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 At-Large Review Implementation Working Group call held on Tuesday, the 28th of August, 2018, at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Alberto Soto, Alfredo Calderon, Cheryl Langon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Holly Raiche, John Laprise, Lianna Galstyan, Maureen Hilyard, Nadira Al-Araj, Sarah Kiden, and Satish Babu.

We have apologies noted from Bastiaan Goslings, Alan Greenberg, Bartlett Morgan, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, and Justine Chew.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich on audio, Evin Erdogdu, Jennifer Bryce, Negar Farzinnia; and myself, Andrea Glandon on call management.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, to please speak at a reasonable rate for interpretation, and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Andrea, and welcome, everybody. I hope I'm coming through clearly. It's nice to have so many people on the call today. Thank you. Just going over the aim of this particular working group, I guess starting off with the expectations of ICANN in regards to the purpose of reviews. And ICANN actually states that the purpose of ICANN reviews is to support a culture of continuous improvement as

---

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.

well as encouraging accountability and transparency. I'd like to think that this is what we are going to attempt in the implementation of our plan, so that we can demonstrate or confirm that we're fulfilling our purpose within ICANN to our own stakeholders as well as other constituencies within the ICANN community.

Moving on to what we've [inaudible]. There's going to be further information later on in this call. But, in response to the actual review which took place nearly two years ago, ALAC reports to the board are quite comprehensive, and we had input from both ALAC and the wider At-Large community. That's something that was a great team effort putting those responses together.

But they included the two main reports for the At-Large review recommendations, feasibility assessment and implementation plan – even the title took up half the document – which was presented in August of last year. So, that was a year ago that we actually put that report together. Then, of course, the At-Large review implementation overview proposal which was the one we presented in April this year. Of course, it's that proposal and its recommendations that this working group is going to be working on. And it was accepted by the board on the 23rd of June, so it's taken us a little bit of time to get going, but this is what we're going to be working on.

And the board is expecting three things from us in the resolution, three main things that we're going to be concentrating on. The first thing of course was what we've actually done today, and that's form the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group. And our role is to oversee the implementation process without At-Large as we go through

the actual process and to ensure that our implementation plan includes metrics and overview, defined goals and methodology, prepared for each implementation item.

So, I mean, that's going to be a task that we're going to have to take responsibility for, and there's a form which I'll talk about later which we're going to have to use for that. The second thing is that we work with ICANN org staff if there are any budgetary implications for each of the steps in our plan, and the detailed implementation plan has to be ready within six months of the adoption of the resolution. So that takes us up to the 23rd of December. And we've been working on a timeline that's going to help us to do that. I'm actually hoping it'll be done a whole lot before that date, but [inaudible] that's our timeframe.

And the third thing is that as we're going through this process, we have to provide a [six-monthly] report to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee detailing the progress that we're making with our plan and giving special attention to metrics and of course how we use our budget. So in a nutshell, that's basically what we'll be doing as a working group. And I'm looking forward to working with everybody on this and to help us to achieve the expectations of the board and to produce this really exciting and innovative and sustainable plan that we hope to achieve as its major outcome. So that is how I see the aims of the group. So we can begin. Are there any questions, first off? Oh, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you hear me? Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I can.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, this report that is due every six months, when is the first one due? When does the first date start? When they approve this or when we say we start?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think the report is due, like [if they take it the] start is when the resolution was – from the board resolution, so six months from the resolution, which is between now and – I think it's December anyway. Isn't it? [inaudible] six months.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, it is. It's the 23rd of December, because it goes from the date of the resolution, which was the 23rd of June, and Maureen felt, for some peculiar reason, that some of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee may not be spending the following days of the 23rd of December reading our document. I can't understand why. Apparently, some parts of the world do something at that time of year. So she's aiming for earlier. But from an administrative point of view, the drop-dead date that Maureen is aiming for is no later than the 21st. so you'll see the 21st of December as the end milestone for this first reporting period in the initial report in any of the documents and graphics that are

produced. Eduardo, it would have been lovely if it would have been six months from formation of our group, but they've learned those lessons in the past, so it's from their resolution. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Is that okay, Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alright. No other – oh, Alberto. Take the floor, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: You mentioned that we have to use some kind of methodology. I don't know if we have that work methodology aim at some specific task, but perhaps we may use a Gantt chart, because I think there would be some tasks that would be overlapping or will take place simultaneously, and some others that need [badges] and some others that do not need [badges.] So perhaps with a Gantt chart from, I don't know, activity [one to N,] moving to the right as in an Excel spreadsheet, and we may plan from the very beginning, but at the same time do some kind of follow-up or monitor the progress, and report on the progress that we have to report on periodically. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, do let me take that answer.

EN

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. You may.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alberto, Maureen and I asked Heidi, must be three weeks back now, what Gantt chart production software would be preference for use when we're working with ICANN, because as we know, we have enough problems moving between Word and Google Docs, so we wanted to minimize all of that.

The MSSI staff, after Heidi twisting their arms, I believe pretty much continuously, had a meeting with Maureen and I just yesterday, and that's because she didn't want to have the meeting after our initial meeting, to tell us that, yes, using [inaudible] spreadsheets and Gantt charts would be great and, oh yes, here are some blank templates that they would like us to be filling into the report.

So through what I call frustrating delay, we are planning on taking you through some of those things today. But thank you for thinking that Gantt charting is a good idea, because that's exactly what Maureen [had thought] from the beginning, just we didn't seem to be able to get the .org staff outside of our own to understand that. This is me being polite, my friend.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, that was quite a frustrating [inaudible] exercise, but we're adapting our way through that. Eduardo, you have another question.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I have a follow-up question on the report. Does this report need to be – every time we get a report, every six months, does that report have to be approved by ALAC?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I don't know. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. The board resolution specifically directs the ALAC to convene the ARIWG, and then it directs the ALAC to ensure that the reporting is in line with the other requirements, such as budgetary, etc. So I would think it would be a little bit odd if we didn't take it through some form of ALAC awareness-raising, if not ratification. I don't think it needs to be voted on, but it certainly needs to be – even if it needs voted on, that'd be great, but we do need to recognize that we're doing the work, but this is the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group on behalf of the ALAC. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. The reason I'm asking is because if we're going to go through ALAC, we have to make sure we have this review not the day before, because of the time it takes for ALAC to look at it. Thank you.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Eduardo, I believe you and indeed Alberto before you are articulating perfectly what we're going to be discussing later as well, but the reason for proper project management planning. And that's even the decision of the type of Gantt chart that we'll want to be using. I have a personal preference for a hybrid between the milestone and the project one because I like to see simple beginning and end date and rolled up milestones that have been completed and what's coming ahead in an overlapping ability, but I also like the project-style Gantt which allows the dissection exactly as you describe it to ensure that by a certain date, documents are in the hands of the ALAC, etc. And remember, this will be planning that we're running out as far as December 2020. Thanks.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Thank you, Eduardo and Cheryl. Okay, any other questions? No? Can I then move on to the introduction of the working group itself? Just an explanation, basically. We have [selected] three tiers of members, membership, and we had a bit of a discussion today and we do have to get some clarifications which have to be dealt with within [the realm.]
	But the first group of personnel that we have within the working group are members. And they're the sort of official membership group, but they're appointed by the regions, ostensibly by the regions, and they do need to have that regional balance as we have for a lot of our other working groups, and sort of an equitable representation form the ALAC and At-Large.

So the members of course at the moment are – with myself as the chair, and we have Cheryl and Alan who have been – along with Holly were sort of the main leads in the whole development of the review documents and led the ALAC and At-Large through that whole process. And then we have the ALAC and community members from AFRALO.

We have Hadia and Sarah, and I think that one of the things that we were discussing was that in the Panama meeting, we asked for volunteers to put their hands up for the particular group, and we had representatives from the different regions actually do that. However, there's been a little bit of a – there's been a request within AFRALO to review their membership, which [they're of course] entitled to do, that has to be a RALO initiative, not [inaudible] done within this group. So we'll just wait and see how that is. At the moment, we have Hadia and Sarah.

From APRALO, we have Holly, who was, as I mentioned, one of the leads in the development of this plan in a way, and we've got Satish. For ERUALO, we have Bastiaan as the ALAC member and Olivier who also was a major contributor to the reports and getting the regional leaders contribution to the – well, all the reports. And so we've got some people who have been very involved in the process from the outset, which is really important, because we're actually looking at it from the perspective of internal as well as the external responses that [made it into the review.] We have Bartlett and Alberto from LACRALO, and Jon Laprise and Eduardo from NARALO.

So they are our members, and we do expect that our members will actually be available for meetings at all times. Now, then we have a

group of the participants. Now, one of the important things about this implementation plan is that we have the voices of At-Large contributing to the activity, and so it is important that we do have participants from across all the regions.

So this is – the participants include anyone from At-Large who wants to participate in the discussion, and so that is both the online meetings and the mailing list, anyone is welcome. So I think it's really important that we get participants from across the regions. At the moment, it looks as though APRALO sort of are very keen, and I thank them very much for their support, but if we can have some participants from other regions too, that would be great.

And then [of course] the third group is the observers. Now, we're also sure that there will be other people from outside of At-Large who will be interested in what we're doing and how we're developing within our plan, and so the meetings and the mailing list is going to be available to them, except that they will be read-only on the mailing list. But [inaudible] all part of the accountability and transparency, being that [they] will be [inaudible] part of our process anyway.

So those are the three groups. And I don't see that there's any conflicts. But are there any questions about the groups?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, if I may, I just wanted to point out two things. When we made the call for people to offer themselves – and I note Sarah's got her hand up, so what I'm saying may very well affect her question, so if she can indulge me for a moment. When we asked in Panama for people to put

themselves forward for this group, we were very clear that what we wanted was members, capital M members who were committed to absolutely every meeting unless they were bedridden. Gee, like me at the moment. And gee, you can make a meeting then too. That wasn't me being funny.

But the primary requirement was to have a majority of them who were well-established in the work of either the immediately before them At-Large review working party, the original At-Large review process, or external experience in the types of quality systems and review processes. So if you happen to be an ISO 9000 or ISO 14000 auditor for example, or trainer, you'd be ideal in this process.

So we weren't looking for just any old whoever that the regions through whatever mechanism wanted to put forward. We were wanting to attract people who'd actually worked in the process before then. And despite the concern raised in one RALO by one member at least, I would have thought that the lineup that put themselves forward on behalf of that RALO were exemplary examples of exactly that criteria we were after. And indeed, one in particular, the one that sits in what would be the regional membership seat, is – if I checked correctly – still the secretary of the RALO. But anyway, I think that does need to be said, that we just don't want any old [who who] appointed. We need people who actually deeply and have been deeply engaged in the review working party process that went before it, or indeed the processes before that. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Are there any more questions or queries related to that, about members? Okay. Well, now we'll move on to –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, sorry, Satish does have – Sarah's hand's up, but Satish also has a question in chat, and I'm delighted to answer his question. Maureen and Alan and I, or Alan and I, or me and Maureen depending on which meeting we were in, did speak to the majority of the RALOs in their meetings after Panama, and we certainly made a call for people to step forward as participants. We would love to see more participants, and we can indeed make formal calls. But participants of course can join at any time.

APRALO put forward many more names than the one that was needed to fill the regional seat. And Satish, as you will know, you've put yourself forward for that, but you had many others wanting to be involved. And so knowing of that, we have listed them in the participants as a [CD of the list,] but we'd love to see any number of participants from any of the RALOs listed.

We will be listing, however, because we're going to be utterly open and transparent in everything we do. The reason that APRALO has observers, however – Satish, perhaps this is something you can answer to me and Maureen – is because that's how the action item captured your instructions. So we were certainly confused as to why t hose two names were stuck as observers. And as Maureen outlined, that would mean they would have read but no write ability to – at the mailing list.

While we have you, you might want to go back over your notes or the recordings of your meeting recently and see why staff took that down as a note. We would love to see both those names shifted to participants, which of course at the very least, they should be. If they aren't sufficiently motivated to want to occasionally post to the e-mail list, I do wonder if they're sufficiently motivated to be involved at all. But that's just my clear biases. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Sarah, take the floor, please.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi, and thank you, Cheryl, for clarifying the membership issue. I just wanted to ask how this will affect membership from AFRALO, especially based on the comments that we've received during the ALAC call and [inaudible] the ALAC call today. How will it affect us and the membership?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] Thank you. I'm happy to try and respond to that. If you – and it is your seat and you that has been, I guess we'll call it challenged. You were in the meeting, you heard what Tijani said, and Tijani has made a call for some formal process. It's totally within your region's right to do so, but I will channel Maureen for a moment and say what we need to do is get on with the work.

So until someone has literally levered you out of your regional members seat at our meetings – and I'm hoping that you won't be levered out of

your seat, because you are ideally suited to be in it – that you continue to work in the role you've been classified as. So we're going to, I'm afraid, punt it back to your region to sort it out. But we don't stop working and you don't stop sitting as a member until it is sorted out. But the challenge from Tijani was surprising to me, certainly. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for raising that, Sarah. I'm assuming anyone can actually add their name as a participant, but we do have [inaudible] leave it up to the RALO. It's their responsibility to make that change. But we just feel that it's – at the moment, we – [I feel like] a little bit out of our hands. But as a participant, anyone can join. We'd like to have your participation in this activity.

Okay, so if there are no other questions, we need to move on to the start of the formal part of this meeting where we're looking at what the board – from a formal board perspective, and Cheryl's going to give us a brief explanation of that. And the reporting guidelines, which [inaudible] some of the management tools that we were talking about which I'm supposed to be mentioning later on, but I think they will come up in Cheryl's discussion as well. So Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. And if you keep wondering why without Alan in today's call, it seems like a Cheryl and Maureen show, when you look at the member list, you'll note that Alan and I are listed as [inaudible]. If you want to imagine us as Maureen's foundation, that's a good way of doing it. Before some people wonder why that's the case, Alan of course

steered the ALAC through this last interaction with the review working party that Holly and I co-chaired, the work he did specifically with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and the development of the implementation overview proposal which is our base document makes his continued input – even though he is leaving the ALAC at the Barcelona meeting – very important. So we wanted to make sure that we had our clutches well and truly, our hooks well and truly through several layers of skin on his back so he can't escape.

And why am I there? Well, people, I'm the only person who's ever taken as a community member – and Heidi is the only one as a staff member who's taken any part of our entity through this process before. So I chaired the last review process and indeed steered through the last implementation work. In addition to that, if anyone ever wonders how I fill in my spare time, they can look at the wiki listing of what I do, and they'll see that I'm involved in a number of other ICANN organizational and specific review processes.

So I'm also taking the Nominating Committee through this exact same process, so I'm deeply immersed in what ICANN and MSSI needs and what the reporting requirements are. Which is what I'm trying to talk about, but I thought I'd just make that clear for you all, seeing as from time to time, there is a question of why people never seem to leave. Well, in some cases, some of us shouldn't on some jobs, and this is one of those examples.

Right, if we can just take our minds back to what Maureen covered in her introduction and purpose, she did mention that we had – the resolution on the 23rd specifically talked about not only the document

that the ALAC, the implementation plan that the ALAC approved this time last year, in 2017, was accepted and named in the report, but most importantly, the implementation overview proposal, that hard-wrought document that resulted in us being able to better manage what we did believe and what we didn't believe, was implementable, and ways forward on anything that was identified by the independent examiners that was approved on the 20th of April 2018 and dealt with by the Organizational Effectiveness Committee shortly after that.

That second document, which is in the primary [resolve,] is pretty much our starting point. So one of the things that I know Alan was concerned about was us not to be tempted in any way, shape or form to relitigate anything we said we were not going to be doing. So it's not that in our reporting we are going back to observations made in the report by the external examiner. We'll be using what we said was implementable, because that is what the [resolve] out of that overview proposal of April this year. It is that that the board has recognized as our base point. So again, thanks to Alan. Oh, and welcome, Alan. I see you in the chat. Perfect timing. Were you waiting in the wings until you heard us use your name in vain? Would you like to say something about that document before I jump into budgetary planning, reporting and fiscal responsibility?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really. You've all heard me talk about it far too much already. I will post in the chat in a moment when I find it, however, a quote from the RSSAC, comments on their report. And all I can say is I only wish I had written that in response to one of – in one of our many responses to the

reviewers. You'll see it in a minute and you'll see why I'm saying that, but it's not really related to the work at hand, I just thought I'd share that with you. But no, you're correct, the document that was approved by the board, the last document, was honed – and I use that expression because it's an expression meaning sharpened, but it means with great care and to great levels of sharpness, and it was honed to focus specifically on the issues that we thought were important and proposed ways forward on them, and minimized the amount of work on things that were essentially red herrings and that we didn't want to distract us from the real work.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan. And I'm looking forward to an amusing anecdote. Anything that will brighten my mood on this subject will be appreciated. One of the other board resolutions in point 1.4 as opposed to point 1.2 and 1.3, surprisingly enough, that was resolved – and thank you very much, Andrea. She's not only wonderful at managing polls, I believe she's probably psychic as well as she captains us through putting all the links and things into chat. Thank you. Perfect timing, my dear.

But the point 1.4 is where it talks about the fact that our working group – and indeed the ALAC more importantly through our working group – has to work with the ICANN organization to include in all of our reporting and implementation steps and planning. As we develop our detailed implementation plan, it specifies a couple of things in our detailed implementation plan. And this is our work. This is what we need to start now and have initial reporting done in advance of our December deadline.

And I'm just going to literally read the resolution out for the record so it's painfully clear to everyone in this call, as we start, what our job is. This is partway through the resolves, and I'm just diving in. "The implementation plan shall incorporate a phased approach that allows for easy-to-implement and least costly improvements to be implement ed first. With those items with more significant budget implications addressed via subsequent budget cycles, any budgetary request should be made in line with ICANN org's budgeting process, and the detailed implementation plan has to be submitted to the board at the six-month point that we've discussed.

So what we're doing of course now is looking at our previous document that Alan and I just referred to, the one that came through the ALAC on the 20th of April this year, and we will, as a first run, need to reorder some of what we've done, because what we have to do is look at not only expanding and looking at the specifics of the detailing of how these things can be implemented, but we have to reorder them as a priority for the easiest and least costly to be done.

Okay? So that's going to be our first piece of homework, is rethinking that and putting it into the template for the initial reporting. But Maureen will go into greater detail. But the only other thing that I wanted to just remind you about regarding the resolutions from the board on 23rd of June, and that is the point 1.5, and that is of course that initial report is only the beginning. We then need to make sure – and here it is in fact written, which I've put in chat in response to Eduardo's question, here it does say – I'll read it out loud – the board directs the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group – in other words, this group – to provide the Organizational Effectiveness

Committee semi-annual written implementation reports on progress against our initial implementation plan we lodge in December, including but not limited to progress towards metrics detailed in the implementation plan and use of allocated budget.

So that can, of course, be read to say that after the initial implementation plan, we could just go ahead and do our own reporting at the regular intervals as required by the resolution to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, but seeing as Maureen will be chairing this group as well as the ALAC at that stage, I would think it would be very poor form not to at least socialize and bring the whole of the new ALAC along with us in that process. Because remember, we will have brand new people in the ALAC who will have little or no experience in our review process to date.

And with that, Maureen, I don't think there's anything else I need to talk about, other than I would definitely encourage every one of our participants and members to read the board resolution, including all the whereases, etc., and the rationale. I really would encourage you to read the rationale as well. There is excellent support and extremely strong guidelines for us in the whole body of work, which of course we went through as part of the consent agenda on the 23rd. And I'd like to – as I suspect Alan and Maureen and Holly would as well – just put on the record here our thanks to not only our current board member, León, who is a member of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee for the work he certainly did in assisting us through this process, but the fact that we have a number of At-Large members who are part of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, including the chair, just by the way, did us no harm at all because they'd experienced the review

process from the [inaudible] point of view along with us, so they were painfully aware.

With that, Maureen, I think the rest is yours, and I can rest my voice. Thank you. Oh, if you wouldn't mind, I think we switched and you're going to be showing the –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

ALBERTO SOTO: Hello.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Yes.

ALBERTO SOTO: Hello ,can you hear me now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we can.

ALBERTO SOTO: I was within the resolution regarding the timeline, and I think that December 23, we have the present the implementation time. But I think that well in advance, we have to have the budget that will require – I don't know, some activities will require extra budget. So I think I'm not

mistaken, we have to present the budget request well in advance of December 23. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think that when we put the proposals through, I believe that the budget requests as a arise in the discussions that we have, these will actually be – staff will actually propose those as they arrive within the plan, but they have to be justified so that the finance committee actually does get some pre-warning of those budget items. Which is really why we have to start working on these pretty quickly.

But if we can just move on to the actual overview proposal for example, which actually details – which is the document that the board actually approved, and it does highlight the action items which We have to work on. And I think that what I might do is [inaudible] ask the author of that document if he would mind just going through it with us very briefly, and perhaps highlighting some areas that he thinks may be priorities, or as he – I think he mentioned at the ALAC meeting yesterday that some of you may have been at that there were some areas that may not require as much energy as others. so Alan, can I call on you to introduce – to go through that with us? [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Yes, sure. I've put my hand up originally to answer Alberto's question, because I think it's a really important one. If you look – we know at least some of the things we're going to be wanting to do are going to require funding, and we have timelines on our various projects

which range from six months to a maximum of two years, which is what we estimated to do everything.

If you look at the normal budget cycle where we stat preparing a budget almost a year ahead of time, there is no possible way we can meet our implementation deadlines for anything that requires money, factoring in the regular budget cycle. So we have been told that if and when we decide we need funding and we can put together a rationale from it, we should present it.

It may be funded as an extraordinary expense in the middle of the year, which the board has the capacity and ability to do, or they may say we'll defer it until the next fiscal year, which might be the next one we plan for or it might be the one that's going to come up in two months, and we didn't make the budget cycle, but they're going to squeeze it in.

So the whole concept of how ICANN budgets goes against the whole concept of implementing organizational reviews, because the timelines just don't fit. But we have been told that it will be accommodated, and we should presume as we're doing our planning that if we need funding resources, we will get it. How quickly we get it obviously is going to depend on the details, but the whole issue is a really important one that we remember that we're not going to be able to follow the regular rules in terms of funding for this, and that's understood by all.

All right, I think what you're asking me to do is to try to sort of differentiate between the different types of issues that were raised, and our responses to it. Did I get that correctly?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. if you recall in the original – our original responses, there were 16 recommendations, and eight of them, we essentially accepted with some qualification, and eight of them, we rejected. We're no longer looking at the original recommendations, but we have focused the plan that was – the proposal that was approved by the board based on the issues behind each of those 16 recommendations. So we still have 16. The wording of the recommendations is gone, dead, but we still have the issues.

And in our original responses, we basically said that we're rejecting half of them. We still might do some work on it, but we're rejecting basically what they said. And that shows up again in the proposal that was approved by the board, because if you look – and the easiest way to see it is to look at the third column, that is the timelines associated with it.

On eight of them, we have timelines. It might be six months, it might be two years, it varies. And those are the issues that we're really going to have to put our real heavy focus on. Of the other eight, three of them said not applicable. That essentially says we rejected the issue, we rejected the recommendation.

An example for instance is they said we should be funded from auction funds. Well, we know the only way ALAC is going to be funded is from operational funds. So there's nothing we have to do to implement that, and it's a not applicable. There are two others that are similarly – they

were pulled out of the air and we just don't have to do anything about it at all, because we effectively have discarded it.

Five of them are – the timeline says ongoing. That says, essentially, it's something we're doing, we will continue to do it, there may be some changes and there may be funding requirements associated with those changes, but there's not hard deliverables in a certain period of time. We have done outreach, we will continue to do outreach. When opportunities arise, we will hopefully jump at them, assuming we have appropriate funding. But they're not major new tasks that we have to implement by a specific date. So they stay on our radar, they're important, but they're not major tasks.

Now, within those, there may be some minor things that this group is going to have to orchestrate, and we're going to have to read the words carefully and look at it. But just to keep in mind that we really have these three different categories of how we addressed issues, and our response to them in this group and in the larger group that'll be doing the implementation are going to be very different from each other.

So just keeping that in mind as we go ahead makes the task a little bit less onerous, because we're not really looking at 16 major projects, we're looking at eight, and some of them are relatively minor. I hope that puts the focus on. I'm glad to take any questions if there are any.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Are there any questions? Thank you, Alan. That was [inaudible] because I think it leads into what I was asking for. Heidi's actually put in the Google doc, which I'm still using as a reference, but I think that

people have – and we'll put those three areas. I think it's really good that we actually look at it from those sort of three perspectives about what is most urgent, what we need to do within – as Cheryl said, like what's not going to cost us anything to do and get rid of on that list of items that we've been asked to provide something?

Now, what I wanted to ask was it does say that we have to have an implementation plan for each of those items. So when we're actually looking at something that you've said is like – yeah, it doesn't matter for us, there's an implementation plan form that we have to fill in for each of those items. So we're going to have to look at how we address that issue if it's not appropriate for us [inaudible] because it actually doesn't impact on us. For example, the auction proceeds issue.

So we will have a team of people who'll be looking at filling in that form for that particular issue. But have you got another question, Alan, or [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Well, a question and a comment. Don't be afraid to use "not applicable," because if we are being asked to fill in something on each of the 16 issues, then at least some of those are issues that we have stomped our feet and yelled and screamed saying this is stupid, it's nothing we need to do anything about or nothing we can do anything about. We don't want to now go back on all of that and say, "Oh, dear, we made a mistake, we're really going to do a lot."

So I think our credibility to some extent hinges on the fact that if we have said it's really not an issue for us, that we stick by it. And I don't

think we're lying. I don't think we're putting on any airs in doing that, because I think we carefully considered all of these issues when we went forward. But if indeed the board is expecting us t o produce 16 reports, then we will do it, but we shouldn't be afraid of saying, "Done." Put the paid in full stamp on it and there's no more work to be done.

I'll also make one other comment, that the board has asked us within the six-month period to give a detailed plan. I think we're going to find that we have to give a plan. That plan will be more detailed on the things we plan to do immediately and less so over the things that are going to span over two years. So again, I don't think we need to worry about demonstrating that we have everything down pat immediately. What they're looking for is the demonstration that we're working on this and that we'll meet our targets.

So I think all of it's going to have to be taken with a bit of a grain of salt, and I don't think it's going to be as onerous, these reports, as some people are making out right now, because the reality is we know how to do some of them. Things like we need to get our website cleaned up so the titles on the page are not wrong. Well, that's going to take some focus, it's going to take people looking at it and thinking about how do we do it properly. It will then take staff some time to get it done, but they're not hard. Other ones, just coming up with our plan is going to be hard, because we understand the problem, but we don't necessarily understand a solution that will work, and it's going to change over time. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Yes, no, that gives us some real good guidance for when we're moving on. But as I sort of mentioned before, I think we have to be looking at some of those issues for example that Alan mentions, the issues that we need to be looking at a little bit more innovatively as to how we might approach some of the issues that had been problems that we haven't been able to solve in the past. So we're looking at how – we've got a [brains trust] here, and I think we need to take advantage of the ideas that might come up that we can actually incorporate into – write it down, because the group that actually works on that issue can hopefully cobble together a plan of attack – as we said, as continuous improvement. And if we can be seen to be wanting to develop an improvement within our system, surely, [inaudible] that we think is sustainable as well, then we can't be seen to be doing too much that's wrong.

We're nearly at the top of the hour, so we're taking a little bit longer than we should have. But if I can just move on to the management tools, I think one of the things that – in the discussion that we had yesterday – Cheryl and I attended this meeting where we were presented with all these [inaudible] for a start so that when we're actually looking at the agenda and it has for example – [the day one documents] for example were what we actually had in our proposal, so what GNSO has produced and as their phase one document, we've actually already done as part of our proposal. So that's pretty much a given.

In phase two, we were given a document that GNSO had which was recommendations identification template, which they later changed and we got a specific ALAC [inaudible] recommendation plan template

which is for us to fill in. But in those, along with that form filling exercise, we have actually developed a Gantt chart just to look at how we propose to complete [this first phase.] This is really a phase of developing the actual implementation plan.

And so Alberto, you can be sure that the Gantt chart [is there, and] you'll see it eventually, but [it is] part of our plan to have a visual that we can – and as we're going through, there'll be milestones that we'll be able to meet, and we can actually put those on to the chart as we're going through.

As we've mentioned before too, the whole idea is t o get this plan into the board before December. And if we can – and as Alan pointed out, we may have a plan that's really [inaudible] because we have been focusing on those things that we can do through it, the things that we can get started. And if we can get those into the implementation details organized for that, first of all, we should actually have enough to keep us going for a while and keep us busy, and then of course, [inaudible] working on – the plan has to be improved before we can officially start it.

And I just had a message that the six-month report actually starts from the time that the board approves our implementation details plan. That was for Eduardo. So this report that we're going to give for the 23rd [inaudible] to the board before December. But the actual reporting as such will be from the time that the board actually approves that implementation plan.

Okay. Are there any questions? I know that we just glossed over the management tools, but there are a whole lot of different forms and templates which we will go through at our next meeting. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I do have a question. I might be confused, so please, I need clarification. This management tool, the Gantt chart, I just went to the page, it's an Excel file. Are we going to use that, [or is that just an example?] Or are we going to use an automatic tool that does this automatically? Or how is it going to be? I'm just curious.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: May I jump in there, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks for the question, Eduardo. Right now, I suspect you're about to feel my personal pain. The extent to which MSSI can advise us about project management and Gantt charting is to in fact use Excel spreadsheeting. As somebody who in her own company developed and provided to customers project management tools, this is like dragging fingernails over a blackboard.

However, we do need to make sure that we are able to use tools that will work with the reporting requirements from MSSI, so we'll be using

Excel spreadsheets. Now, thankfully, Heidi and her staff have had a bit of practice at extracting the different types of Gantt charts that we may want to use, and as I said earlier, we'd personally prefer a hybrid choice between the milestone and the [project design] Gantt chart, but she's confident that staff can ensure that they can be appropriately extracted out of Excel spreadsheets. But trust me, my friend, this is just like asking me to get a chisel, a lump of sandstone and start writing something. Okay, that's enough from me on that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Eduardo first, just to finish.

EDUARDO DIAZ: No, I just wanted to follow up on that. If this is the normal way of doing things with ICANN, it's fine. I'm just curious. So I will follow your lead. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: You'll be totally involved in all that stuff anyway, Eduardo. So yes, we'll keep you posted. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. Just a bit of history some of you lived through, some of you didn't. In our responding to the various versions of the At-Large review reports, we followed MSSI's instructions to the letter and used the documents and the forms and the templates they wanted us to use. It created an enormous amount of work for us, and in fact caused problems because it wasn't really amenable to what we were trying to do. So as we get tools that we are instructed to or suggested to use, look at them with a critical eye and make sure that they're going to help us, not cause us more problems than there were. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan, for that advice. And I think that that's something that as a working group, we will actually be very critical about how we actually use the tools that we're given. Because as it is, I think it's sort of – they seem to be developing things on [inaudible] as well. Okay, so if there are no other questions – I know we're rushing through this at the end of this meeting, but the frequency of calls.

We have decided – we, sort of Cheryl and I as we have been looking at for example as we were developing our Gantt chart, and how we might meet the needs of the board and the time frames that we've got, I think that we need to have a meeting of this working group every fortnight so that it will be every two weeks, [just especially] as we are starting to develop this plan, that we need to be getting some groups working [inaudible] smaller groups working on various items.

So as we're moving into this process, fortnightly calls may be necessary. And I apologize for those [inaudible] and a number of other working groups as well. But for me, this is an important one. So if we can get as many of our members, including our participants as well, but they're very important to us. So our next meeting will be in two weeks, and you'll be informed on when that actual meeting date is. It's on my Gantt chart, which I haven't got access to at the moment.

But yes, so if there are any questions or queries about anything or Any Other Business.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, rather than me type the answer to Satish, he's [pleading] for rotation of calls. Our fabulous staff, Gisella in particular, has established over many years a set of ideal times for call rotation, and it was certainly the intention to share the pain. But of course, sharing the pain doesn't mean you don't turn up when it's an inconvenient time for you. If you are a member, you turn up whether it's inconvenient or not. Dare I say if you can even only barely draw breath. We're certainly, however, going to do call rotation. So the answer is yes, in the standard format, as

best it works with other ICANN meeting commitments, which we leave up to the extreme expertise of Gisella.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. I just read, Olivier, that he had to get up at 6:45 this morning for the ALAC call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, poor baby.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And now he's sitting on the beach.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And he spent the day on the beach. Ladies and gentlemen, as we finish this, let's give all our sympathy to Olivier, who when this call started – or, sorry, when he was dialed out to in advance of this call –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Poor [Olivier.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: "Hang on a minute. I'm still on the beach. I just need to get inside to my computer." So we're all incredibly empathetic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [It was night time.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, dearie me. Now you're making me laugh. Okay, so we may have our next call at the same time. It just depends on what other meetings are happening. But as soon as Gisella works out the rotation with Evin, then that'll be the way we rotate. Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, definitely. Okay, so we will consider everyone for the rotation, put out some doodles and [inaudible]. But thank you very much, everyone, for coming, and I've really appreciated that we've had a really good attendance. And yeah, if we can get more participants into that list, that will be really good, and AFRALO can confirm their members, that will be really good. And we'll see you at our next meeting. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, just as we close, [inaudible] we may, depending on needs, extend some of our future calls to 90 minutes. This was a kickoff call just to get everyone up to speed. So when Maureen does her agenda out in full for the next call, be aware that the invitation may be for a 90-minute call. But that'll be clear with the calendar invitation that comes your way. Thanks, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you all. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, everybody. Bye.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. That concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines, and have a wonderful rest of your day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]