
EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. And welcome to the At-Large Review Working Party Call on Tuesday, 25th of July, 2017 from 17:00 UTC to 18:00 UTC.

Today, on the call with us, we have Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sarah Kiden, John Laprise, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Eduardo Diaz, Vanda Scartezini, Kaili Kan, Ali Almeshal, [Angie Gray], Negar Farzinnia, Andrei Kolesnikov, and just joining us is Alan Greenberg. Welcome, Alan.

On the Spanish channel, we have with us Aida Noblia and Alberto Soto.

We have listed apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Bastiaan Goslings, and Glenn McKnight.

And on staff, we have with us Heidi Ullrich who will be joining shortly, Silvia Vivanco, Ariel Liang, and myself, Evin Erdoğan, as well as Lars Hoffman.

And on Spanish interpretation, we have Sabrina and Marina.

And I'd like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record and also for our translators.

With that, I'll turn it over to you, Cheryl and Holly. Please begin.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Evin, and thank you, everyone. The aim of this call is just, first of all, to remind everybody that we have a fairly tight timeline in which to respond to, and it's essentially the form that we have to fill in,

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.

and it's a long one for all of the recommendations and for all of the EMM recommendations, and then to point out how you can comment and a few tips on commenting. And if Cheryl would like to talk – and I imagine she would – just a few words from the experience that she's had from last reviews.

So with that, the first thing I'd like to talk about is the timeline that we have in which to comment because it's not a long one, and this is a repeat of what we said in Jo-burg, but I'll repeat it.

The timeline that we've got, and we're now really in the third week in July, we've met our timeline so far. There are two templates on which people can comment. Both of them are available and everyone should have been sent a link to both by Ariel. We should have started, and indeed, we have started to input into those templates.

What I was hoping for from this week through, say, the second week in August is that there will be RALO meetings, and hopefully, just using the regular RALO meeting for each RALO to discuss their own input and to provide input.

By the third week in August, ALAC should be meeting to consider all of the input and we need to start coming to some conclusions because what we need by the first week in September is a complete response from all of ALAC and the RALOs, the submission that has to go to the – well, it's the feasibility and assessment plan that has to first be reviewed and then it goes to the October Board meeting.

I think we can make the timeline work on schedule right now, but we may not always be on schedule. And thank you for putting the form up.

This is the form that's on the wiki and... Oops, Alan, you want to [get it]?
Go ahead, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think the timeline you gave is sort of a mixture of two different timelines.

The current documents that are out there, I think have a deadline of, I think, the 6th of August.

HOLLY RAICHE: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we will then do a revision of the formal documents, incorporate changes and such. And then go out for another brief set of comments and the intent, I believe, is at the ALAC meeting in August which is the 20-something or other, that the ALAC actually signs off on this.

There will still be some clean-up to be done in the next week or two, but we are looking for the end of the first week in August for the substantive comments, and then a very short period after that, probably a week or so, that there will be an opportunity for additional comments. And then we're looking for approval from the ALAC.

Understand that there is still going to be a little bit of clean-up. But essentially, the ALAC is going to have to sign off the third week of August and we want to get this submitted no later than the beginning of

September. But the editing and tidying up always takes longer than we ever imagine and we need to allow for that. So a little bit more aggressive than what you outlined, but basically the same.

HOLLY RAICHE: I was going to say that's very, that is very aggressive because that's –

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it's the only timeline that we can make sure to make all the committee meetings before the whole Board and the committees change. And since this OEC is the one that has lived through the review with us, we really don't want to go on to a new one.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, Alan, that's fine. It's not the timeline that we talked about in Jo-burg. It's a different one.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think –

HOLLY RAICHE: And I think, well, that's what we, I'm talking to a slide that we talked about in Jo-burg, so it's a new slide and it's a new timeline, which I understand why we're doing this. But it's certainly a more aggressive timeline, and in which case, this becomes a much more urgent task that people actually start commenting as soon as possible.

I was hoping that, in fact, people could use their RALO calls to make comments, and it may be that there have to be special RALO calls to do it. Cheryl, you put your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My, well, anyway, I don't know what slide you're talking about. I don't have the slide we used in Jo-burg. Cheryl's hand is up and maybe she wants to speak. I think that this is what was agreed to in Jo-burg. If I'm wrong, then I'm willing to say I'm wrong.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Well, I'm looking at the slides that I presented, so it's a different slide and it's a different timeline. But, in fact, they're probably, if we have to come back to ALAC, which we do, so what you're doing is suggesting there is a one-week period for people to look at what we're saying? I assume that that makes sense. It just, it really puts time pressure on us.

And fine. I will do a revised timeline.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's a huge amount of time pressure on this.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes, I know. Cheryl, go ahead. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Look. The timeline is the timeline and yes, it's aggressive. I don't think there is this vast difference between what you and Alan are talking about, Holly. The notices with the links to all of the review party, which is, of course, the vehicle through which we want any At-Large Structure and member of RALO input to come in through – so that's the working party that's the nexus here – is regionally balanced and there's lots of people who can do these commenting things.

After all, this working party hasn't actually been slavishly beaten to death. The drafting teams work like Trojans and deserve huge credit from Holly and I for the amount they did in some very tight timeframes. But in general, I would defy the rest of the working party up until now to claim that they have been unfairly put upon as volunteers. Well, now is where it happens. So I'm certainly not overly concerned about requiring the working party members from each and every one of the RALOs to get going, reach out to their regions, and get some input, which is what we're going to be discussing now in the substance of the rest of the call.

But what Alan says is important. It doesn't mean that we have to run in the specific RALO calls in my view. If the working party from any given RALO wishes to do so, that's fine.

My feeling is, though, that each of the RALO meetings as they run, which all run before the ALAC meeting when we get the [inaudible] and support of the whole of the ALAC, and again, the useful part of that timeline as Alan and you have outlined now is that it means that RALO input because of RALO meetings being held before the ALAC meeting at the end of August can all mean that each of the ALAC representatives

from each of the RALOs can sit there, end the night or day or whenever, and say, “Yes, we support the implementation plan as we’re about to look at now, in its current form,” recognizing there will be some [inaudible] or some editorial tidying up between now and when it is submitted to the structural improvements committee.

So I don’t think there is this huge gulf between what you’re both talking about.

To respond to Eduardo and his concerns about published timelines, it’s what, Holly’s slide is as close to draft publishes I care to bother to get and if you are all desperately keen to have timelines that are [graphic], we will do so.

But it basically goes now, meeting, 6th input, and then each of the RALO meetings running and the 20-whatever it is, 4th, 3rd, 5th, something like that, ALAC meeting support, final adjustment, and we did work out a date which was the one that is required to get onto the Board agenda of the Structural Improvements Committee, whatever it’s called, effective, operational effectiveness, whatever it is, organizational effectiveness, whatever they’re calling it this month.

Sorry, Leon, I’m feeling a bit [inaudible] hours of the morning.

So that’s a whole lot from me, but I just wanted to make sure we were really clear on all of that. And the other thing is when Alan referred to “formal document,” it is the compilation of this set of individual wiki page-style forms, pro formas, that we’re looking at, but also, of course, the Google Doc, which Ariel is going to take us through as well. So I’ll

shut up now and let everyone else get into it. I'm glad you're amused, Leon.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. Alberto? Alberto, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. I agree with Cheryl and personally, I will reach out to the LACRALO members because in our last meeting, some of our members wanted to change certain things, etc. So what I want to do is to engage in outreach initiatives starting today despite the tight schedule so as to seek input from my region.

If, at the end of that process, we do not have input from LACRALO, I, myself in my capacity as LACRALO representative, will have to voice my own opinion if I don't have input from my region. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alberto. Alan, is that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it is a new hand.

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Two things. We spent, when I say “we,” I’m talking about the working party, the ALAC, the larger community, spent an absolutely immense amount of time responding to the last draft report. We did that knowing that what we were saying at that point was going to form the substance of what went into the Board. We weren’t expecting significant changes.

And so let’s not forget that there has been an absolutely unbelievable, by At-Large standards, probably the largest effort that I can ever recall that has gone into creating a document at all levels within the organization.

So what we’re talking about here already has had unbelievable amount of community input into it and there aren’t a lot of surprises. They’ve changed very little in the final report, so we’ve made some adjustments and this time has passed so there’s a couple of other wording changes. But to a large extent, we have done the work already and now we’re just making sure that it makes sense as something going into the Board. We’re not expecting an awful lot new, and if we find something new, fine, we’ll incorporate it. But we did do a huge amount of work. That’s number one.

Number two, a lesson we learned in the first At-Large Review, and some of us have very painful memories of that, is the implementation plan was, it had literally hundreds of issue, items in it. And the work to dot all of the I’s and cross all of the T’s, and implement it all was unbelievably large, and much larger than it needed to be to accomplish the end. So certainly, my hope is that the implementation plan that we pass on to the Board this time is going to be generic.

We are already seeing and will continue to see lots of specific comments that people make of how we should implement better working groups, or how we should implement better outreach. But I think we're going to be really wise if we keep what we say to the Board as generic as possible.

All the details will be used when we actually implement things, but we really want to keep things generic and simple or we're going to end up spending the next two years with a large number of people doing the implementation and we really don't want to do that. As I said, there are scars from the first review. Some of us don't want anymore scars from this review.

So people should understand as they're commenting, that just as the last draft comment was fed into the Board comment now, some of the comments people are making are going to be fed not into the document we present to the Board, but to the actual implementation plan that we work on once this all go, once this passes the Board. Thank you. Sorry for taking so long.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Tijani, go ahead, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Holly. Alan read my mind. I think that the work has been done. Since ITEMS didn't change almost anything in their final report, so I don't think we will reinvent what we did before. What we have to, perhaps, work on is how to present to the Board our view of

the implementation and how we explain them that we are aware about this problem and the solution for this problem is this and not what was proposed by ITEMS.

So I don't think we need a call with the RALOs. If we need, if we want more comments from the RALOs, I advise that we now, the RALO Chairs, share the templates with their ALSes if they want to have their feedback again, and they connect the feedback. The most important point is to have a deadline because we don't have time so that we can stop the compilation of the new input if there is new input. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Tijani, and this [inaudible]. It's 3:21. Can we actually have part of this [inaudible]. Go ahead, and then could we have actually, at least ten minutes of the [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Holly. We're actually jumping into some other agenda items as well, so I'm not overly concerned. I just wanted to thank everybody for their very positive input and I think this is hitting in a very good plan, why I thank you.

But I just wanted to pick up on Eduardo's point that he put in chat, and just to make sure that the document that we are running with, and it's something that I won't [sit] as well, is this compilation of pages which is, as Ariel is going to be taking us through shortly and as is in front of you at the moment. It is, in fact, the feasibility, our opinion, and reaction – the reaction work as cited, substantially done – and some feasibility

assessments and implementation notes that are to be put forward from all of us for every single one of the recommendations made by ITEMS. So our model for the document is quite clear.

It is, in fact, this particular pro forma, which is very important to make sure what Alan was referring to about the very lengthy and complicated community and directions that we had developing our own implementation plan last time. This is designed to avoid, so I don't think we're going to fall down the same rabbit holes. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. Okay. Now, where we are up to folks, in going through the forms, we've got a revised timeline which includes at least a week for people to review what we finally say before it goes to the Board. So what I will do after this meeting is circulate the revised timeline that Alan suggested and with some [inaudible]. And Alberto, thank you for volunteering to have a RALO meeting.

And just going through the form, Ariel, could you bring up, say, just Recommendation #1 so we can talk through what people are going to be commenting against? The things that are already in each of the recommendations as well as the EMM, start with – and these are the things you don't have to fill in clearly. The first thing is what the final recommendation from ITEMS was, the issue that they actually identified, and whether we supported it or not. All of that, as Alan pointed out, is already done.

The next line is, “If not, please provide the reasoning,” and in fact, that was something that we actually talked through anyway, so largely, we don’t have to do that.

The next section is, “If ALAC does not support the recommendation, suggest an alternative recommendation.” Most of that would come from the text that all of us agreed to anyway, so largely, up to that point, most of the work has been done.

What we haven’t done, we have not actually talked about, and then moving down the text, please provide a suggested alternative recommendation. Some of that can be implied in what we have said in the response, and I would suggest people look not only at what ALAC said, but also what the RALOs made their own submissions.

So there are two documents, not one, and we should be looking at both because what the RALOs put in is their own viewpoint and if we’re going to have a final document that goes to the Board, we really need to reflect not only what ALAC said, but what the RALO said. So there’s a little bit of work to go back and see what was said by the RALOs as well just to make sure we’re actually covering what everyone said.

In that column, therefore, if so, please provide a suggested alternative recommendation, and at that point, we need to actually look at what the two submissions actually said in terms of was there an alternative and what is it? What I want people to think about is also, if we didn’t make a clear recommendation, what should it be and what kind of priority, which is the next slide... sorry, the next heading.

We do not have comments yet on additional working party comments, and there may be some there in terms of what should we have said that we didn't say, or what would you like to say now looking back?

The next big space is called ALAC Comments. Now, what is there now is what Ariel very kindly put in the text of what we actually said. There actually should not be anything in that space because we haven't commented.

We've commented on what was said by ITEMS and what is there now is not the final text. It is the text that is taken from our response to the initial ITEMS team, not our final text, so please feel free to look at what you would like said, what more we can say, and so we need to add to it. We need to think through if that's finally what we want to say.

Possible dependencies, we haven't even started thinking about that, so what is it that we need in terms of resources, whether it's money or staff, and who will implement? We need to think about that.

Budget effects? Well, some of it will have a budget, and implementation times, we'll have to think that through.

Proposed implementation steps, given that we have not, at this stage, decided the steps to what we are implementing because that is what's open for comment, then we'd expect a fair amount of comment on proposed implementation steps.

So really, what we're looking at is start looking really at, when you go down to the one, two, three, four, fifth box, if ALAC does not support the recommendation, what's the alternative? We will have suggested

something. It's up to everyone to actually have a look at what is there, if there is anything. What would people suggest? What would suggest, be suggested by way of priority? For additional working party comments, that is, at this stage, is or should be a blank space because that's where people can fill in as well as the ALAC comments.

And I repeat what is there now is simply taken from the text that was submitted months ago. That's what we have to actually look at and add to, and that's what we have to incorporate what the RALOs said.

So before I go to Alan, are there any questions? Are people comfortable with what we're talking about because there are recommendations and do not forget, there's also comments against each EMM as well, so it's a big task.

Okay. Alan, go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two short things. Just as a clarification, the wording there is not always exactly the same as what was in our previous comment. In a few cases, the wording was just aimed at reviewers and this is aimed at the Board, so the sentence structure has changed a little bit. There is no substantive change. But the content has been adjusted because it is focusing on a different audience.

Remember this template is focused on the GNSO process, or it's based on the GNSO process. They very carefully did a working party review of the review. The working party completed it and tossed it over the wall

to the GNSO. The GNSO then made some additional comment, and I believe changed one or two of the things from the working party.

Since we're doing this really as a merged group, and the mailing list we're using is a merger of the working party and ALAC, I would suggest that we really don't need the two different sections and that we can merge together as a working party and ALAC comment, and not try to present it as the two different personalities of the group. So, unless there's a strong objection, I would think let's refine and come to agreement, and then only have one section and change the title slightly to reflect that. That makes sense to me, anyway. I don't really care a lot about it, but I think it will stop us from having to duplicate work. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Alan, just to clarify, you mean we should be combining the RALOs' submission and our submission into one document? That's what I was thinking. Otherwise, it makes no sense.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. I'm talking about the template. The template has a working party comment and an ALAC comment on it currently.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's based on how the GNSO did it, as their working party followed by the GNSO and they did it as complete – there was virtually no overlap between the working party and the GNSO Council.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm suggesting since we're doing this as a combined effort, the mailing list we're using right now is the combination of the two, that we merge the two template items to be working party and ALAC comments.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not particularly worried about the RALO document that was submitted. There were virtually no differences. There were wording differences, obviously. And as the RALO Chairs and RALO people on the working party are looking at it, if they feel that they expressed something far better than the ALAC version and it should be substituted or merged, I think that's just fine. But there really were no differences in the overall content of those two documents. So, I'm less worried than you are to make sure that we factor that in. I think we've already done that, but people certainly can go back to the wording if they wish, and

propose different wording from anything we're saying. That's what this whole process is about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan, and I [inaudible] than you are. So that says something. Can I just ask this group right now to indicate if any of you have any objection to what Alan is proposing?

Now, let's be clear what is being proposed. In the template document that Holly has just taken you through and that you see on screen, there is a separate section – and Alan has told you why – for the equivalent to Council in the GNSO world, in other words the ALAC, and the RALOs, the equivalent to the constituencies in GNSO. His proposal is – and I am personally supporting it – that because of the way we are working smarter and together from the beginning, that we change that template and that the wiki will reflect those changes, and that we have just a single comments section which will be titled ALAC probably or/and Review Working Party.

So, if any of you don't want that to happen, let us know now. Otherwise, that will be an action item that goes on after this meeting. And I see a big green tick from León, and he's one of the Board members who's going to have to read and untangle all of this. So, if he likes how it's modeled, I think that's a good idea. So, if you object, put up a big red X, or tell us. And if you don't object, I'm happy to see a sea of green, and then that becomes an action item on staff. Okay? Thanks, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And my suggestion is instead of ALAC comments and working party comments, we have one thing, and it is called the At-Large community, which will indicate that in fact it's ALAC and RALOs. And I think that works because this is not just an ALAC document, it should be an ALAC document as well as a RALO document. The reason I'm mentioning RALO is not that in fact they don't say the same thing, but if you read the RALO submission that use some examples and some text which we did not, which actually provide a bit more useful information, and I would be keen to incorporate that [site].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, that's all fine. And all we're talking about, Holly, is a title on these documents right now, and I think community is a good word. There is absolutely no objection, but I think that's a hand up. The screen is so small from where I'm looking at. Is that a hand up from Alberto? Sorry, from Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, it's a hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It is? Then I was about to go to Eduardo. Go ahead, please, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I agree with what is being said, that would you have some comment, and I just want to be clear. So, we're talking only about this place where

it says ALAC and working party comments, to change it to what you suggested, Holly? Is that correct?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Eduardo, there are two boxes which Alan pointed out. One is additional working party comments, and one is ALAC comments. Given that the working party was basically producing – as well as other comments – the whole of the comments, in fact it should be just one box. So, in fact there should not be a separate section for additional working party comments. Merge that with ALAC comments and retitle it as simply At-Large comments so that it includes both ALAC and RALO comments.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay. I'm sorry, I didn't see that extra box there. That's why [inaudible] all about. Sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay. As Cheryl pointed out, it's fairly small. So, it's just I was going right through the form, and I think it makes a lot of sense to actually just combine all of the two so that in fact given the time frames, basically what we say –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I think we're in over-agreement, so that's going to happen. Let's move on.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And I'll note Ariel has already made a change, although not their final wording.

HOLLY RAICHE:

That's alright. Okay. Moving right along, Recommendation #1 – and are there any further questions on this particular form? Because what we're going to be doing – how to make comments.

In terms of this form which is from the wiki page, you make comments in the normal way. First of all, you have to log in if you're going to make comments, and then at the very bottom – in other words you have to scroll all the way through, so you cannot make comments against each of the boxes. You have to go to the bottom of the form. If you can just start where it puts the – that's where the comments are.

So in fact, even though you may be commenting on various headings, and in fact it would be very useful – now that I'm thinking about it – if you could indicate where your comments should go. Should they go under the At-Large comments? Should they go under dependencies? Who will implement? Indicate where the comments go, because there should be two categories. One is the comments, and then some indication of what you're thinking about in terms of implementation and the importance of implementation. So, commenting here will be the normal way that we've commented on all of the other wiki pages. You have to log in and then comment under your own name.

Ariel, can you bring up the Google Doc, please, so we can have a look at how to edit there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And here, I think it would be very good for us to just now hand over to Ariel. And if she wants to take us through so that all the working party members know exactly how to input their comments and where and how they will be promulgated. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: And before we go to Ariel, John, I don't care where you add to the comments. Everything will be read. It will all be incorporated miraculously somehow. So, that's great. Ariel, want to go ahead and talk through this version, the Google Doc's version, which is [great]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, I just want to clarify something that John said, because he said he added it to the upper sections.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: John, did you edit the upper section of the [inaudible] wiki document?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yes, I did.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's really problematic. On the wiki, you should only be making comments. Because otherwise, we don't know what to transfer over and keep them in sync.

JOHN LAPRISE: Right. My mistake.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry to interrupt, but that could get us into a real rat's nest if we end up with multiple copies of the document. Thank you. Sorry for interrupting, Holly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's not a problem. But of course, once Ariel takes us all through, everyone will know. Let's go.

ARIEL LIANG: Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks, everyone. I'm just going to go through the wiki first because I do want to emphasize a few points. I've put the link in the chat already. To find this wiki landing page, you can find it through this hierarchy on the left of the At-Large, ALAC review workplace home, and it's really like the first kind of [product] page of the current review. So, that's on the very top, and you shouldn't miss it. And then before you comment, I've put some of the reading [inaudible] points in this Please Read section, so please read that, and [on that, stress] the point that for example you need to log in to the wiki before commenting, and put

your name before the Google Doc comments and things like that. So, please do read that information here.

And then for this green box on the wiki, there are also pointers for how to comment. I will explain it here. And for the wiki part of commenting, I have put all the recommendations, individual workspace in this little box on the left. You can click through them to go through each recommendation, and then let's just go to Recommendation #1 as an example. And as what Holly mentioned earlier, we have put – there's a very loud noise in the background.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yes, somebody's disconnected, Ariel. Just hold until staff – Evin, please disconnect that number so we don't all get deafened with our [head bits.]

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Sorry about that, everyone. [inaudible] There you go. Sorry about that.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thank you very much, Evin. So, for the top section that John mentioned, there's just a topic that's using the template provided by the MSSSI staff, and then we extracted the relevant comments on the previous ALAC statement to prepopulate this table. So, please do not change the contents in this table. In fact, after this call I will put some added restriction in here so that this content in this table won't be changed so that we don't make any confusions later.

And if you want to provide comments via the wiki template, please put your comment under this comment section here, and also as Holly mentioned earlier, scroll all the way to the bottom, and then once you log in to the wiki, you can see your name, your photo here, write a comment and you can just type your comment here and save so the comment will be logged in the wiki page. And if you see other people's – thank you, Evin. So, if you see other people's comments and you want to respond to, you can also do that, and in fact we already have for example Alan responded to Holly's comment. So, you can quick reply to other people's comments [inaudible] you log your comment responding to this person's comment. So, you can do that as well. That's for the wiki part.

And then for the Google Document, I'll go back to the landing page first, because I also put the Google Document link in this wiki page. And also, all of the ALAC members, RALO leaders, ALAC Review Working Party members and also ALAC liaisons, you have received individual invites from me to comment on this Google Document. So, if you didn't receive such an invitation, please contact me individually and I will send you an invitation. But you should have received that. And you can also access the document through the link here.

This is the Google Document, and basically, the content is exactly the same as what you see in the wiki in terms of the content in the table. So, it's exactly the same, and the advantage of commenting on this Google Document is that you can directly highlight certain parts of the passage and then you can put in your suggestions.

So, right now I'm in edit mode, but I can go into it so I have a different access privilege here. But for other people, you can just highlight whatever [it happens] you want to say, "I want to change this word," and you can type your suggested word here. And then for example now we see your comment will be popped on the right.

So, that's a way to do it. I have another very important point I want to make, is that if you have a Google account, please log in so that when you comment, we can see who has made a comment. But if you do not have one, you can still comment on this Google Document. But please write your name before a comment so we can identify who has said what and we can follow up with you later if other people want to respond to your comments, and make sure it's not completely anonymous and we cannot trace back and figure out the rationale for certain suggestions or comments. So, that's a very important point here.

I will stop here, and Holly, Cheryl and Alan, please add it if there's anything I missed.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Ariel, that's fine. Thank you very much. And I guess the answer to John is, John, if you want to change the text below or above the line, use the Google Doc because then we can actually trace who did it.

So, just to review – and Ariel, could you put an action item on yourself just to resend the links to both so that people can be sure that they have the ability to comment on both? Would be great, and the reminder for what Ariel has just said, for the wiki page, please all of your comments go below the text. For the Google Docs, if you do not have a

Google account, then when you are writing your comment, please put your name so we can trace back. And it's going to be up to the leadership team to actually read all of the comments and combine them.

I would urge that because of the tight timeframe, if the RALOs can actually get together or urge each other to make comments, that would be very helpful. Thank you very much. Alan, go ahead. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Just a reminder of what I said before, and as you make your comments, it could be helpful if you identify them as, is this something you really believe should be included in the comment to the Board, or is this a detail of implementation that we will be taking into account from the next path? Because as I said earlier, if we start giving very detailed, "We should do X, Y and Z which might encourage working groups to be more active, or rewrite the charter because then it'll be clearer to people," if we put things like that into the Board response, we are then going to have to track them and respond to each of them, and give status reports every three months. Whereas if we simply use it as our own notes to ourselves, our life is going to be a lot easier. So, let's try to make our lives – in my mind – easier, not more complex.

But any comments like that are helpful. Even if they don't go into the document itself, it will help us to the next phase. We are optimistic that the Board will accept our recommendations and will go ahead and implement whatever it is we're saying. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Alan. And just to stress, do not shy away from recommend any implementation steps. Because even if it doesn't make it into the Board document, ways forward and suggestions of ways forward will be really useful. While it may not be officially what goes to the Board, it's going to be very useful because how we implement these, how we implement the recommendations is something we have to work through. The Board's not going to see all of it, but we have to see all of it, and so if you've got some great ideas, that would be fantastic, and would be really welcome.

So, with that, we've got an action item on Ariel to resend the links. We've been through the timeframe which Alan has kindly updated. We have agreed that we're going to combine the two sections in the template, the additional working party comments and At-Large working comments are going to be combined into one heading which is simply At-Large comments. And we have a very tight timeframe, but I really hope that all of you could have a look at the document, and make some comments, because we're going to be coming back to this mid-August with a document that everybody's going to have to look at and probably have just one week to comment on before it goes to the Board.

So, aside from Cheryl, has anybody got any comments? At this stage, in fact we just need all of you to read the documents and comment on them. Cheryl, go ahead, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much, Holly. So, as all of the working party members – whether they're observers and participants or whether they're a

representative – are going to go back now and do that outreach and interaction and homework that we've heard from a couple of [inaudible] today that they're poised ready to run. We encourage you to remember that as you are the technically penholders, and you're the ones who will be making any comments into the Google Doc, that you send links far and wide for anybody's input only of the wiki.

That doesn't mean that we may not get someone finding their way into the Google Doc, and that's okay, because if it's you, you'll be identified, and if it's not, well, we'll sort it out or treat it with whatever level of desirability we want to when we discuss it. But I would encourage just about anyone to put a comment in the wiki in the normal wiki comments way, but use your Google Doc link as your tool.

Now, on that, Holly, I'm hoping that we will be agreeing now to a next meeting, and I will suggest that next week – which brings us a couple of days before the first deadline of the 6th of August. The 6th of August of course is going to be interestingly enough over the weekend, but that's fine. So, there are a couple of opportunities for us to meet as a working party, and any of the ALAC who wish to join us next week as well.

I would like to suggest that we look at something at the 20:00 UTC mark. If not, most of my 19:00s next week are fully booked, but I assume an hour later, at 18:00, may be okay. So, if we want to do a Doodle – and I'm happy to do so as long as it literally goes out today – perhaps we can offer from, say, the 2nd, 3rd and 4th of August dates at the 18:00 and 20:00, but I cannot do 20:00 UTC on the 3rd of August because I'm chairing another call at that time. So, that would be the only one that I won't be available on. So, if you don't mind, I would not

put that timeslot into the Doodle. I'm happy to go to 21:00, but I think 20:00 is usually about as friendly a time zone as we get across all the regions, through experience.

That'll allow us to then not only look at what happened with the Google Doc and start doing some agreements and acceptances of some of those comments that you'll have all been putting in at that time, but also take a good conversation on prioritization and resources, which I think are the two other primary ones. And I'm pleased to see Vanda say 21:00 is always good for her. So, let's put 21:00 on all those days as well. And I suggest they should be 2nd, 3rd and 4th. I have no problem working on the Saturday, which remembering if it's 4th for the rest of you, it's Saturday for Holly and I. So, that should work out.

If that's able to be done, then I think we're in pretty good stead to go to AoB, Holly, and I'll hand it back to you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, it's [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: Who's speaking?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, good morning.

HOLLY RAICHE: Hello.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: You're on the wrong call. I think you're on the wrong call.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello?

HOLLY RAICHE: [Kaili?]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can hear you. Just say what you want to say. And the first thing you should say is who you are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, good morning. [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You have the wrong number. Just identify the line, Evin. Identify the line. At the moment, mute it, and if it's someone who doesn't belong here, disconnect it. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you. We will mute him.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. Okay. We will have – and for another action item, if you could put down sending out a Doodle for the next call, and check with Cheryl and myself as to the appropriate time for that. I am not volunteering for Saturday, by the way. At that stage we will be able to start going through what the comments are so that we will be able to meet what is a very tight timeframe in terms of getting together all of the content for all of the headings that are there. But in the meantime, it's the top of the hour. Is there any further comment, Any Other Business? Because if not, you've got two free minutes.

If there are no other comments, then I could say thank you to everybody for attending this call, and we will probably talk relatively soon. But in the meantime, please use either the wiki or the Google Doc to make your comments, remembering that for the wiki, please make your comments below the text with your name. And if it's Google Docs, and you are not subscribed as a Google member, then please put your name so that we can identify where the comments are coming from.

And again, I would say go back and look at the RALO submission as well, because even though they're very similar, there are some very interesting points made in the RALO submissions. With that, I would thank you and say this call is at an end.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, everyone. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you all. This call is now adjourned. Thank you very much for your participation, and please do not forget to disconnect your line when you're leaving the AC room and the bridge. Thank you very much, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]