. The anticipated increase in grassroots participation through the introduction of the EMM and creation of additional At-Large members risks rendering such global events unmanageable in terms of size.

Rotating annual regional meetings we believe should serve to increase grassroots awareness of and interaction with the wider ICANN community, encourage more timely and issues-based

recommendations, and enhance the overall ICANN outreach performance by integrating ALMs into the outreach program.

We recognize there may be a need to examine financial impact of these changes in the longer term. We'll come to this later. We have some ideas in slide #13 below.

Next slide please, Tom.

Slide #11, Recommendation #12. We would like to encourage RALO participation in existing external regional meetings. In addition to the rotating annual regional meetings linked to ICANN meetings – which I mentioned before – the global At-Large community should, we believe, continue to put a high priority on participation in external regional events. As part of their annual outreach strategies and in close cooperation with ICANN staff and other I-star organizations – we believe particularly ISOC and the RIRs – the five RALOs should augment their existing participation in established regional events involved in the Internet Governance ecosystem.

CROPP and other appropriate funding mechanisms should be used to support the participation of At-Large members in such events. It's important that this increased activity should be coordinated with the overall ICANN outreach strategy.

Next, Recommendation #15, slide #12 – Tom, if you would. I'm having to fight with my screen to get these things up there, not necessarily easy when you're not on Adobe.

Membership of the Cross-Community Working Group and gaining access to the funds generated through the new gTLD process. We are conscious that some work has already been done in this area, but we think it is important to establish substantive ALAC membership of the Cross-Community Working Group which will manage the distribution of these newly available funds. ALAC should also initiate direct discussions with the ICANN Board about using a proportion of these funds to support revitalized At-Large activities. We are conscious that this will be a new move, but we believe it's essential for At-Large to make sure that it's involved in this important new funding mechanism.

Next slide please, Tom.

Here we are dealing with outreach. We have yet to draft our recommendations on this important area. We're conscious that a good deal of effort has already been put into the outreach program both by At-Large staff and ICANN staff and At-Large itself. We're deliberately seeking now in this public comment period the widest possible input of opinion and ideas to contribute to what we will recommend. As things stand, our aim is to build upon the current Best Practice which seems to be in the Asia Pacific region, building upon examples like the recent APRICOT meeting in Saigon which I think is still continuing. But there are other examples including in Latin America. We should put particular emphasis on the need for stakeholders and staff to cooperate in creating an effective outreach program with an enhanced role for At-Large in fulfillment of their initial mandate.

I think that is the end of my contribution so I will now pass over to Tim to explain the Empowered Membership Model.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you, Nick. Can you hear me?

NICK THORNE: I can.

TIM MCGINNIS: Great. Greetings from Ho Chi Minh City. I'd like to talk to you about the [reformulated] functional model of At-Large which we call the "Empowered Membership Model" or the EMM.

When we envisioned the EMM, one of our [inaudible] was to empower At-Large members to participate in At-Large. The Review Team identified barriers to entry as a main issue. So by simply removing barriers to participation, we hope that more people will become involved in At-Large.

We don't anticipate a massive influx in the number of people involved in At-Large processes as some have feared, but we do expect a significant increase and we do expect that the currently engaged members will continue to participate whether as individual At-Large members or as is the current status quo being the ICANN specialists for a group.

Currently, Regional At-Large Organization leaders – normally a Chair and Vice Chair – hold a completely separate role from that of the ALAC or the At-Large Advisory Council. We've combined the RALO and ALAC roles in the Empowered Membership Model to allow for tighter integration between the regions and ALAC, amongst other benefits. We

have heard feedback that it would be impossible to fill these roles with people who can do both the RALO and the ALAC, but our vision is that RALO Leadership is simply meant to oversee or coordinate outreach not to do all of the outreach themselves.

Similarly, ALAC members do not have to be involved in policy work themselves [in] other parts of ICANN. Instead, they will rely on what we call “rapporteurs” to report the status of working group policy making from other Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees. In fact, the EMM prohibits ALAC members from being on working groups so as to lighten their work load. As noted in the draft that’s out for public comment now, this also frees up 10 travel slots for rapporteurs which I will talk more about on the next few slides. Once we combine RALO leadership and the ALAC seats, it frees up these travel slots for rapporteurs.

On the voting rights of the EMM, we’ve designed the voting system of the EMM so that hordes of people can’t join just for the purpose of voting. In other words, only active ALMs or At-Large Members are able to choose their RALO leaders who sit on the ALAC. We have purposely left the methods for tracking these voters unspecified so as not to micromanage staff who will be empowered to carry out this role.

Tom, can [you give me] next slide please? Thank you.

Slide #15, the basic organizational structure. Basically the same sort of structure. In the current status quo on the left-hand side of the slide you see the current organizational chart of the At-Large community, and it’s quite simply to the bottom-up, people make organizations who make up

RALOs who elect people to ALAC who advise the ICANN Board. On the right you see a graphic representation of the EMM which features a merger of ALAC and RALO Leadership in #2 on the slide, and on the bottom, the EMM introduces this notion of “At-Large Members” or ALMs who can be individuals or groups of individuals acting in concert as today’s ALSes do.

In other words, today’s ALS can become an ALM and participate in At-Large in much the same way they do today with one person representing the larger group carrying policy ideas and feedback to and from the group. It’s important to note that today’s ALS can decide if it wants to continue to act in this manner or have multiple people become ALMs from that group. And we’re, of course, leaving that choice up to each ALS.

I spoke briefly on the last slide about the role of the 10 ALAC members from the regions, each having two roles. They have two and only two. So it’s also important to note now that the five ALAC members who are selected by the NomCom also have two hats and only those two hats. So it’s the five ALAC members chosen by the NomCom will in addition to ALAC duties each be a liaison to a different Advisory Committee or Supporting Organization.

The little black box which says, “NC” on this slide on the right hand side next to the #2 represents these five liaisons to ASO, GNSO, GAC, ccNSO, and SSAC. It’s envisioned that these liaisons do not, though liaisons keep ALAC informed of the big picture of activities within each SO or AC, [advice] can be worked on in a timely manner within ALAC.

We've heard the feedback of the Review Working Party [inaudible] of finding suitable candidates to act as liaisons but we are confident that with additional criteria being specified to the NomCom, the NomCom can and will choose persons who are up to the task.

We find the objections to these new liaison roles – which is just an expansion of the current liaison system – to be another example of the barriers to participation or gatekeeping that plagues the current At-Large community.

Next slide, Tom.

The basic functional aspect of the EMM is fairly simple. When a prospective At-Large member expresses interest in At-Large, they will be referred to the RALO leader who will provide information about opportunities to become involved in At-Large – #1 on this slide. We also see that staff will have a role in the intake of new ALMs by creating and maintaining a “Welcome” pack of online materials. So these new, or even the existing ALMs, can participate in either outreach and engagement efforts within a region if they choose or they can focus on policy work or they can do both. That's #2 on this slide. [Inaudible] policy work will report on the state of working groups to ALAC as rapporteurs – and I'll go into that in more depth in the next [inaudible]. But it is important to note that all ALMs – At-Large Members – who are engaged in Policy Working Groups are expected to be [rapporteurs], even though they may not be [inaudible] a travel slot. That's #4 on this slide.

In other words, all ALMs are potential rapporteurs. In the final version of our report we may actually change the term of the rapporteurs which is now one year, we may change that to one meeting so that ALAC can be assured of consistent reporting from ALMs. But it's important to note that the policy work of ALMs and rapporteurs can be done entirely remotely if needed.

As I mentioned before, active ALMs participating in policy work or active ALMs doing outreach and engagement in the regions will be the only ALMs – At-Large Members – to be granted a vote in the RALO/ALAC election. And that's #3 on this slide.

This role nullifies the fears that many have that anyone on the Internet can vote for ALAC members.

Next slide please, Tom. Thank you.

So the policy advice work flow in greater detail is on this slide. We've aimed to strengthen and simplify the policy role of At-Large with the creation of [this] Empowered Membership Model. And this slide just simply describes that work flow.

We envisioned that At-Large Members will participate in ICANN working groups – #1 on this slide – in slightly greater numbers than is currently the case, largely due to the elimination of the focus on internal processes in At-Large. In other words, the EMM turns At-Large to look outward at other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees instead of inwards towards its own processes.

The policy work flow of the EMM is that these ALMs and rapporteurs participate in working groups – as a green arrow – and report to ALAC as rapporteurs – #2 on this slide. ALAC can then provide feedback to the working groups via the ALMs or rapporteurs – represented by the purple arrows on this slide. In this way, ALAC will have a greater and earlier set of information on potential advice that may needed to be formed – that’s #3 on this slide – and also give input to working groups early on so that ALAC views may be incorporated into working group policy making at an earlier stage. This will hopefully result in a lighter work load for ALAC.

This feedback loop on policy is a crucial part of the EMM and is something that we note that At-Large has been already trying to implement.

Next slide please, Tom.

LARISA GURNICK:

Tim, I’m sorry to interrupt. People are having trouble hearing you. Your audio is a bit choppy. This is really important information. I’m wondering if you could pause and see about a better connection.

TIM MCGINNIS:

Okay. I’m dialing in from the APRICOT meeting in Saigon, and I’ve found... Go ahead, Tom.

TOM MCKENZIE: If you want I can just for these two slides – because in fact, Tim has nearly got to the end of his block of presentation – so I could, if you like – I have your notes in front of me, Tim – just run through these two slides and then before we hand over to Rosa and conclude.

TIM MCGINNIS: Go ahead.

TOM MCKENZIE: Okay. So what Tim has just described is the work flow process within the EMM which includes at certain small points the use of random selection for certain elections. Currently the At-Large elections and selection processes take up really, as far as we can see, a great deal of time and energy of At-Large folks. And that’s what we wanted to address. It’s time and energy that we feel can be better spent on policy advice and outreach – the main function of the At-Large community.

So the EMM includes a representative, democratic, component which is the election of ALAC members by active ALMs as well as these random selection methods for other roles as and when needed. What we think this is, is that these streamline selection processes will not only free up time but above all, remove much of the politics from the election processes within At-Large.

I’ve noted previously, enfranchising only active ALMs – that’s to say ALMs that have either been active in policy advice processes or active in outreach and engagement activities – and we define what we mean by “active” in our report – so enfranchising active ALMs rules out the

massive organized, what you might call “electioneering” in choosing rapporteurs as we’ve just described as the use of a random selection process is only used in case of multiple volunteers for a single rapporteur role.

Very simply, what that means is to say that for one working group, if you have one person who volunteers to be the rapporteur, that person will become the rapporteur. If there are two candidates – volunteers for the position of rapporteur – a random selection mechanism will be used to determine who will get the position, become the rapporteur for that working group. That eliminates all attempts to influence the outcome of the decision.

This eliminates the need for complex electoral processes and electioneering for these roles. In other words, if more than one person for a specific working group, as I’ve just said, this mechanism will be used.

As noted earlier, in our final version of the Review Report we may decrease the rapporteur role term to one meeting. That’s to say that they will only be appointed to report on the work of that working group that they have been following for one ICANN meeting. Up to now, our thinking has been that rapporteurs would attend ICANN meetings for a cycle of three meetings.

So what we’re proposing isn’t actually very new. We’re proposing to use an RFC-like random selection mechanism which is in use in various parts of the Internet technical community, and so this is really not a departure from the norm.

We have also eliminated the multi-month, multi-internal body, highly complicated Board selection process with a much more streamlined system that also involves a random selection component which we describe in our report.

We understand that the use of random selection to do the final selection of a Board member may be controversial, but in the current version of the report we have stipulated that all candidates for a Board position must be experienced in At-Large and that the NomCom will filter the pool of candidates. So we're calling on the NomCom in the first instance to filter the pool of candidates so that only those highly vetted candidates will be eligible to enter the random selection pool. This will remove a great deal of political intrigue in At-Large that we have heard of and which has been, as far as we can see, quite detrimental to its efficient functioning.

In addition, it has been made clear from the start of the review that the At-Large Board member does not actually represent the interests of the At-Large community, as their primary role is to represent the interests of the ICANN organizations to the whole. So that's for us an additional reason why this random selection mechanism is justified in this instance.

If a Board member does not, indeed cannot, represent a community that elects it then the choice of who is selected becomes less important. We find that the At-Large community has a shared norm that the Board member selection is the key political prize in At-Large. And we also find that the importance placed on this political process detracts from the actual work of At-Large.

We are now coming pretty much to the end of our presentation, and on this final slide we would just like to illustrate to you, to show you, the impact that our model will have on travel funding. We understand that equitable travel funding is an issue that is sensitive to the At-Large community. So what we've done is we've created a [inaudible] – what we've done is we've created a [inaudible] where travel funding is spread across a greater number of people through the year instead of being simply concentrated as it is today on RALO and ALAC Leadership positions.

If you look at the top row of this slide, what you see is the current distribution of travel slots among the ALAC on the left, the ALAC NomCom – people in black in the middle – and the RALO Leadership on the right. The difference with the EMM – If you look down to the bottom part of the slide – is that you have the same ALAC NomCom members representing 15 slots, and suddenly what we open up is 10 slots for what we have just described is the rapporteur roles. In other words, the people representing the work of the ICANN working groups on which they have been working.

So there, those last 10 slots on the bottom right hand corner of this slide – those are your Internet end users that suddenly find themselves being able to benefit from these travel slots. And what we expect is a much bigger turnover of people attending ICANN meetings

While we wish we could increase the number of travel slots, the overall number of travel slots ideally would be what we would like – and we address this as a recommendation in our report – it's the merger, the combining of ALAC and RALO Leadership roles which frees up 10 travel

slots which will allow a much greater number of people to stay actively engaged.

We have also finally made a separate recommendation which is to suggest that the posting of all other opportunities for travel – the other mechanisms that are in place at the moment to allow At-Large members to attend ICANN meetings – that all these different opportunities – and there are many of them – are published in one single place on the ICANN page in the interest of greater transparency.

A final point here on this slide: the Council of Elders – which is the two travel slots on the right hand side at the bottom of the graphic – this is a new honorific role that we have included in the EMM that will ensure that the institutional memory is maintained. It is a simple way for those term-limited ALAC members to maintain involvement and it provides historical context. Those two slots at the end of the travel, they're reserved for the Council of Elders, as we have called them.

We hope that all this will lead to a much more active and focused At-Large community.

That doesn't quite yet conclude our slide presentation, but this is the final slide. And for this I would like just to turn over to Rosa if you are there just to talk us through this slide before we open it up for [inaudible].

ROSA DELGADO:

Hello. Can you hear me? Hello?

TOM MCKENZIE: Yes.

ROSA DELGADO: Hello. Can you hear me? Yes. Okay, thank you.

First, this slide is the anticipated impact of Empowered Membership Model. The Empowered Membership Model we have just described is intended, as the name suggests, to empower Internet end users who wish to become involved in ICANN policy making process via the At-Large community. It will do so [as] we have seen in a number of ways as listed on this slide.

Number one, on the left-hand side of the slide you can see #1, most importantly, by lowering the barriers to entry, removing the requirements to become a member of the ALSes we predict will result in higher rates of participation and [faster] renewal of ALAC/RALO Leadership positions.

Number two, incentives [included] voting rights for ALMs that are active in outreach and engagement activities or policy advice work will energize the membership base.

Number three, the universal implementation [limits] for RALO and ALAC Leadership positions will encourage an upward [outward] movement of At-Large members.

Number four, the integration of RALO and ALAC functions will remove an unnecessary functional layer in the current At-Large Structure.

Number five, the [inaudible] function will create incentives included travel [slot locations] for members of the At-Large community that had [acted] in the policy work.

Finally number six, [inaudible] easier access to ICANN working groups will result in higher rates of engagement and a faster rate of renewal of active community members.

Our proposal includes the use of simple metrics to measure the impact of EMM in terms of ALM participation in ICANN working groups and outreach and engagement activities. These metrics will be useful for future review of the At-Large community, and the At-Large community itself to measure impact of the EMM in the short, medium, and longer term.

That's all and thank you very much.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Thank you, Rosa. This wraps up our presentation of the review process so far. We would now like to open it up to discussion. Once again, as Nick said earlier, really this is the public comment phase of the review and so we strongly urge members of the At-Large community that have not yet had the opportunity to comment on the draft review documents that we have submitted and indeed any other participants in the webinar that are not part of the Review Working Party, we encourage you to speak up and ask us any questions that you may have. This stage of the review process is especially intended for you. It is the public comment period.

Finally, between us we speak English, we speak French, and Spanish, and so feel free to use any one of those languages to ask questions you may have. Thank you.

Larisa, over to you. Hello? Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much, the ITEMS Team, for your presentation. We're just waiting to see questions coming from the participants to start the discussion.

Please, go ahead. CW, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Hello. I didn't realize that the Chair had given us the floor.

Thank you very much, ITEMS. It was an extremely interesting presentation, and there's a lot very valuable in it. Just for starters I would say I actually do agree that At-Large and ALAC itself could spend less time on internal procedures and more time on development of policy, vis-à-vis the rest of the community.

I would also say that I have [inaudible] – we're not going to do that. Somebody's got their mic on and we're getting an echo. Somebody turn their mic off? Let's try again.

My first point would be about term limits. It is quite difficult to learn and understand the ICANN policy processes well enough to act effectively, and term limits have to be considered carefully and in my

opinion should apply on the same basis – whether it's three years or five years – across the whole institution. You cannot have a brand new user interest representatives with less than two years' experience trying to argue the case against the established interest of constituencies who are represented by people who have been in posts for five years or more. I'm in favor of term limits but they have to apply across the board.

Regarding individual membership, I think we should bear in mind that At-Large did not invent the system that we've got. I don't really appreciate the nuance in some of the public comments to the effect that it's somehow At-Large's fault [if] it's difficult to represent user interests in the structure that has been provided. We've got what we've got because the Board – I think we're going back to 2003 – because the Board expressly decided that they did not want individual members to have an influence over the organization, and notably to elect Board members.

I'm concerned that the EMM would fall between two stools. Many individual members would sooner or later – preferably sooner if they've been here before – sooner or later wonder what is the point of being an individual member of At-Large when the real objective ought to be to be an individual member of ICANN?

For the sake of argument, I'm personally neutral as to the merits of either case but certainly do now think that providing wider individual membership of At-Large solves the problem of insufficient representation of user interests in the ICANN Board. And from that point of view, I've never supported the idea that At-Large should have

one sole seat. The purpose of NomCom was to provide a majority of the Board that was primarily independent of the Supporting Organizations and representing the public interest.

I have many other smaller comments, but given the time available and the complexity of the documents – and if I may say so, the dutiful complexity of your slides – I defer and I may decide to contribute to the public consultation. But meanwhile, thank you very much to the members of the panel, some of whom I know personally. And congratulations on the work you’ve done. I do think that in some respects the proposal open up problems which would have to be solved in the future. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you for that comment. There’s quite a few people in the queue, so Tom and the ITEMS Team, if that would be alright with you I think we’ll go to the queue and give you a chance to comment at the end. Is that alright?

[TOM MCKENZIE]:

That’s fine.

LARISA GURNICK:

Very good. Then Khaled is next, then Tijani, Alberto, Ken, and Stephane.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you. I have several questions but I will ask only four of them. The first one, you are calling your system “Empowered Membership Model.” What are the powers you are giving to the members? I know that for the new ICANN Accountability mechanisms we called the community as “Empowered Community” because we gave them [seven] new powers. What are the powers you are giving to the members of At-Large?

Second question: you are proposing that the liaison will be appointed by the NomCom. It has never happened in ICANN. All the ICANN constituencies have liaisons between themselves but none of them is appointed by the NomCom. It is a new way [to see] the role of the liaison or the quality of the liaison.

Also, you proposed to involve the NomCom in the selection of the Board member selected by At-Large. As you know, the NomCom already selects [eight] of the Board members and the community selects the remaining members. You are proposing that the At-Large member sole member [is] selected or the Nom Com is involved in the selection of this member. Do you think it is [reasonable]?

Also, you propose to replace the At-Large meeting by regional meetings. That means that the whole At-Large community will never meet face-to-face together – only African people meet together, only Latin American people meet together, etc. Do you think it is a good thing for the community? [Inaudible].

LARISA GURNICK: Excuse me, Tijani. Sorry for interrupting you. Tijani, could we switch your phone line to better quality for sound? Please stand by one moment, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Is it better now, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: One moment, Tijani. We have an echo.

[TOM MCKENZIE]: If you want, maybe we can take some more questions or –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Is it better now, Larisa? [Slightly] better.

LARISA GURNICK: There is still an echo, Tijani. Maybe while we try to get you a better line we can go to the next person in line which is Khaled.

Khaled, please go ahead.

Khaled, we cannot hear you. If you're still interested in speaking please go ahead.

Okay. Why don't we try Alberto then? Alberto is the next in line I'm sorry for the challenges that people are having speaking.

Alberto, are you able to comment now? Go ahead please.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Can you hear me? Okay.

At the very beginning you talked that there's not too much participation because the structure is complex, it's a poor structure, and you said that ALAC is not accountable or is not clear or is not accountable at all. And sincerely, my first question: what are you suggesting for that accountability to be implemented or to be effective?

Then you talked about turnover, and in the rotation – I don't know. except two people for many years, the rest of the people is rotating without any problems.

Number three, participation of RALOs at external events or regional events – I don't know really where you get the information that the RALOs are not participating there. I may send – at least on behalf of LACRALO – a long list of ALSs' participation in regional events and we are coordinating with GSE. So really I cannot see the basis or the foundations [or] the rationale. I'm going to write this down in the public comments. Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Alberto. Next in line is Khaled. Are you able to speak now?

It seems like we're having some difficulties. How about Ken Stubbs?
Ken, why don't we try you now.

KEN STUBBS: Yeah, thanks.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you.

KEN STUBBS: Thank you very much. I have a couple of concerns. First of all, I see the comments about putting people on the Nominating Committee that have a limited experience or no experience with ICANN. I think it's extremely important that everyone who goes to the Nominating Committee is thoroughly educated on ICANN and also it's extremely important as part of this education process to ensure that those people that go the Nominating Committee remember, whether they like it or not, their principle obligation is to ICANN – not to the organization that sent them to the Nominating Committee. Their job is to select appointees that can best serve the interests of ICANN as a whole – not the interests of the At-Large or the registries or anything.

I've been on the Nominating Committee a few times and I see members like Glenn McKnight and Tom Barrett and Stephane have been on for a long time as well, and we've all seen instances where people voted what they felt was their principle obligation to the people who sent

them there rather than voting based on what the best contributions the organization.

I recognize this leaves a significant amount open for interpretation, but for somebody to get on there and you see a block of four or five people from a certain area of the world voting only for candidates from that area of the world, it sends a very bad message. That's why we have a very detailed evaluation process. Last year, Stephane did a wonderful job. And I've seen other former Chairs like Cheryl and so forth. So please remember that. It's not an esoteric endeavor. It's something that's very practical and should easily be managed within each one of the groups that comprise the At-Large membership. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much for your comment. Stephane, you're next. Please go ahead.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much. Hello. Can I be heard? Hello? I'm hoping.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes you can. Thank you. Please go ahead.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Perfect. Thank you. I'll agree with Ken's comments. Not the ones about me doing a good job obviously, but on the role of the NomCom. I think

it's important to get the role of the NomCom and the expectations of the At-Large community right.

This proposal – this was my point – this proposal I think is bold, it's obviously rubbing many people either the wrong way or raising questions. We're having a very, very, interesting debate in the chat which shows that the proposal itself has the merit of at least shaking the ground a little bit and making us all reconsider some of the things we've taken as givens in the past with regards to At-Large.

However, I think as many people have noticed or commented on in the chat, it doesn't feel finalized by any means. My questions to ITEMS was, what happens next in your view as reviewer? What would you like to see happen next? I understand the process once you've made your report is out of your hands. But I am interested in hearing what the people making these recommendations would like to see happen. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much, Stephane. I note that we have 11 minutes left. Tijani, do you want to finish up your comments quickly then we can give a chance to the ITEMS Team to provide some quick responses?

Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes. Thank you very much. My last question, perhaps you didn't hear my two last questions are the following: you want to replace the At-Large by the regional meetings which will make all the At-Large community

not to meet together face-to-face. They never meet face-to-face. Do you think it is [agreeable]? And the last question it is, you are proposing that no more At-Large working groups. This is very interesting. We would be the only one [inaudible] in ICANN that doesn't have their own working groups. Can you please explain? Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you, Tijani. Tom, before I hand it over to you, Khaled Koubaa also had a question: "In his personal capacity, I would be happy to hear more from ITEMS on how exactly the EMM will accelerate the policy work flow. This is not clear for me in this case."

And now I turn it over to you, Tom. Thank you.

TOM MCKENZIE:

Okay. We're going to divide these answers up between ourselves.

To respond directly to Khaled Koubaa's question about the policy work flow – Tim, can you just quickly remind us – you did touch on that during the presentation, but could you quickly remind us on how the EMM will fluidify the policy work flow?

TIM MCGINNIS:

Sure. The policy work flow bypasses the regions, as people have noticed in the chat with alarm, that RALOs no longer have a policy role. That's largely because naming policy is done on a global basis and not on a regional basis.

So if you eliminate one layer of bureaucracy from your decision-making process, you will of course speed up the process. But really what it is, is it's a feedback loop – so the rapporteurs take the information back to ALAC early on in the process, and the ALAC feeds back to the working group by the rapporteurs so that early on in policy processes the ALAC knows what's going on in a working group and vice versa. That's the main benefit in terms of the policy work flow.

But to answer Tijani's other question with a similar sort of answer: What kind of power does that give to members? It gives the power to participate much more easily and it gives the power of being a rapporteur so there are more opportunities to participate face-to-face and it opens up the sort of real potential, the power to participate remotely and only remotely if need be.

I think that the answer to Ken's question or statement is, the EMM does not address who gets on the NomCom from At-Large. That's not an issue that we heard a great deal of complaints about.

I'd like to address Stephane's question. He knows the process, he knows that once the public comment period we've got to produce our final report to the Board, and then it's out of our hands. But what I personally would like to see is that the community – not just the At-Large community but the Board and the entire community – take a look at this proposal with open heart and open mind and see that it does attempt – and probably does – solve many of the problems people have complained about.

I think that what I'd like to see is not a reflexive, defensive, attitude but an attitude where people are more willing to really take a look at it because I am not sure that everyone in the At-Large community has actually studied the proposal in depth.

TOM MCKENZIE: Great. Thanks for that, Tim.

Nick, there was a question about the world meetings and the getting rid of the effect that eliminating the sort of global ATLAS meeting would have. Do you want to speak to that?

NICK THORNE: Are you asking me, Tom?

TOM MCKENZIE: Yes.

NICK THORNE: Yeah, fine. Let me deal with two issues. First of all, Stephane's point if I may, just to reinforce what Tim said. I think what we hope to see is our proposals looked at seriously and not defensively and taken as a whole by the Board and hopefully by At-Large and the ALAC as well. We were very concerned to find out during this process just what had happened to the Westlake recommendations, and I very sincerely hope that this process of emasculation, death by a thousand cuts, doesn't happen to our report which is both objective and well-meant.

My second point, in response to Tijani's comment: Tijani, you're quite right, moving to a regular series of regional meetings for grassroots At-Large communities would replace a five-yearly or six-yearly – whatever it is – global meeting. Part of this is because we hopefully will have not a sudden rush but a significant increase in the number of ALMs and people actively participating in the At-Large process which would make bringing everybody together in one global meeting a huge affair. And I'm personally doubtful of the benefits of that. We think that moving to a regional series of meetings would bring more regular in-touch contact from grassroots to the ICANN system with a benefit that will transmit in both ways.

But my final point will be, if you look closely at our report you'll see that there's a note in there which says that, "Look, after we've tried this for one circuit of regional meetings, let's review whether or not a global meeting could still be worthwhile." So we are not saying it's dead and gone. We're just saying, Let's try something else in the medium term." Thank you.

TIM MCGINNIS: Tom, if I can jump in here.

TOM MCKENZIE: Yeah, sure.

TIM MCGINNIS: Another answer to Tijani's question is yes. We are not going to meet globally as a sort of Internet United Nations. That's not the Internet

model of policy making. But the point that he made about elimination of internal working groups – well, the GAC does have a few internal working groups but the SSAC and RSSAC, they don't have internal working groups and they are able to produce advice in a timely fashion that is sound and relevant. And that's what we hope for At-Large as well. Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much. With only one minute remaining, we're going to close this webinar. The recordings will be posted on the At-Large wiki and I also want to draw your attention to the fact that there will be another workshop with ITEMS on Wednesday, the 15th of March in Copenhagen, and the information and the links are posted in the action items box.

Thank you very much to the ITEMS Team. Thank you very much for such robust participation. And with that, I will say good-bye. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]