ANDREA GLANDON:	Thank you. We will now officially start the recording of this conference call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the NARALO monthly teleconference on Monday, 13 August 2018, at 19:00 UTC.
	On today's call, we have Allan Skuce, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gordon Chillcott, Javier Rua Jovet, Joe Catapano, Judith Hellerstein, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight. On audio only, we have Shelley Robinson. We have apologies noted from Anna Loup.
	From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco; and myself, Andrea Glandon, on call management.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please mute your phones and microphones when not speaking to avoid any background noise.
	Thank you, and over to you, Eduardo.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you so much. First of all, I want to thank you [inaudible] for being here today. I want to say a few remarks before we get into the agenda as such.
	Just a couple of announcements. We have a new individual member that just joined us between the last meeting and this one. His name is George Kirikos. I invited him to be in this meeting, but he wasn't able to get to this meeting. So I will have him during the September meeting so

he can introduce himself. He's from Canada, and he has been around for [about] 15 years watching policy making in ICANN. So I'm going to let him talk next time.

Also, we have in process a new ALS application from [Alternatives]. They are from Montreal, Canada. This is through Glenn's outreach. This is an organization that according to its application is about 2,000+ members. So, Glenn, if you can talk about them later, I would really appreciate it. But let's see what happens from this meeting to the next one.

Also, we have decertification process going on for the also Knujon from Garth Bruen. Some of you may have known him. We reached [out] to him, and he doesn't want to participate in these meetings or ICANN Org at all. So hasn't been around for almost more than a year now. So we're doing that.

During the agenda today, we have [inaudible] webinar with Cheryl [inaudible] and Alan, which maybe he's there or not. But this is ask them to give us a presentation. I don't know if you know ALAC has went through a review of the structure for about three years now on and off. At the end of these three years, there was an ALAC document that was sent to the board saying we read the reviews and this is our recommendation. This is what we are planning to do.

The board accepted this, and now after a long process we finish [to start] and to start the implementation on this review, Cheryl and Holly, I believe, are manning this working group that are going to be in charge of implementation. We invited them here to tell us what is going to be happening in the future, how things are going to change, how things are

EN

going to be implemented just to give us an idea of this implementation that everybody should know about. It will affect everyone, RALOs and ALAC as well.

With that in mind, the agenda, does anyone have a question or changes to the agenda, or can we accept the agenda the way it is? If we don't have any objections, the agenda gets approved.

The first item in the agenda is the CROP FY18. I don't see William here. He hasn't reported on the ARIN 41 yet. Glenn, can you tell us a little bit about this effort and then Judith, please, that we did during the RightsCon meeting?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. As we mentioned at the last meeting, RightsCon actually was in Toronto. It's back and forth. It was in Brussels the year before and San Jose the year before that. Excellent conference. Not sure where, maybe Judith knows, where it's going to go next year. But we did also a workshop on the indigenous fellowship program, which was well attended as well.

[I'm] doing outreach [and it's summer], so the potential ALS was the CNIB, which is the Canadian National Institute of the Blind. It has expressed interest [at the summer], so they're going to get back to me as a potential ALS in the fall.

All I can say is if you're interested in human rights and [digital] rights, which is a big issue, RightsCon is the place to go. Maybe Judith has a comment as well.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. Yeah, as Glenn said, it was an excellent conference. The next conference, I believe, is in Tunisia. So it's not in our field, but many of the people I was looking at, some people who were on as individuals because their association is more global and so they can't come on there, but they would like to come on. So there's [inaudible] different people [inaudible].

But it's an excellent conference, and we had really great interest in our indigenous panel. It still remains a very good opportunity because we want to get people more known about ICANN, especially from the At-Large point of view. It's usually a [inaudible] NCUC. So we want to make sure there's always an At-Large point of view because some of the NCUC people who come on tend to [inaudible] badger At-Large. So it's always good to have different viewpoints. That's all I've got.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you, Judith. I think Glenn has his microphone on. I don't think he's online. I wanted to ask him a question about this [Alternative] group if it came out from this CROP trip or not, but I will ask him later. Glenn? Glenn, are you there?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, my phone rang at the same time. I apologize. What was the question?

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ:	Oh, I have a question. This [Alterative] ALS, that new application, did that come from any of these meetings, or this is something that you did on your own?
GLENN MCKNIGHT:	Yeah, actually I met them prior to the [DNS] symposium in Montreal in June. But I did follow up with them in June for their application. These are people that I've said in a Skype chat, they're working on the first North American IGF, and it's going to be prior to or after the ICANN event in Montreal in November 2019, which also will have the School of Internet Governance as well. So it's going to be a very, very important meeting between the IGF, the School of Internet Governance, and the ICANN meetings.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Okay, thank you so much. That's part of the things that I wanted to show here is that these are results directly from people that are going to CROP meetings, and it shows that there [will be] contacts and we do have leads and we follow up on them. So thank you so much, Glenn and Judith, for your reports.
	Next one in line is Leah. Leah, you're still in the NomCom. Can you give us a final – I know that the NomCom reported on the final selection, but this is time for you to say any words that you want about this NomCom or the next NomCom.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah, sure. I'm just excited that for me it was my first NomCom. I think we really put in a lot of effort to reviewing all the [inaudible] candidates and then coming up with the most successful and suitable eight. We definitely included input from the community, from the various constituencies in terms of what their needs our, and then our own experience through the interviews and applications reviews to make sure we were choosing the most suitable candidates. We hope that the candidates that we selected make a good representation and meet some of the goals apart from just the skills and experience in terms of diversity and representation.

There's still more work to be done, and we hope that the next NomCom can continue with the processes and procedures in place. We definitely welcome feedback from the community to help us in our next year. I thank you all for your support and welcome anymore input definitely from community on how we can continue to better this process. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Leah, I have a question for you. This was your first time in the NomCom. Now that you have been selected for the next one, do you feel that you are more prepared based on the experience that you had this year?

LEAH SYMEKHER: Yeah, absolutely. I think the first year is usually a very intensive learning experience. Working with the previous NomCom delegates and new NomCom delegates and the leadership team, I think that really has helped a lot. Things that we did in this NomCom like creating the job

descriptions, the criteria for selection, the [face-to-face] intercessional, those really were a great way for me as a new delegate to learn and be able to know how to apply that, how to become better as a delegate in my second year. So I really think [things that were done with this team] helped me to learn and prepare me for the second year, and hopefully we can continue with the new process that we set in place.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I think in my personal opinion we are very well represented there in the NomCom, so I wish you lots of work in a good sense and another successful year.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Thank you. Thank you very much, and thank you for ALAC for having confidence in me and choosing me again to represent for the next year.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. For the next one, Glenn, it's yours, the NARALO.org. We wanted to keep this discussion open, so we'll send it to you on this.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, I think everybody has given feedback on the changes and updating of the links. [Evin] has worked hard on fixing the site. So if there are any other comments from any other community members, please let us know. If not, I think we can close this item. But I just wanted to give the opportunity to the community if there's something that still is not satisfactory to you that you would like to see changed. But we did the

updates, which were glaring, and I think it's find now. So I'll just turn it to the community if there are any other comments.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I do have a question. I always get confused between there's a web page for NARALO, a web page for ALAC, and there is a wiki. When you look across these places, there is information in one but it's not in the other one. It has been uploaded in one place but not in the other one. The links do not work in one; they work in the other ones. It's kind of messy to find information.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah, I can't disagree with you. Perhaps that's something we can look to staff as maybe just having the one. But there are clearly two different pages, and it's hard to update. One gets updated; one doesn't. Perhaps it's something for staff to consider just having the one.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Or maybe we can use one for specific information and the other one just for work. I don't know if [you] follow. Like wiki the [way it's treated] more for work and you can comment on things, you can develop documentation, you can take care of whatever work you have to do there. But the organization itself should be in another place. Because sometimes what happens is you are in one place [and you have it] in another place. But anyhow, we aren't going to solve that now. This is a problem that I have. Glenn?

EN

GLENN MCKNIGHT:	Yeah, I see that Heidi has put her hand up. She's probably responding to my comment of the explanation by staff, so I'll turn it back to you, Eduardo.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Okay, Judith, your hand was first or Heidi? I'm not sure. I wasn't looking. But anyhow, let's have Heidi and then Judith.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you. I'll be brief. Yes, Eduardo and Glenn, in response to your comments about the web and the wiki, particularly for the RALOs, we are conscious that sometimes they're a little confusing. Now the wiki is normally meant to be more of a working environment. So that's where you'll have, for example, the policy. That's where the drafts are, etc., the working groups. That's again where all the work on the working groups is.
	For the RALOs themselves, you will be updating those in collaboration with incoming chair Maureen as well as the RALO chairs. We've already had some early discussions on making them more personal, etc. So you'll see some improvements, again, in collaboration with all of you and likely the subcommittee on outreach and engagement on how to make those more effective. Thank you so much.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you, Heidi. That sounds great. Judith, please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. This problem has been around for a long time. The problem is that the website is only under the control of [inaudible] under the control of certain At-Large staff while the wiki is under everyone's control. But the problem is what goes on one, what goes on the other, and the links.

When I was a secretary, there was a big problem always with that, and I don't know how we could solve it. I guess how we could solve it is have only certain information that is not changed on the website. Like have join an ALS or links to a meeting or something like that. Then that way, it limits the amount of things that have to be cross referenced on the web. Most of the work goes on the wiki. That's one thing that we can do.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Judith. So let's see what [this work that] Maureen has in mind, what's going to be there. But at least we are all aware of this point, and we just have to find the best way to make it more easy to find information and more easy to [inaudible].

The next one is the section for our ALAC members to give us a report on what has been happening since last we met here in terms of what's happening in ALAC. So Javier, Jon – I don't know if Jon is here – and Alan, any one of you want to [inaudible] first? Is there anything to say?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, you faded out. I think you said no one else is here but me, so I'm going to do it. Is that correct?

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: You can do it, yes, and Javier is online. So just go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then let's go to Javier in that case.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, Javier, are you ready to talk? It's muted. You're muted. In any case, Alan, go ahead. I don't think Javier is [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The short answer is there's an awful lot going on in terms of policy work. There are things related to WHOIS, GDPR, EPDP. I'm just going to give you buzzwords, and I'll tell you why in a moment. There is a public comment open on subsequent rounds for new gTLDs. There are a number of other public comments that we're responding to because there things don't stop even though there are bigger issues going on at the same time.

We are holding a weekly consolidated policy working group that is looking at the two main substantive issues. That is, the new gTLD rounds where we have to formulate the public comment within the next few weeks and the ongoing work, including several webinars and tutorials on issues related to WHOIS, to RDS. So I'm not going to try to describe the details here.

There are ongoing meetings that are being presented. We send out invitations to everyone, and if you attend, you'll find out a lot more about these things.

EN

The consolidated policy working group is also the general place where we're looking at responding to ICANN policy statements and ICANN public comments. That's the place to go to find out what's going on and how you can contribute, so I'm not going to spend a lot of time looking at the individual details. The agenda points to a lot of them. But there's lots and lots of work going on and lots of opportunities for people to contribute. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I want to add this consolidation working group is an excellent place to talk about policy and see what's going on. I guess the main reason that working group was created was so we have a coordinated voice in how we supply comments [to this] policy. Because this subsequent procedures, I don't know how many pages that thing has. It has pages and pages and pages of questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Many hundreds.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Many hundreds. So it's not that you can divide and conquer here. You have to look at them and choose, and that's what this consolidation group is doing. Select the ones that we want to have a statement on because there were some that don't affect the end user at all. It's a very interesting process not only in the sense that you can see what [the ones are there] but you are able to look at these questions from the perspective of the end user.

So I recommend everyone that, like Alan said, this is an open invitation. It's there. It's open. And I recommend anyone to participate or at least be an observer and see how the process goes because it's very well refined [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: And one of the co-chairs has his hand up.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Sorry. I think I got distracted and didn't realize we had gotten to the policy group update report. I apologize.

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, sorry, Jonathan, to interrupt you. We are just going through the things that were happening in ALAC, and Alan just talked about this consolidation working group. But go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I see. All right. I got confused by how we were on that topic. Sorry, [inaudible].

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, go ahead and talk about the policy group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: One of the things that I wanted to mention and was just going to mention when we got to that update is that as we identify the issues, we're trying as a group to identify what matters to end users and also what we think our position should be. But at that point, we'll then need people to participate in drafting that section of our response. So we are interested in more people being engaged to do some writing on a particular question because there are so many questions to answer. So I just wanted to add that to Alan's description.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's not just something to watch. It's something in which to participate.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, that's correct. I mentioned observing, but it's really we want active participation [on the team] in the discussion and in making some of these questions [inaudible].

Is Javier online? Javier? Hello? No? Okay, well, thank you so much.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Hello? Hello?

EDUARDO DIAZ:	Javier? Do you want to add something to what Alan said about what is happening in ALAC and about [the last call]? I don't know if you wanted to say something. Do you have anything?
JAVIER RUA JOVET:	Sure. I can [inaudible]. I always talk about Work Track 5 because I'm there. In terms of policy, Work Track 5 is moving now to its first consensus calls on country and territory names. So there's a lot of e-mail discussion going on, and some ALAC members have been involved a little bit on some particular points there. I think, Jonathan, it's in one of the loops. And I think the consolidated policy group is looking at some things that are going on in Work Track 5 regarding three- letter codes and in some language that has been proposed.
	So things are moving there. The whole idea is to have an initial report before Barcelona, around a month before Barcelona, so around September. So I'll say that for now. Thanks.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you so much. Questions for Alan or Jon: When is the deadline for the comments for the subsequent procedures?
ALAN GREENBERG:	I believe the submission deadline is somewhere around 1 September. I don't remember the exact date, but not long from now.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, so it's not like we have to wait another month just talking about it. We have to start acting on it and writing.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have to start writing soon, otherwise we're not going to have something.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yeah, okay.

JAVIER RUA JOVET: Remember, that deadline is for Work Tracks 1-4 [inaudible]. Remember that Work Track 5 has a different schedule. It's a bit behind, so we haven't even put out an initial report yet. So, Eduardo, the comments [inaudible] for the initial report of Work Tracks 1-4.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you for the clarification.

There were a few of the members from NARALO that participated in the IGF USA. I thought it would be interesting to have some of you people who are here, I see Dustin there, [John Moore], I don't see him in the list. But if you can tell us what happened in the IGF USA, what was important for us to know, and get an idea of what happened there. I know this was [not] a CROP trip, so many of you went on your own dime. But in any case, I wanted to give the opportunity to the rest of the

membership here to know what IGF USA is all about and what happened there. So, Dustin, you want to go first?

DUSTIN PHILLIPS: Sure, yeah, I can do that. We had the conference on July 27, a few weeks ago. It was well attended. It had about 250 in-person participants and, I don't know, maybe around [800] remote participants and covered a variety of topics, ranging from the future of work to privacy to the impact of courts on Internet governance and cross-border regulation and other topics as well.

One thing that was cool that we did differently this year is we had a lot more interactive sessions throughout the day rather than the typical panel plus Q&A. Being in the room for a few of them, I have to say that they went a lot better than I expected, and I had decent hopes for them. They really engaged and informed the audience.

I know we have a few of the session organizers on the call as well, so I can let them speak more to some of the specifics of what was discussed and what they took away from their panels. But it was a successful event, and we're looking into adding more activities in between the annual conference around the U.S., not just in DC. So if there are any people on this call that have an interest in having an IGF on-the-road event come to them between now and next summer, reach out to us and let us know.

As Glenn is mentioning in the chat, we did take the opportunity in the closing plenary to honor David Vyorst who was the executive director of ISOC-DC as well as the co-chair of IGF USA for the past several years

who passed back in December and also [inaudible] who was really influential in Connecting the Next billion work and was a former political appointee in the Obama administration.

So I can go ahead and hand it over to Jonathan and Judith to fill in the rest about some of their sessions.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much, Dustin. For the rest of the people, just to let you know that Dustin Phillips was one of the co-chairs of the IGF USA this year. So thank you so much. Judith, you have your hand up. Hello? I guess not. Anyone else want to mention any…?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hello, it's me.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, go ahead please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I had myself on mute by accident.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay.

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I led the connectivity panel. What we did was very unusual. We decided [with the] interactive. We first had a series of lightning talks. We focused on connectivity and [economic] opportunities and what our community is doing and what can we more. So we had communities throughout the U.S., from Appalachia, from California, from New York. We had a government person from Boston telling about what they're doing on expanding connectivity.

We started out with a series of seven lightning talks of about here or four minutes each. Then we had some Q&A and some questions. Then we broke out into a series of table for about 15-20 minutes to try to work out some solutions on how we can get these ideas moving forward. Then we brought everyone back together with a recap of what they had suggested on it.

We had a packed room, standing room only. Everyone was very engaged because we had gotten them in the table discussions and figuring out what kind of solutions they have and whatnot.

We also had [inaudible] represented the indigenous communities. So we had very open and a lot of heated discussions on how we could solve connectivity from either the low income cultural problems going into other ones in Appalachia or in Detroit where there are some other issues through finishing up talking about California and their issues of creating an online community college and giving free tuition for the first year or something to the online community college. So it was a fascinating series of lightning talks.

Every single one of the sessions was captioned, so we have transcripts for every single one of them. I think [inaudible] is putting them up on the site along with the videos.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much, Judith. That sounds like you had a very great time there and it was very successful. I have only a couple minutes. Glenn, I have Jonathan too, can you have one minute to say what you have to say and then let's continue the next item?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sure. I'll be very quick. I'd like to thank the organizers for a great job, as always. I'd like to also mention that this is an open process so if you have a topic you feel that the IGF USA is ignoring or it should be showcased for next year, you're more than welcome to join in to the monthly calls and have your voice known so that the topic. And you can also volunteer to coordinate a panel. There are pictures and video of the event. So that's it. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eduardo. I helped organize the future of work panel, which I thought was interesting and worth checking out. But I want to really direct people to the GDPR session. I thought it was a really good discussion. It was about whether or not the United States should adopt

GDPR-like legislation. It was a pretty vigorous debate, and I recommend it to anyone to check out the video of it because I think it was a very good discussion and a lot of thought provoking observations made by the panel. So I really want to direct people to the GDPR session at the IGF USA.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you so much. If you can find the link and put it in the chat, I would really appreciate it, to that video if you know it. Thank you so much. Glenn, I don't know, you have your hand up [inaudible].

Okay, well, in any case, let's move to the next item. It's a very short one about the work ahead to meet the implementation review. Alan and Cheryl, I invited – [inaudible] invited them – to this meeting. We have about 25 minutes or less to do the presentation and the question and answer. So, go ahead, Cheryl or Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan first. If we could have the slides, please. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Sorry, Alan, just a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lots of documents. Not the right one yet, but it's coming.

ANDREA GLANDON: I know. Give me just a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: You're welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG: As you can see, I have rechristened the group NACRALO instead of NARALO, an accidental typo. Next slide, please.

We'll start off with a little bit of a history. It's going to be a very brief history. The At-Large review has been going on now for something over three years, and there are lots of little things that have happened along the way.

A little over two and a half years ago or two and a quarter, the team was selected to do the review. A draft report was issued in January 2017. The final report was issued in May 2017. By September, we had given your formal response to it, and this was in the form of a feasibility assessment and implementation plan.

Essentially, we were asked to comment on whether we believed the recommendations were feasible and how we would implement them. We did that and we responded, to a large extent, somewhat negatively. About half of the recommendations were accepted with qualification, and about half of them were rejected.

EN

Our response went to the board committee responsible for reviews, he Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and they had somewhat of a problem because normally they will receive a report from an AC or SO that would say how they are going to implement the implementations. They would approve it or perhaps ask for some modifications and then pass it on to the board for the board to say, "Yes, this is what we would do."

Unfortunately, since we were not in a position to say, "This is how we are going to implement the recommendations" because we were either rejecting or modifying pretty much all of them, the OEC had a real problem of what is it they approve to pass on. So they had a relatively inspired reaction, and they asked for a mapping to be done from between the issues and our proposals, effectively recognizing as we did that many of the issues that were identified were real problems but we did not agree with the recommendations on how to solve them.

So they essentially asked for a mapping from the issues to the proposals, effectively bypassing the recommendations. Staff delivered that mapping. We looked at it, and we had some problems with it but the overall concept was the correct one. And we essentially revised the mapping document to be more focused on what we would be doing and explaining to the board why we were doing that. Because clearly, if we are not following the recommendations, we have to explain how it is we're going to address the issues.

We did that in a document that was entitled the "At-Large Review Implementation Overview Proposal," a rather long name but it made clear that we were talking about the implementation. It was a proposal

from us, but it was just an overview. The actual detailed planning was still to be done.

Last June, the board accepted that proposal. The OEC accepted it followed by the board. That is now turned over to us for us to implement.

So that's the history. Looking at what it is that we said we would do, we were addressing the issue that there were not enough people involved in our policy discussions. So we said we would address that. There was a clear statement of perceptions about At-Large. That is, there was stagnation, no new leaders. A lot of our documentation on the web and the wiki gave mixed messages. We were both complemented and criticized on outreach, similarly on social media. And, of course, it was mentioned that if we are going to have targets to make changes, we must measure these things. Next slide. Can we scroll the slide, please? Thank you.

Okay, so going into a little bit more detail, it's individuals who do work. It's fine to say we have ALSes or we have working groups or whatever, but when it comes down to it, it's individuals who write text, it's individuals who make proposals, and we need to identify those.

So we have ALSes. Now ALSes in many cases we have looked at purely as the representative. But the reason we have ALSes is they are groups of people, sometimes big groups, and we need to reach out to the people within each ALS for potential workers.

EN

And, of course, we have individuals. We've always had them in NARALO. Not so in the other RALOs. But there's no need for someone to have to go build an ALS just because they want to participate.

We need to improve how we communicate with people to tell them why they should be interested and tell them what they need to do. That has to be done in simple language for people who are not already involved in ICANN. We need to, once we get people who are interested, we actually need to involve them and not just have them watch. Next slide.

All right, it was made quite clear that there are people within ICANN, many people within ICANN, who believe that there is no turnover in people within At-Large. The same people just get recycled into different positions. One of the things we did is document the history to demonstrate that there are a lot of people. But at the same time, the criticism was not wholly without merit. So partly, we need to document that we bring lots of new people in, but we also need to keep them and have them move up in the ranks. So we need to be careful that we're not just moving our friends around from one position to another but making sure we get new people involved and get them really active.

In terms of documentation, we need to make sure that when we say something on the web, it's really clear. We've had problems before. We have problems with the organization of our wikis. That was sort of implied before in our discussion of the wiki and the web. It's not always obvious to people how to find their way around things. Next slide (and the last slide).

Outreach, as we've already talked about in this meeting a little bit, the challenge is not to do outreach. It's easy to go talk to people, but the outreach has to be with a goal. It needs to be with a goal of actually getting people involved. And not just getting them involved because they want to join ICANN because it sounds like a neat thing to do but get them involved as actual workers. That, again, is the challenge.

Better use of social media will help that hopefully. And, of course, we have to be able to track things to demonstrate that, indeed, we are doing things, we do have people involved. Because the credibility of our organization depends on having other people have faith that we're really doing a good job.

That's about how we got here and where we're going and how we're going to go there. I'll turn it over to Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. While Andrea loads up the slides, I'm just going to jump right into it. These slides are a few, but they're worthy. The reason they're worthy is because Maureen and I are hoping that each of the RALOs will be able to use them as a ready reckoner reference point. You can load them up wherever you like on your wikis and web pages. But what we want to make sure we're doing is allowing anyone who is listening to today's recording or looking to find more information to get full and accurate information.

So let me give you the high points and [holiday features] of the board resolution as at 23 June 2018. The ICANN board resolution regarding ALAC review and the proposal that we made as Alan outlined as to how

we would respond to issues identified is quite lengthy. But the part I want to start you at today and the part that I think is the most germane to our RALOs and our work going forward is all the way down in Item (h.), although I would recommend that you all take some time and read the full Whereases and Resolveds. It's a very good resolution.

That's where in the Consent Agenda part of it was resolved that the board accepted the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan as approved by the ALAC on 22 August and the Review Party's implementation working plan as approved by the ALAC on 20 April 2018. This is very important because what it means is the work we have to do now is the work we self-determined.

That's going to be very, very odd if people keep scrolling. Let's just to go to Number 3, which is the following one. There we go. Oh, dear. Okay, I don't know about anyone else, but I'm getting dizzy.

The thing that's worth noting is that as part of this resolution – what we should be looking at is the slide headed "Formation of the ARIWG." As part of this resolution, there is a requirement, it was resolved as follows:

The board directs the ALAC to convene – I don't know if I have scroll control or not. I do. There we go. Formation of the – my apologies – working group. The board directs the ALAC to convene an At-Large review implementation working group – which, of course, we've immediately shortened into the letters ARIWG because we need more letters in our lives.

This is the working group. It is a new working group that oversees the implementation process of the implementation proposals contained in our documentation as accepted and reviewed. This was formalized in the meetings of Panama, and this is, of course, the vehicle that we're going to be going forward.

At this point, I need to offer the chair of the ARIWG's apologies. Maureen Hilyard, involved with our regional IGF in Vanuatu at the moment and was unable to make this call. But it's under her new group, this ARIWG, which Alan and I are pleased to serve as ex officio members on, that the ongoing work will be focused.

For your information, if we now move to the next slide, one of the key features of the ARIWG – I'm still getting used to using that word – is that it's going to have to have fiscal responsibility with its budget planning. This is a requirement in the resolve.

It was also resolved that the board directs the ALAC to work with ICANN Org to include expected budgetary implications for each of the implementation steps into its detailed implementation plan. This implementation plan that this working group is to put together needs to incorporate a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly improvements to be implemented firs, with those items with more significant budget implications addressed via subsequent budget cycles. So we will have to work with our ICANN budget cycles.

Any budgetary requests should be made in line with ICANN Org's budgeting processes. And the detailed implementation plan needs to be submitted to the board as soon as possible but no later than six months

after the adoption of the resolution, which, of course, was June 23. So the clock is already running on our work.

Another thing that we are required, and at this point I'd like you to move the next slide, is that there is a resolved requirement for how and when we report. Regular reporting from this working group is a requirement. It was resolved in that resolution that our working group is to provide the Organizational Effectiveness Committee semiannual written implementation reports on progress against the implementation plan, including but not limited to progress toward metrics (which Alan gave a nod to in his presentation) detailed in the implementation plan and the use of our allocated budget.

You'll see from that, that this is a very structured and highly formalized process going forward. It is real work and work that is going to take those of regional and ALAC members a great deal of time and energy to perform effectively and efficiently.

Now let's move just to the next slide, which is something that I'm not going to read in full, but I suggest you take some time in your own time to have a look at. The point here is in part from the rationale for the resolution. Here with this rationale for the resolution, it's talking about the importance of our role of the ALAC, how it is that we should be more self-determinant. I think this is something that great heart should be taken from with the hard work that the RALOs and At-Large Structures put into getting us through the reviews today.

If we move now to what is the final slide, and that is talking about the structure of this new working group, obviously, the function is clearly

outlined by the resolve. But the structure we've designed here is assumed and based on the standard practice that ALAC does with many, if not all, of it's working groups. That is it needs to be both regionally balanced and have a clear ALAC specific component to it.

In this way, we have taken a name from a volunteer from each region and a volunteer from the RALOs. So it's a region within the ALAC and a volunteer from the RALO. In NARALO's case, Eduardo was very quick to put up his hand in Panama, so he's holding your banner as a capital M Member of this working group. And John Laprise put up his hand from an ALAC regional perspective.

What we needed to do, however, is ensure that what we are going to be discussing is, of course, always open and transparent. So whilst we will have two formal members from each region, on ALAC and one RALO, and should we ever need to take a consensus call that needs to be mead, obviously, it is their voices that will be used in any count or figuring of.

But what we have, of course, adopted is a full open and transparent way of doing things, so anyone who is interested – and that's, obviously, an open invitation to everyone on this call and to any of your members of At-Large Structures or Individual members not on this call – to let staff know that they're interested in following closely and they can be a participant or an observer and you will find yourselves listed as such and recognized. Obviously, the members we expect to be paying all the extra attention and carrying the primary workload, but everyone else is more than welcome to help.

We need to be agile. It has to be worked collaboratively but in a timely manner. The published project timeline that is bound, obviously, by those major milestones in the resolve, but the timeline that we will fill out ourselves in our first meeting is something that we must attend to and wherever possible achieve.

It also needs to make sure that we have a good mix. It has to be well-founded [within] a good mix of skillsets and experience. So what we've encouraged is that the members who are stepping up to volunteer of this group should be well-founded and experienced either in ICANN review processes or ALAC reviews specifically.

Today, I'm delighted to report to you that we only have two places to fill. We need a regional representative from LACRALO and a regional representative from APRALO. We will be sorting the APRALO out when Alan, Maureen, and I present this same talk to APRALO's monthly meeting. And we are expecting to hear back from LACRALO soon. With that, at the end of this month, the last week of this month, we should be holding our first formal meetings as the ARIWG.

That's it from me. Happy to have any questions.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Alan. We have about three or four minutes for any questions, anyone.

In the meantime, I just wanted to mention from what Alan mentioned at the beginning of the history, this document that was put together, the feasibility and implementation document that was sent to the board

and then they came back and asked for a mapping, the final recommendations that we got, some of them if we were going to implement them, we would probably have to redo the whole ALAC structure. It's like we were going to be obligated to start from scratch. So that's why some of the recommendations were not accepted as such and we put out our own implementation [inaudible] this document based on what we thought needed to be done.

Any questions? If not, I want again to thank Alan and Cheryl for taking some of your time to give us this presentation. And, no, this is not policy related, but it's a thing that is happening that is very important. It's going to happen, and it will have an effect not only in ALAC or in the whole At-Large once all the things are implemented.

So with that in mind, I am going to adjourn this meeting. Thank you so much for everyone to be here today, and we'll see you next month. In the meantime, we'll continue the discussion offline. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]