EVIN ERDOĞDU:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party ITEMS and MSSI Team call on Wednesday the 26th of April, 2017, from 18:00 UTC to 19:00 UTC.
	Today on the call we have with us Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Rosa Delgado, Holly Raiche, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Kaili Kan, Tom MacKenzie, Nick Thorne, Eduardo Diaz, Vanda Scartezini, Angie Graves, and Aida Noblia.
	We have apologies listed from Bastiaan Goslings and León Sanchez.
	On staff we have with us Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, myself, Evin Erdoğdu, Charla Shambley.
	On Spanish interpretation we have Marina and Claudia.
	I would like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record and also for transcription purposes.
	With that, I'll turn it over to you, Cheryl and Holly. Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Evin. Ready, Holly?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Good morning. Just to note, you needed to list Tim as being there as well. That was in the chat. Okay.

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.

Thank you. Good morning all. This is I think the final call of the working party. Today's call is basically to go through the draft final report of the ITEMS Team. This will begin with a short presentation by Tom and possibly by others on the team, and it's our final opportunity to work through any corrections or clarifications or talk through any changes that have been made since the last draft, the one that was put out for public comment. This is to ensure the final report does not contain any unexpected new information or for any final clarifications before the ITEMS Team puts their final report to the Board.

In the wrap-up, I will also review basically where we as the working party will go from here, but why don't we start with Tom, if you can give a brief overview of the final draft final report and in particular if you could highlight the issues that you believe that were raised in your review for ALAC and possibly a word or two on how your proposals will address those issues raised.

Over to you, Tom. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. Hello. I hope you can hear me.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

TOM MACKENZIE: Good. I think as far as we're concerned, we're getting pretty close now to the close of the review process. Generally speaking I would just say

that we've been very pleased with the way things have gone so far and we see this conversation as really, as you said, Holly, a final opportunity to correct, make any sort of factual corrections that may be there.

As we mentioned in the introduction to our final report, this review process has inevitably thrown up a number of issues on which we hoped and we were going to find some form of consensus with the Review Working Party, and I think to a certain extent we achieved that during the months that we were working together. There were inevitably also going to be areas of disagreement where we felt that you had made recommendations which reflected the concerns of the community as they had expressed them to us but which were going to meet with push-back from yourselves or from other members of the community.

So what we did in the last phase and in this phase was to try and be as fair as possible, taking into account all the very legitimate concerns sometimes which you had, and then to arbitrate on whether we were going to stick to our original recommendations, to modify some of them, to change the wording, or in some cases to merge some of the recommendations.

I'm not going to say much more just about process but I can just start now to answer your questions about the issues. But just before, I'll just take one minute just to say that the reviews, what the ICANN Bylaws ask of Independent Reviewers like ourselves to answer are three questions. The first is whether the organization or Advisory Committee or the Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee under review has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure. And to that question, the answer as far as we were concerned was very clearly yes. There was

absolutely no doubt from the people within At-Large but also across ICANN and even beyond, that the At-Large organization has a very important role to play in representing the interests of Internet end users. So there's no question there.

The two other questions are, if so, whether any change in structural operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness. And there we came to the conclusion that yes, there was a change in structure that was desirable to improve the effectiveness of the organization. And what we came up with were a set of 16 recommendations which concerned different aspects to do with the mission and the day-to-day running of the rules and procedures for the running of the organization.

And then, of course, we came up with our package of reform, what we called the Empowered Membership Model which was a comprehensive package of reform which, to our minds, represents a means of improving one of the biggest problems that is faced by At-Large which is how end users can become effectively engaged in the policy advice processes on one hand or the outreach and engagement activities on the other. I'll come to that in just a second.

The third question which is related to the second in ICANN's Bylaws is whether the organization, council, or committee that is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations, and other stakeholders. And there again we felt that there were measures that could be taken which would help the At-Large community to be more accountable – more accountable to end users but also more accountable to the ICANN organization as a whole. To put it shortly, that

accountability will come as the result of the increase in the number of end users that are able to participate in At-Large processes.

Those are the three questions which framed our entire thinking throughout this process.

Now to come to the issues, there were obviously lots of issues. It's a 100-page report and it would take us all day, night, to go through all the issues, but we have decided to narrow these down just to five overarching issues. Those were: 1) There was a strong perception that we felt from the different conversations that we had that there is an unchanging leadership within At-Large. Whether this is legitimate or not, this is a very widely felt concern across ICANN and even, to a certain extent, within At-Large itself. And so to that issue we made a certain number of recommendations about how you might increase the turnover and address this particular problem.

Second, the membership structure of At-Large. We heard from many people that there are barriers to entry. We understand. We looked into this at considerable length and from many different points of view. We understood that there was a need when the At-Large community was being established that you needed to have some sort of [inaudible] level for entry into the organization, but we felt that you still needed to reduce barriers considerably to make it a lot easier for end users to enter the organization according to an identical set of criteria across the board, whether you're in the United States, Latin America, or Africa. It should be the same for absolutely everyone – a level playing field for all end users. That's a simple statement to make, a difficult

implementation, but we feel that our Empowered Membership Model provides a practical way in which that can be achieved.

Third is outreach and engagement. We felt that really there has been lots of activity. It's an incredible number of activities that have been organized. But on the one issue, there's been a lot of focus on the ATLAS events that are organized every five years, and we provided a recommendation on how you might address that particular strategy for outreach and engagement and replace it with a more viable and cost-effective system of international events at a regional level.

Fourth is the issue of elections and accountability. Here we felt there is a considerable need for simplification. We were lucky enough to be able to observe how an election for your Board Director took place and we feel that there are measures that you could implement to make that process faster and simpler. I'll stop there.

And five finally – and that's where I'll stop – is that the At-Large, the community, has become too internally focused and we highlighted, as you know, that there are a very large number of working groups that have been set up which have caused the community to become very inward-looking, and we have proposed a number of measures which will allow, on the contrary, the community to become much more actively involved in the policy activities of the rest of ICANN.

I'll stop there. It was a brief introduction, as far as I'm concerned, but I throw it open to you for the rest of the conversation.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Tom, thank you very much. I think that was a really, really, useful overview. Part of me wishes that it happened three or four months ago. I think that actually encapsulates exactly where you're coming from and it certainly will make our response a great deal easier to write because I think we can write to those points.
	I'm going to shut up now and listen to other people. Cheryl. Let's start with you. Do you have any further questions, any further comments, before we open this up for discussion?
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thanks, Holly. Not so much a matter of commentary other than Holly, I wanted to draw your attention to some five points that Alan raised in his apology that he sent. There's a couple of topics Tom and ITEMS Team, that Alan very much doesn't want us to complete discussion on or indeed begin discussion on until he has the opportunity to join us. So there's a few particular matters that we would prefer to hold off on until Alan is able to join us. Obviously if he doesn't join us in the next 15 minutes then we'll run with them anyway. He has outlined in our chat with Holly and I what he wanted to raise. So we'll make sure that they are raised but we'll put them on hold. So if you wonder why we don't or try and skirt around one or two points or put them on later in the agenda, that's perhaps the rationale there.
	Do you believe then, Tom and Team, that you've had sufficient information provided to you from the public comment phase now that you have no errors or interpretive – I use my words carefully here – variability in interpretation from hearsay to fact? Olivier, for example,

did point out that in the At-Large Advisory Committee response to the draft report there was a reasonable amount of material – he quotes it as painstaking research – showing that the turnover of volunteers presumption as assumed by a community beyond ourselves is probably [foundless] if not patently false that you're comfortable listening to the hearsay and not with the facts as we present them.

The other thing I'd like to ask ITEMS to respond to is a little bit of administration assistance, I suppose, helping us understand how you dealt with the input from community in the public comment phase. In other words, was there any ranking or weight given to opinion from my great aunt Mary who can't spell ICANN versus another Advisory Committee? So if you could help us understand how you dealt with the process that's been going on since we met last, that would be great. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. If you want, I can take that just simply by saying that there were around 15 public comments that were made, which is not a huge number, but they were very lengthy comments. Together they were almost 100 pages of comments, from memory. There was a very large volume of comments which we had to go through, and we feel that it's almost our prime responsibility, our first kind of responsibility as reviewers is being able to distinguish between what is clearly just hearsay and what is a genuine criticism or comment of our report or any of our findings. And so we had to arbitrate on those.

Another tool that we were able to use, which was actually very handy, was that the ICANN staff prepared for us a summary of the comments which they put into a table and then used a color coding to indicate high or medium or low levels of support for recommendations mainly. So that was a useful tool that we were able to use when preparing the final draft.

And then, just a little point on method, if you like, what we did was that when there was a strong basically [public] consensus that things were sort of okay and the people were in general agreement with what we were saying, we didn't really do very much. We didn't add much. We just sort of left this document pretty much as it was. Where there was strong differences of opinion or push-back, we acknowledged this by inserting into the report blue boxes which you will have seen after the recommendations in which we say typically, "Well, okay. We see that you are worried that such and such a recommendation will have such and such an impact but we have decided to maintain it," and so we provided a small rationale after each recommendation in these blue boxes. That's to help you readers see how we proceeded. I'll just say that it would have made the report start to look very confusing to readers if we were going to be injecting all this kind of comments from the public in any other way than the way we chose to in the end.

That's really the method that we used. I hope you found that readable, clear enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. Yes. It's certainly very clear, but just to be absolutely clear in my mind, all of the public comments were taken at face value and treated equally.

TOM MACKENZIE: Sorry, is that a question?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Yes].

TOM MACKENZIE: If that's a question whether all public comment was taken at face value and treated equally, I think the answer to that is no. We looked at all of the public comments, but then there were obviously comments from people who had clearly understood what the subject of the report was about and the recommendation was referring to and those comments were treated differently.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tom. That's important and it's very important for those of us who spent many hundreds of hours in policy development work where we go through I would argue significantly more and leave [their] public comments at times. It is a difficult task and it's important for us to understand how ITEMS approached it. Thanks for that.

We've got a queue now, Holly. And I note that Alan has joined the call. So back to you, Holly, to manage the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you very much. In order we have got Tijani, Kaili, Alberto, Christopher, and we will put Alan next even though he hasn't got his hand up. I have got one question beforehand and I'm putting myself in the queue.

Tom, one of the comments that was made, and you've repeated it again, is essentially about the ATLAS. One of the responses we made was that not only is there ATLAS but there are lots of regional assemblies as well. I think there was a little bit of query in our minds did you actually look at the sorts of engagement that we have managed apart from the ATLAS including the regional and other regional events and what more do you expect or were you looking for in our response? Then I'll shut up. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE:

Okay, Holly. I think I'm probably going to hand this over to Nick if he's able to jump in. The only thing that I would say is that we were aware of the other regional activities that you are engaged in and we could see the value of those activities. Just recently, Tim – who could also speak to this – was at the ARIN meeting and we actually reported on that. That was a new addition to our latest report, adknowledging the activities that are taking place regionally. But if Nick perhaps wants to jump in and just say a word or two about the ATLAS strategy –

Nick?

TIM MCGINNIS: I can jump in while we're waiting for Nick just to affirm that when I went to [inaudible] for the African Internet Summit, we early on identified that was the first meeting we went to and we identified early on these regional meetings as being extraordinarily useful in terms of outreach and engagement. You want to expand on that, Nick?

HOLLY RAICHE: Nick does have his hand up.

NICK THORNE: Yeah, I'm happy to do so. I do have my hand up. Can people hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

NICK THORNE: Good. So yeah, we attended a significant number of alternative meetings around ICANN and beyond ICANN. Our approach to the ATLAS meeting was essentially colored by our own experience and most of us, I think, were actually there in both Mexico and certainly in London. We thought that it was more important and would be more effective to get the views of At-Large into the ICANN mechanism if you had more regular regionally-based meetings.

Part of that was that with our EMM model and the concept of the At-Large membership rather than the insistence upon having an ALS which we do see as being something of a barrier to membership, we think that

with a bit of luck there should be a greater input from the end user. And that we believe could be more usefully focused through regionally-based meetings.

Building up to… And you will note from our report that we did not – repeat – not exclude a full scale global ATLAS meeting. We suggested that this should be looked at after a certain number of years' experience – I think we said three in the end.

So to recap, yes, we saw external meetings. In a separate part of our report we have encouraged all regions of At-Large to improve their already good focus on those regional meetings outside of ICANN, but within the ICANN context we believe that more could be done through regionally-focused meetings. There is a review clause there which says, "Try it. Have a look at it. If it doesn't work, we'll look again."

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Nick. I think we'll go through – Alan has made a comment to that but I think we'll go through the people who've put their hands up and we can get back to Alan's point. But Tijani's had his hand up for some time.

Tijani, go ahead please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Holly. Thank you, Tom, and the team for this final report. I first noticed [on the record] that you arbitrated on the public comments to distinguish between what you call [genuine] comments and the others that you don't want or didn't like. I would like to ask a

question. What is the difference in terms of the main ideas, the main things, from the very first draft report and this one? Is there any change regarding the main issues? Yes, there is small adjustment of small things, but this doesn't change anything of the main ideas. Thank you.

TOM MACKENZIE: If you want, I can take that. The changes are more of form as opposed to substance. I think what we had found in December was the blueprint. It became the initial structure for the report and we made a set of recommendations which we acknowledge were probably maybe in some cases needed to be changed. They needed to be adjusted taking into account your push-back. And so on the different issues of working groups and of end user engagement, of the role of rapporteurs, all these different aspects of the reforms that we have submitted I think they have evolved a lot in the level of detail that we have provided over the past six or seven months since we issued the very first draft report.

But the main findings were basically there in December. Just to be clear, they were in a raw state, if you like, in December but those were the reflection of what we had heard and so there is no question there. The issues what we are told, what people feel to a certain extent within At-Large but also beyond, are that it's difficult to get involved, there is this perception – and maybe it is just a perception but even perceptions matter – of an unchanging leadership, that all these things are real concerns.

You can choose what you do with this reporting, but we feel that we have made a very honest and transparent and direct reporting of what

we have heard, and then obviously provided a set of solutions as to how you might address these perceptions or issues.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I think we'll leave it there. Kaili was next and then Christopher, Alan, and then Alberto.

Kaili, go ahead please.

KAILI KAN: Thank you, Holly. First of all, I would like to thank you, Tom, and your team about your efforts and I believe you have been trying to do your very best. However, for your draft report I see there's no fundamental changes from the first draft. So I would say that the problems that you have found or that you have collected, I feel that most [inaudible] of those issues are – what I have heard [inaudible]. However, for [inaudible] recommendation [inaudible] I would say. [Inaudible] an example, [inaudible] taking away the ALSes and replace with the Empowered Membership Model I believe that is extremely impractical, not to say that China has well over a billion people population and well over 800 million end users. How could you expect the individual end user even in a country of a few million people, how will they operate locally? How will they collect the opinions, views, of the end users in such a massive users group? There's just no way.

So by taking away the grassroots organization, you will actually kill the At-Large community. You expect the end users to participate. However, we have to remember that the average citizen gets into [inaudible] they

have to go [through]. Most of them will not go to [court] themselves. And also they need consumer associations. So you look at the leadership of the consumer associations like in the U.S. are they relatively stable? I would say yes. These are people who can't afford to fully devote themselves. [Inaudible] we at ALAC are not paid by anybody. Even myself as a professor, before I retired I could not afford to participate like here, ICANN matters. So therefore, first of all, taking away, taking out [inaudible] that is not acceptable.

Also I would say that you – based on your experience [inaudible] and pretty narrowly defined. However, for public policies like ICANN we need semi-professional people to take care of matters who would reject the end user's interests and to present that.

Talking about the [inaudible] reflect in your report I would say both of them are true. I would suggest that you include your recommendation is that part of that is about the Bylaw that [inaudible]. What is the criteria of becoming an ALS? And also please notice that all the RALOs already have individual membership. Okay. Even if you do not want to join an ALS, you can represent yourself in RALO. And [inaudible] view with ALAC for example our Chair, Alan, before was an individual member of North America's RALO. Okay, so we already have individual membership. However, [inaudible] changed is the criteria for an ALS or the individual member. That is not to be composed solely by end users.

The criteria should be [inaudible] the organization or individual, whether they're willing to represent and defend end users' interest. That's a [better] criteria. For example, in China – I'm not trying to defend China's Internet practices any other way, however, Internet

Society of China, that is itself a medieval stakeholder structure. It has both the scholars – including myself – to represent end users' interests, and also, we are the professionals. And also, we have Internet companies' cooperation, and also we work together, highly cooperate together with the government because the government's policy are [inaudible].

So, organizations like this do not necessarily need to [inaudible] model the end users, the consumers and the governments and the corporations of [inaudible] but that is one suggestion [inaudible] And I will suggest you include any newcomer in your reports.

[inaudible] regional is that ICANN's mission is [inaudible] especially today most people, end users, are more concerned about Internet applications rather than their domain names and Internet addresses. So therefore, it is very natural to have so many ISOC members in each country to become ALSes to join the work of ALAC. Okay, thank you. So, those are the recommendations.

HOLLY RAICHE: Kaili, there are about three questions. Can we let people answer that, please? Thank you.

KAILI KAN: Yes. [inaudible] as far as I know that –

EN

HOLLY RAICHE:	Kaili, can Tom answer those questions? There are a lot of people who want to ask questions. Thank you.
KAILI KAN:	Right.
TIM MCGINNIS:	Can I take a stab at that, Holly?
HOLLY RAICHE:	Can we all be brief? Thank you. Yes.
TOM MACKENZIE:	I think this is a good opportunity just to make a reminder of a very basic principle of the ALS model which we have proposed. And that is – and we might as well just repeat it, that we have suggested that you replace the current system which requires membership within an ALS in order to become involved in policy activities within At-Large with a new system which we call the ALM [inaudible] which would allow anybody to become a member of the At-Large without criteria.
	Now, this is a big change. We understand that this is a big change. There are no criteria. Literally, you can decide that you are interested in policy making issues within ICANN and just join, become a member. That's it, there's no requirement.
	Now, we heard you when during the conversations, meetings, the phone calls, the many [concerned] calls that we had. We heard you

when you said you had concerns, legitimate concerns about the hordes of people from different parts of the world who would become suddenly involved, and the consequences that that might have for an organization like ICANN.

So, as a result of that, we built a mechanism which you can look at, which [will mean to say] that whereas your bottom line allows anybody to get involved, it is only and only those people who participate actively and regularly in working groups, who show to the rest of the community that they have a valuable contribution to make through their participation in meetings, phone calls, etc., it is only those people who move up the system either as rapporteurs – so with all that that entails in terms of participation with meetings and things like that – or – and this is another issue that I know you have concerns with – voting rights, and so we have only strictly limited voting rights to those ALSes which have shown to the community that they have been able to play by the rules and participate constructively and actively in working groups.

So that simple criteria will immediately eliminate all those hordes of people that we have heard about, all those kind of nightmare stories about the organization becoming captured. So that's really sort of in a nutshell I think how we would just sum up the mechanism for the ALS, and why it has – and how it has rather – these in-built mechanisms to guard against capture.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

TOM MACKENZIE: Tim, Sorry, you had –

TIM MCGINNIS: Can I take the other question?

HOLLY RAICHE: You could take [inaudible]

TIM MCGINNIS: [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: We've got 15 minutes.

TIM MCGINNIS: I'll be very brief. I'll be 30 seconds, Holly. I think that the notion that there's a professional class of At-Large volunteers is something we recognize. We always envisioned that there would be a small, dedicated group of volunteers being very active in At-Large.

The EMM just tries to expand that group slightly. We don't mean to wide open to loads of people and in practice it will not be, but we did see – well, I'll just leave it at that. We recognize the sort of semi-professional nature of ICANN volunteers, and we just try to expand that group slightly.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay. Fine. Look, this has been really helpful in the way that you phrased your responses. We've got Christopher, Alan, and Tim. And could all of you please just be very brief so we can fit everybody in who wants to make a comment? Thank you.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Holly, I thought Christopher ceded to Alan, so I would have thought Alan was next.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Oh, Alberto did. Did Christopher? I know Alberto did, I saw that.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I don't care what the order is. Let's get on and try to get this finished. Thank you.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Alright. Alan, go ahead and we'll sort Christopher out. Go ahead. Thank you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. I wasn't trying to jump the queue, I just want to get this meeting done. I have five issues I want to raise. I will not re-raise the issues I've –
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Sorry, Alberto is trying to speak. Has Alberto got the floor, or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Has Alberto the floor, or not?

HOLLY RAICHE: Alberto relinquished his place to Alan, so I'm respecting Alberto's wish on that matter.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I proceed?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But this is okay, there's no problem. So, Alan may go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I will not repeat the things I said in the chat. I hope someone's reading them. There are a number of completely incorrect things that the reviewers have said, and they should be pointed out. I won't reread my own comments here.

I have five issues. I'm going to raise them all without getting answers so that we can do this proceeding as quickly as possible. The first one is on recommendation number four, on the ALT. The dialog that goes along with this recommendation says – and I will read it – the At-Large leadership team is an ad hoc group, not chartered by the Bylaws and that it often takes substantive decisions that should be made by the ALAC.

It goes on to talk about the group as an elite group. I think that is a very derogatory term in this particular instance. However, the question is, what substantive decisions are you talking about? Because I happen to be the ALAC Chair and I've been on the ALT for a good number of years. The ALT does not make any decisions, and our rules of procedure explicitly forbid them from making decisions, except in very specific cases. So, I would like to understand just what substantive decisions you're talking about to base that recommendation on. That's number one.

Number two, recommendation 14, on auction funds, we explicitly pointed out that the Board is not empowered to enter into discussions on the use of the auction funds, and yet you again suggested we enter into discussions with the Board on the use of auction funds. I would like to understand the basis for that.

Number three, you are continuing the term empowered. We pointed out that that was an inflammatory term within ICANN, and we even suggested another E word for so you could keep the acronym, that is the enhanced, and yet you continue to use it. What is it about this name that is so important that you have to stick by your guns?

Number four, in recommendation three, you suggest that staff focus more on policy issues. I would like to understand – and you specifically say the EMM will free up staff time. My understanding is the EMM will require staff to monitor who is active and who is not, and I don't understand what part of the EMM will free up staff time. I would like to understand that.

And number five, you are again saying we should abolish working groups. At the same time, you are saying we should enhance social media, we should look for better collaboration tools, we should do better outreach, and yet if we abolish the groups that do that right now, who is it that's going to be doing this work? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Tom, the questions are in the chat as well.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. Can you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: Alright. I won't take these in any particular order, but, the use of the word empowered, we came up with the term Empowered Membership Model because what we thought that we wanted to do from very early on in the process was to empower end users, and it was to empower

end users in a way which they simply do not seem to be, and they are not perceived to be by a very large number of people that we spoke to.

So we felt that it was a word that was appropriate. It also does happen to be the word that is used by ICANN, you refer to the Empowered Community. But we didn't see that there was a problem with that. And if that is a sticking point, we really don't mind if you change the name of our model to anything you like.

It's not really the name that matters, it's what the model proposes that is really what our review has been all about. But as I say, the word itself was one that we felt was appropriate.

Now, staff time. Well, the main way in which staff time is going to be freed up is because we are not going to – or we are suggesting that staff is going to be less used to support all the many working groups that currently exist and which require calls to be organized. All this kind of activity is going to be significantly reduced if you implement our model as described.

And then you ask the question about social media and whether social media requires a working group. To our minds, social media does not require a working group. What social media requires is some bright person in your community to come forward during a meeting or during one of the ALAC calls, one of the top-level calls, who says, "Hey, you should be using this social media." And it should not require – to our mind – the setting up of a working group with all the sort of [inaudible] that that entails.

This is a very good example of the kind of process which should be much more fluid, much more dynamic. If that social media person wants to form an ad hoc group, well, he or she should go ahead and do it, but not go through this, what we have seen as a relatively heavy process to get there.

Now, what questions am I missing?

HOLLY RAICHE: I've put them in the chat, Tom.

ALAN GREENBERG: ALT and auctions.

TOM MACKENZIE: The ALT, right. Who wants to take on ALT, guys?

TIM MCGINNIS: I'll take that. If the ALT is not making decisions, then why do you need it? Is my retort. Basically, what we found was over the last decade, there has been a creation of many working groups and structures that potentially reduce transparency and [availability] of involvement from the bottom of the bottom-up process. ALT is one example of that.

We're not going to get into what people said about the ALT, but what we found was that it was an ad hoc process, it's not in the Bylaws, it was created over the last decade to make administrative decisions that we feel should be in the hands of the ALAC. Did you hear me?

HOLLY RAICHE: We did, and thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did hear you. You still haven't told us which those decisions are, but I'll accept that. Thank you. And lastly, auction funds.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

TOM MACKENZIE: Oh, auction funds. Yes, well, we felt as a review team that –

TIM MCGINNIS: [inaudible] if you'd like.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, okay. The only thing I was going to say – and then I'll hand it straight over to you, Tim – was that as a review team, the one advantage we have is that we're not so constrained by the strict sort of formality in which ICANN functions, and so this was one recommendation – it's the only recommendation – that we went out on a little bit of a limb and we said that this was something that you should at least consider. This is an opportunity for end users to be supported with these considerable funds that have been entered into the ICANN system, which ultimately do come from end users who are the clients of

the registrars, who are ultimately selling the domain names under the new TLDs.

So, we feel that there's a strong argument to support this idea that we had. Tim, just fill in for me.

TIM MCGINNIS: Okay. Yes, sure. Well, we found throughout the last year that the folks that we interviewed and surveyed from At-Large were very cognizant of the lack of resources from end users in terms of participation compared to the more commercial organizations, and we obviously felt that this is clearly a once in a lifetime opportunity that the organization is going to have such large funds, so we're trying to level the playing field and suggesting that there's a permanent funding mechanism for At-Large that's not dependent on operational funds. We thought we're doing you a favor. We're trying to give you guys some money, trying to make you a bit more independent. I can't understand the objection to this one, frankly.

HOLLY RAICHE: If we could wave a magic wand, we'd love money. But thank you. Look, we've got John next and Christopher. John, go ahead, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. I want to get t o the EMM and reiterate comments I've made in the chat, which is that the At-Large is unlike all of the other SOs and ACs in that it's very heterogeneous. The EMM assumes a level of norms and participation globally that simply isn't present. People participating

in international organizations is not the norm in most parts of the world, and the EMM relies on people of good will to choosing to do exactly that. So, I think one of the underlying assumptions of the EMM is highly problematic. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, John. Can I also point out a comment that John has – Tom, go ahead, and I'll find John's comment as well.

TOM MACKENZIE: John, just quickly, we take your point, and one thing that we have clearly understood – just in case there's any doubt – is that we know and we fully understand that there are not thousands, hundreds, millions of people around the world who have the skillset, the knowledge to participate in these kinds of obscure, high level policy discussions.

But given that fact that there are only a very small number of people around the world who have the capacity, the intellectual wherewithal to participate in these conversations, it surely has to be as easy as possible for you to detect those – whoever they are – those 100 or so, 200, 300 people around the world and to make sure that you get them into your system as easily as possible.

Now, in this process, I would speak just personally, just for a second just to say that I have come across at least two or three people in Belgium and in Hyderabad who clearly had an interest in these kinds of issues, and who I think would clearly be the kind of people that you were

looking for, people who are used to – people who work [inaudible] for these in connection with the Internet, fine, intellectually competent people but who felt that it was simply too complicated, too arcane.

JOHN LAPRISE: No, that's not the issue. The issue is the cultural understanding of the process, of being a participant in this kind of process. Other societies don't necessarily have that background. It's not the intelligence or the education level, it's the social terms of engaging as a group in a global process, a global deliberative process. That's what I'm talking about.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. Alright. No, I understand, and we've discussed this a bit. And I respect what you are saying, but I think another sort of underlying, fundamental kind of feeling that we have had during this review process is that if there is this perception that there is a requirement to be a certain kind of person, that you have to function according to a certain set of rules – which is the case today, it's a fairly kind of technical, complicated set of rules of engagement that you have a moment – well then that is going to make it difficult for many people who are out there, and possibly that is one of your – well, we have identified that as one of the barriers to engagements within At-Large.

And just to sort of finish very quickly with what I was saying a second ago, those people, the three or four people who maybe I have met throughout the year who probably would have been great participants in the At-Large community, they have put their finger in, seen how complicated it is and gone far away, whereas we believe that if they had

had a much simpler system – and we think that the EMM would be a simpler system – that would allow them to come in, to leave, to come back in again six months later, to have a much more dynamic relationship with the organization and the rest of the community.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Tom. Now, we are over time. It's already one minute past the hour. Can we have another, say, 15 minutes? And that's a question to Evin as well, and it's question to you, Tom.

TOM MACKENZIE: Yes, 15 minutes is fine. 15 minutes I think is okay. It's fine.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Alberto's been very patiently waiting. Alberto, go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Very quickly, I will say again that ITEMS [it says] it has sound arguments, but it has never made them in writing. I have asked for them several times in Copenhagen. I remember I did that. I asked them to send them by e-mail and they didn't.

They based basically the change of the model by saying that the introduction of end users will improve the model, but in three RALOs, there are no restrictions for the participation of individual users. And I think that the sum of the representation of these three continents

exceeds the numbers in the other two continents, and there are no proliferation of individual users. And this is a fact, and that is why I asked for the justification and the grounds, and I have never received them. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alberto. Tom, do you want to have a quick word? And then we can get to Christopher. Go ahead.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. Actually, regarding Alberto Soto's remarks, we went back to the video recording of our meeting. We went to all his questions, and we addressed them all one by one. Now, that doesn't mean to say that we [expect] his pushback on our model, but we did look at them carefully.

Now, there is one concern that Alberto has, which is this issue of the ALSes. And this is what I've seen in the chat as well, is this idea that what we are doing is trying to get rid of ALSes. That is not the case, and I think that's a perception that we ourselves have needed to correct because it was sort of – at least I think our initial report was maybe not clear enough. But we are not getting rid of ALSes, and we in fact recognize the role played by ALSes, notably in Latin America but within the other regions of the world as well in the outreach and engagement.

And in fact, our final report slightly reinforces the way in which ALMs who are the type of ALMs who will be replacing the ALSes, in other words people who represent a grassroots organization, we have reinforced the description of how we think that those kinds of

organizations should be recognized and given rights to participate, funding facilities to participate in meetings, and voting rights, etc., in much the same way that they do today.

So we do recognize that role, and I think this final report you'll find it does make that clear.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Thank you very much. We have got 10 minutes max, and I would like a wrap-up, and after that we have – the interpreters have only 10 more minutes. So Christopher, can you take about one minute? Not even that. Christopher? Okay, one more – does anybody else have their hand up? Excellent. I think we've got through all the comments. So, we're overtime and we'll finish –

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay.

TIM MCGINNIS: Christopher, is that you?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Very quickly, Holly, first of all, I must say I'm disappointed that so little progress has been made since Copenhagen. Secondly, on leadership rotation, I accept that there's been adequate if not more than adequate leadership rotation.

I have no axe to grind, I have never held office in At-Large in the last 12 years that I've participated as a private citizen in ICANN. The problem if there's a lack of leadership rotation, frankly, is in our Supporting Organizations.

Regarding the public comments, two things. First of all, please weight the comment by the scale of the interests which they represent. I personally did not submit a public comment because as a representative of an ALS, I endorsed the RALO's comments.

When you look at the RALO's comments, please multiply it by the number of ALSes that have participated and endorsed that document. It is not correct to treat all the comments as individually of equal value.

Furthermore, in the last 20 years, [there has] been a significant current in ICANN – from time to time dominant, but currently not – that would rather not have the difficulty and the problems of user interests being put on the table.

Regarding barriers, Tom, the main barriers are twofold: the first is on the substance is indeed that the subject matter is quite arcane and limited. Look at ICANN's mandate. Most of the high-profile user interest representatives that I know across the world and worldwide are not in ICANN because they're dealing with downstream content related user interests.

It is very limiting – directly so in view of ICANN's mandate. The mandate is limiting and there are a limited number of individuals, however intellectually competent and with the time and resources to do it, who

are interested strictly speaking in the domain name system and IP addressing. That has to be taken into account also I feel.

I agree that there should be improvements in outreach. We don't have time to go back into the merits of regional and global meeting. I'd think having participated in other election systems in other organizations, I think the election systems in At-Large could be improved, but it's not a big issue.

And finally, there is a problem in your internal/external dichotomy that in order to function as a democratic and representative organization of user interests worldwide, a great deal of internal consultation and consensus building has to be conducted. Personally, I'm grateful that as an individual participant. I don't have to do very much of that, but I have great respect for the leadership who has to engage in internal processes before they can conduct with the full authority of At-Large the external responsibilities that they have. There's a lot else that one could say, but I think the Chair is already [fidgety] and I should stop there. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you for noting the fidgety Chair. I'm actually noting the time for the interpreters, which is fast running out. Tom, do you have a final word? And literally, we've got one or two minutes and that's it.

TOM MACKENZIE: Okay. I'm going to take a minute and I'm looking at the time. I'm just going to say that inevitably with the review processes – and it's an

unfortunate thing maybe, but it's inevitable – it does look as though we are perhaps criticizing and that essentially we are just sort of – all we can see is the problems.

But I think a large part of what we have observed over the past year is what you have achieved, and we sort of emphasized this point in our introduction that as a community, you have done a lot. You have achieved a lot, you've come from a long way over the past eight years.

We simply think – and we strongly believe – that there's a lot that still needs to be done, but we are confident, we think we're optimistic that you can achieve these further reforms because you proved that you've been able to do it in the past.

So, we don't have any doubts about your capacity to embrace change. You've made a point, Christopher, about individual comments, and I think it does give me an opportunity just to clarify perhaps what I said earlier, which is that we didn't literally sort of take all 15 comments and say that they had exactly the same value.

We are aware that there was a RALO statement and an ALAC statement, so those few statements which came from important constituencies, we obviously spent a lot more time poring over than comments that were submitted by a single individual. So obviously, we gave that kind of weighting to the consideration of comments.

There's one other thing that I think we haven't mentioned during this call, which is this idea which has often been objected to us, which is that you tell us that yes, three out of the five RALOs have end user

associations, and so that surely answers the issue about end user participation.

But we actually reject that criticism, because the end user associations that are in place are no more transparent and easy to get involved in than the other ALSes. They are just more ALSes. Three additional ALSes with different rules of how to get involved, and so it's an uneven level playing field.

TIM MCGINNIS: I like that one.

TOM MACKENZIE: And that's another thing that we want to eliminate with the EMM: So I'm going to stop there. I think I took – it's 13, it was 11 that I started talking, but I'll start talking now.

TIM MCGINNIS: Thank you very much, and thank you, everybody, for your time. Just a reminder that for the working party, really, our work has just begun because we will have to draft a final statement to the Board and indeed as a result of this meeting.

ITEMS will be putting a final report to the Board, so with one minute left, I thank everybody for their time and patience, and let's give the interpreters the one-minute break that we did.

Are there any final questions, comments in 30 seconds? Otherwise, I would say thank you all for your participation. And the call has ended. Thank you very much, everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, everyone.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, all. The call is now adjourned. Please do not forget to disconnect your lines when leaving the AC room and the bridge. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]