
ANDREA GLANDON: We'll 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, 11th of August, 2018 at 0400 UTC. On today's call we have Alberto Soto, Amrita Choudhury, Eduardo Diaz, Justine Chew, Maureen Hilyard, Nadira Al-Araj, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Sarah Kiden, Satish Babu, Yrjo Lansipuro and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

We have apologies from Alfredo Calderon, Bartlett Morgan and Dev Anand Teelucksingh, as well as John Laprise. From Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, Jennifer Bryce, Negar Farzinnia 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 speak at a reasonable rate for interpretation, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you and over to you, Maureen.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maureen, before you go any further, it's 11 September, not 11 August.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Thank you, Holly, now can I get going? Thank you, Holly, for being here and the others and thank you for the great team that we've got at the meeting this time, thank you very much. I just wanted to consume our members and the participants, there was a bit of an issue

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.

at one stage about some of the members and participants. I haven't had any other comments haven't been made more recently and I'm assuming that members and participants or members especially first of all, have been accepted by their RALO's and that we can consume their memberships at this meeting. Are there any comments?

Great, thank you. Also, very pleased to see the number of participants that have joined this group. I think with both members and participants, very much appreciated because there's a lot of work to be done and we're going to need lots or people chipping in and providing their support, advice and suggestions. We're going to have to be working really hard on this. Okay, that's settled, that was even turned faster than I thought.

One of the things that we do have to talk about is the future meetings and I've had a few comments about the fact that we -- I have to take it upon myself, they were two times that suited to me, however, we've already come across one and since it doesn't seem to be perfect, currently the meeting for this time coincides with a meeting that Cheryl is involved and [inaudible] not realizing that it was a 90 minute call and it's still going.

It's the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group meeting and it's sort of like [inaudible] meeting and we shouldn't really have that conflict so we'll be looking at another time and we may delay this particular call an hour so that there is -- whether our people do attend that meeting to have a bit of break. We will relook at that to make sure that we don't have future conflicts.

The other one is 1900 UTC, I think that I haven't had any comments about that but if those two times are definitely unsuitable, please let us know because we can easily adapt those times because it's only just our group. Any comments on that? No, great.

Moving on and I do appreciate that we can move on because what we've got to do there's going to be quite involved and we're going to start looking at the documents that are going to be important for us over the next 10 or 12 weeks.

ANDREA GLANDON:

I apologize, I'm sorry to interrupt but the interpreters are saying that you're sounding a little garbled, is there any adjustments that you can make?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

No, I suspect it's probably the actual connect, unless you actually dial out to me again.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Okay, perfect, I'm going to have them call out to you now, thank you so much.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Hi, can you hear me? Now, I was talking about how important all the times that we are going to be doing are going to be for making sure that we have the documents that are required in the hands of the OEC, the

Board Committee before Christmas. I'd like it to get there well before Christmas, so that we can actually get prepared for Christmas ourselves. One of the first things that I wanted to look at first of all was the document that we actually mentioned that Cheryl and I had that meeting with NSSI last week before, the Friday before our last meeting.

This is the document that we have to have ready for the Board [inaudible] have everything that is related to our work, is going to be on this document. When I think of the copious amounts of writing that we did in the leadup to the Board receiving all the different documents and the hours of work that many people spent on it, this is actually going to be another one of those times and it's one of the reasons why I asked if we can have as many as people as possible working on it so that hopefully we'll be able to get to it more easily.

What we're going to do is develop our implementation plan. Looking at the table of contents, there doesn't seem to be that much to it, there is an executive summary, an overview of the recommendations, prioritization and dependencies and a timeline. All looks very, very simple. Of course, the executive summary will probably be a page, might be a little bit more but the executive summary work horse people doing that thing that we do and it's going to be very reliant on everything else that comes in and how we've done it, the timeline, the methodology we've used and that kind of stuff.

That's going to be the first part of that document, although it will be the last thing that we actually write. Then of course, there will be the overview of recommendations, which will include what it says, an overview of the 16 recommendations, each detailed as to what steps

we're going to take in order to achieve those recommendations as we've proposed in our original document but also to provide some sustainable continuity of those issues, the improvements of those issues as we go through it.

Those are two sections, of course, [inaudible] when I gave this PowerPoint to the Staff and Cheryl, but they will be filmed after we have finished our work. Of course, this is the work. For every single recommendation that we made, that was accepted by the Board, there's going to be -- this document must be written up to include what needs to be -- how we're actually going to implement the change that is required? What suggestions, what we want to achieve and how we're going to do it?

This will mean that -- and that's why we're going to go through the proposal document, that was actually okayed by the Board. We're going to go through that because what we need to look and [inaudible] people to actually work on separate recommendations. There are however some recommendations that can be grouped together, so that's something else that we can look at as well. But, this is the work, this section, prioritization and dependencies, that is the work.

The final thing that we do have to do, which is one of the reasons why we're looking at the whole prioritization issue, is looking at how long it's going to take us to complete the work that we're going to do. I'm not quite sure whether we've got the actual timeline. Timeline document, do I have that ready Andrea? But we have got sort of like a timeline which takes us every fortnight from now until the -- is that me that's been terminated?

ANDREA GLANDON: No, Maureen, go ahead, you're still good. You're good.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I hope they come back, I might need them. We've got the timeline document organized and every two weeks there will be set goals. For example, next week, we might start organizing, getting together goals and objectives for some of the probably shorter items that we're going to be discussing.

The timeline will be available, I don't know where we're going to put it but it will actually detail what we're hoping to achieve over the subsequent two meeting time. That's actually not my updated one but that's fine. Are there any questions, I know it's a lot but are there any questions related to the recommendations plan that we have to complete and the timeline as to how long we've got to do it? Okay, have I got an audience still?

ANDREA GLANDON: One moment Cheryl, we're having an issue with your line, just one moment. Oh, you're on AC, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's because I'm using the AC, I can only use the AC because I'm still in another call.

ANDREA GLANDON: Sure, I understand. We can barely hear you though.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Well, I give up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: She is still on the call. She may be able to come back to us later. Any other?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: In this implementation plan, this chart, are we going to see milestones somewhere that we should be aware of?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry Negar, can you just repeat that question again please?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes, in this implementation chart that is being shown in the Adobe, are we going to see their milestones too?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, what will happen is that in fact there -- as we proceed through and actually identify what those milestones are going to be, that will actually be put in there as well.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: What we'll be doing over this meeting and the next meeting is actually prioritizing and once we prioritize, then we can actually put steps, what we want to achieve between now and December. Definitely get those milestones in. That's not an updated chart. That's okay, that will be available to everybody anyway.

What we will do if there are no other questions related to that and hopefully Cheryl can get back to us as soon as her meeting is over, which should be in a few minutes time.

We can move to the next item, which is the actual proposal document. I know that some of you may have actually been through this several times but we have to know it pretty well in order to be able to prioritize and to be looking at how we're going to address those -- focusing on what the priorities dependencies document, just remember, that each of these items that we're going to go through has to be detailed in some way on that document.

How are we going to address that issue in a way that is going to satisfy the Board if there are any budget implications or any other [inaudible] that we actually want to undertake in order to achieve what we want to achieve for that issue, that they agree with them and they accept them.

I had hoped that you'd be able to scroll through these yourself because I know that we're going to be going through them but I'd like be actually

scroll through if possible. Can I have scrolling rights for this please?
Thank you.

What we're going to do is, we're going to actually go through them according to the order in which they were proposed. Is anyone actually been to the Google Doc that I've actually online and it's on the agenda doc as well, you will note that I've actually reordered them and put them as a group but that's for later, that's something we can look at later. What I wanted to do is just to go through and focus you on what we have to achieve. There's 16 of them and I'll try not to over them in too much because I really think that you should also have a look at them yourself.

The first one is to do with the quality and quantity of the LSSI. The target competition, which is the last comment, is saying that we really need to look at because some of these of these issues, remembering that this doc was written several months ago, so therefore there may not -- the emphasis on some of the things that we're doing might be changed.

The target competition may be a little bit different but a guide and that's what we need to be looking at. What happened was an issue was identified, I made a comment as to how do we solve that particular issue and then made a proposal as to how we were going to offer that change.

I think that when we're going through these, how filling the prioritizing of the [inaudible] is that we have to look at each and look at the proposal that was made and use that as the basis on which to develop

the fix, plus anything else and this is where I was after some ideas, plus anything else that will actually help to make the changes sustainable, appropriate but also so that you really feel that are going to add value to what it is that they've proposed and also make of value to At-Large in the long term.

The quality and quantity of ALAC advice was obviously something that the reviewers felt was an issue for us. The proposal by ALAC for this particular was, for this particular item of course, was that Staff under the direct of At-Large leadership has already begun to rework the website and WIKI to ensure that our policy advice pages are excellent and understandable. This will continue and volunteers and Staff resources we will ensure those documents are published [inaudible] of the documents is clear. Now, that for me --

ANDREA GLANDON: Maureen, I apologize, we're having a hard time with your audio, are you on a speaker phone or a headset?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm on speaker phone but I'm not quite sure if the headset is going to work, I did try it earlier and that was still faint. I suppose the chicken outside doesn't help?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, he's loud and clear.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Can you hear me?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yup, why don't you go ahead and speak and I'll check with the interpreters?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Just going through that particular item, this is only one of 16, I think this addresses one issue related to quality verses quantity of ALAC advice. I feel like they website and the WIKI issue was only part of the problem. When we're looking at ALAC advice and for example, the CPWG, which is the organization -- okay, someone's obviously got one-minute remaining on their call.

The quality and quantity of ALAC advice, I don't know how relevant that seems to me but that would require some others to have a look at that and see how well they might be able to respond to that and perhaps it would have been -- maybe we need to wait until Cheryl comes to add some. Does anybody want to make a comment about that, that particular issue? Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm not sure if it's the issue but it's about the proposal that, how do we define accurate and understandable? It's something that's objective. It's going to be very hard to track something like that.

MAUREEN GLANDON: [Inaudible] because I think that what we've got to do, is that we've got to make sense of what the issue is and how it was interpreted and we think that we can actually make it better. It's got to be in language that we think we can get the buy in from the rest of At-Large. That's one of the reasons why we need to have everyone on board to actually really look at this issue.

The comment we made about it and the actual approach, the original approach of the intent of the proposal. That's just one of them but it's certainly one that I would like people to start thinking about because I really feel that and it's not the only one, that some of the ideas -- or perhaps Holly, you are here, Cheryl's not quite available yet I don't think, can you give -- is Holly on the line?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm on the line, I've been concentrating on trying to get into the room, so I haven't been following as closely I should. I still can't get into the room. Deb's trying to sort it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, good. This is just to show that this is not going to be an easy fix, it's not going to be any easy task when we actually have to look at each of the individual items and see how we're going to address it.

Looking at number two, At-Large has struggled to reflect process and user opinion barriers to individual participation and protection of unchanging leadership groups. I know that was a big, there were several issues that came up in that one and there's was lots of

discussion. The timeframe that's been given for this is two years and ongoing. The whole thing is like, okay, how do we ensure that we do reflect and process end user opinions? How do we do that affectively? What are the barriers to individual participation? And what are we doing about addressing those? As well as the perception of unchanging leadership groups?

That's a really big one, it's not just one issue, it's several issues. We'll probably have a team of people working on this one, it's not just something you write a few sentences on. The thick of which you would actually use to address each of those individually, it's not something that can just -- it's not a one size fits all fix it model. We're starting to get the influx on the previous subsequent procedures call, maybe we'll have some more input. That's number two.

Number three, staff resources are disproportionately concentrated on administrative support, staff should have both capacities to support preparation on policy advice. This is still an issue for us in that we are developing support within staff. We have said several that we have support from staff and identifying that they move on, so we've continually having to train new people up to actually address the sorts of needs that we actually have as an At-Large group, trying to provide policy statements and getting it right. Getting the language right, getting the formatting right, all that sort of stuff and we don't have to do that ourselves, we do have to rely on staff doing that for us.

This is one of the instances where we may need to look at perhaps more support in the form of more support in the more staff resources or some mechanism that's actually going to help us do our work properly

and I think that's the whole purpose is, is how do we make it so that we can actually improve the way in which we work within At-Large.

Although we have to sort of be mindful of the fact that some things are going to require a lot of financial resources perhaps or other types of resources, but if we don't say why we need those and why it's important to have those resources, we're never going to get them. At the same time, if we can persuade them that they are essential to the development of At-Large and that sort of thing, it's got to be -- hopefully they'll see the sense of it. I must admit, we have got some [inaudible] in past.

Number four is on the leadership team about the ALT and hopefully -- I mean, I have put forward a proposal that might address that one but it was a big [inaudible] about ALT apparently making decisions and not sharing them with others. That was not the case but I think that the whole transparency issue can to the floor. That is something that we need to ensure that is addressed and made more clear.

Number five is to do with outreach and engagement. For this particular issue I think that we've actually made great strides. Olivier outreach and engagement efforts with regards to partnership with other constituencies within ICANN have really helped to address that issue and we will roll into this, I think that's great.

A big issue that came up was of course, number six, in relation to the election processes. I know that was -- people are not a quite fix with regards to how At-Large develop the processes in the first place. There could be some review of that and I think that the end of that they had it

was ongoing. I guess if it's been given to us as an issue that the Board has asked for, okay what are the steps we're going to use to address that situation? We've still got make some proposal in some way to ensure that there is some resolution made.

Cheryl, I see that Cheryl has come online, if we could have Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, hopefully you can hear me alright now, I'm on the telephone. Please take note as my early intervention in chat relating the rotation of calls. We just need to get the rotation of calls out of sync. At the moment, the 1300 and 1900 calls are in sync with the PDP from 1400 and 2000 calls. The apple around their 13 is in sync with our 1400 and our 19 is in going to be in sync with 2000, so we only need to get them out of sync, we don't have to change times, just repeat say next one does 1300 again and that will avoid the 1900 clash, then we should be right.

Apart from that I've just about taken to my [inaudible] frustration with this overlap, extremely difficult on things I have wanted to make interventions on in this call that I could not get on to it to be heard. My apologies.

Remember as we're going through all of these and I'm going to speak specifically to the one that Maureen is on at the moment but I want to poppy back as well to each and every one of them that you've covered so far. The litmus test here for this first run through is going to be what is simple and costs very little money and hopefully no impingement on the ICANN budgetary process.

They're the ones we deal with first because that's what the Board resolution tells us we have to. That's a good first part that we can do. Things for example, recommendation on the quality verses quantity. Provided we actually have someone in Heidi's staff who can be looking at that cleaning up of how our website truly and accurately represents public, what we do or don't call policy devices and what we do or don't do, providing that person can be freed up, there's no ICANN budget impact and it's something that can start short order and be done quite simply.

That's one of those examples of something that should go into our first grouping of things to be done. The ones that are ongoing and long term are either ones that are more complicated or will have a particular resource requirement and that can be said for items two and three for example. When we go to some of the others, the ongoing ones they're thing that we're already doing and again, they're likely to be ones that we may be able partially if not fully implement in the short term and with little or no ICANN budget costings outside of the normal cost of running ALAC and At-Large.

When we get to this one that talks about for example the complexity of the electoral process, this is interesting because the electoral process is as complicated as our community made it, no more and no less. This was not a process that was thrust upon us, it was not a top down thing, it was developed by the At-Large community.

Notice not the ALAC, the At-Large community and we have two course adjustment opportunities. We have small course adjustment opportunities which are available in every cycle that we go through

where we have recommendations that maybe made by any particular DNSCC, in other words that group that oversees the process as such, would make some recommendations to be considered in the next cycle and if the ALAC believes that those recommendations are worthy or are relevant at the next cycle of elections, then they can be adopted to a greater or lesser extent.

Now that's fine for little course adjustments and get to the admistrivia's that need to be worked on from time to time but if we're going to undertake a wholesale community-based bottom up review and we can do that from time to time, certainly something we can do, our electoral process, whilst it may not be a costly matter, it will be a time consuming one. It's one of those that may end up later in our timeline, even though it's not going to be a particularly expensive exercise.

Obviously, there will be costs in terms of outreach and engagement with our community, the requirements of course to look at what other parts of ICANN and how they proceed in their electoral processes and that sort of thing would also need to be brought on board. It's one of those not necessarily expensive at all but whilst it's not overly complicated it is time consuming to do a full review.

Just wanted to make sure that I can remind you what we're doing, while we're looking at the specifics of the ALAC proposal, because it was the ALAC proposal column that the Board has approved, it particularly needs to be reshuffled in order of the complexity and the costs. With that, I should sush up. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Does anyone else have any other comments or questions? We're halfway through with going through to the election processes and as Cheryl said, that's one of the ones that will definitely need a lot more work because it involves as Cheryl said, the community and that's going to be quite a big ask?

Okay, just carrying on, this is one is sort of considered to be able to take six months. A lot of community time is spent on process and procedure at the expense of ALAC mandated responsibilities to produce policy advice and coordinate outreach and engagement activity. Too many internal working groups are a distraction. Now, we already explained the working group situation but there are comments that could be made about some of the other issues that weren't mentioned. Eduardo, do you have a comment to make on this?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, I'm going to comment, which item are we now? I got lost?

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're just on seven but that's okay.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to say that now that we're going through this one by one, we may want to pause in each one and ask the group about what Cheryl said is, is this something complex, something simple and if there is money around? So we can start [inaudible] as a group, to have some kind of -- I don't want to call it compensable feeling for the group, if it's

going to be complex or if it's going to be expensive, just thinking about what Cheryl said. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Eduardo. I think one of the reasons why I wanted to go through and why we sort of like made it a 90-minute call is to give everyone a chance to actually look at each of these items and amend, we go back, because we got a section where we're looking at the next item on our agenda is prioritization.

Once we've all had a look at then we can look at what might be or what are the issues that we might deal with as Cheryl said, which are the ones we can actually deal with really, really quickly, it's not going to need any money, it's not going to need any extra resources, a little more time on our part and staff.

But, if we can just go through these first off and then we can actually go into that prioritization thing and make those calls because we're going to need to do that in order for us to sort through what we need to next, so that we can perhaps because what I'm after actually, is on penholders, once we identify which are some things that we can deal with now, to get some penholders, to organize some groups, get some volunteers, organize with them and to start looking at, how do we put together because we can't actually -- not officially start on the implementation until we've got those documents done and handed to the Board and then once they okay it, then it's open starter for us, we can just for it.

If we can just go through these so that everybody's really understands what's involved and can actually really be starting to think, that's something I'd really like to help with. That's something I'd like to do. We're nearly there, halfway there.

Actually, I must admit, the next few are on -- although in this proposal, I said, they're a little bit disconnected because this is a social media issue and I know we have a social media working group already starting to look at some of these issues. There's another one later one which is connected.

We need to be looking at what's already -- and this seems to be ongoing as well, this is considered something that is quite difficult until someone said, "I'll take the social media and we'll work together on that." I mean, it's only just started, the groups only just started and they're coming to terms the group themselves about how they're going to do things. They should be very well positioned to be writing the prioritization and dependencies document form for these issues. I can probably skip one. I don't see John on the call but that's okay.

Number nine, need for increased At-Large community awareness and staff training regarding use of social media. Done, I think that that can be looked at through John's group.

Number 10, there are a multitude of communication channels used by At-Large, this has led to fractured and undocumented communications. The technology taskforce is mentioned here and I'm going to see if Dev was able to make it to the meeting. There are a lot of areas which Dev and his team really tried to select, coordinate some things. This is

something we can actually work on, perhaps a mini project that we can coordinate. It's one of the biggies, it's ongoing. Obviously, something that needs a little bit more work on.

We're actually sort really lucky we're got quite a committed team of people who are interested in this type of work. The communication thing is dear to my heart, so anyway in which we can actually make sure that appropriate communication tools are used for At-Large to get our information out to our members and out to other community would be very much appreciated. I think we're got a leader for that one.

Now, while broadly popular, this is number 11, global ATLAS meetings every five years have been difficult to organize and sort of affective results. More frequent regional meetings would be more affective and encouraging by policy input and outreach, while familiarizing more of At-Large with regions of ICANN. I think this was due to the fact that the reviewers preferred the regional meetings to the very big, expensive, global ATLAS meeting.

Well, just today, very fortunately, the Board, I think I can make this public, I don't think it's a secret, but the Board has actually agreed that we will be able to hold our ATLAS meeting in Montreal in 2019 and that they have given us a budget. We're really thrilled because the ATLAS team has actually been meeting. Just last week we were having calls from the meetings team in Barcelona who were trying to get information from us about reserving rooms but we couldn't do anything because we didn't have conformation from the Board that this was going to be allowed.

Today, we got a letter Goran to say that the Board has agreed to this and given us the funds to do it. We're pretty stoked about that. At the same time, the fact that we have achieved one pressing request that we had for something that we planned on for several years already, we do have to address the regional meetings and how we address the issue was perceived by the reviewers. Obviously, from the discussions that they'd had with other people. That will be ongoing, which means that it's going to be one of those biggies that will need a lot of work but something that we do need to focus on.

ALAC to a coordinated ICANN outreach sub optimal. I don't believe that but I think there have been lots of ways in which have, the At-Large has actually work with GSE and as I mentioned earlier in a related issue that other constituencies. There are things that probably [inaudible] not applicable but I think that even though because it is in issue we have to address in some way and that's probably going to need a little more elevative thinking but we'll see how that one goes.

13 we need more systematic RALO participation and regional event. Well, hello more easily said than done. We might have achieved global summit meeting, now we've got to working on CROP other financial support for making that one happens. But, this is again I think one of the things that we've got to do is make sure that when we are making our recommendations in the prioritization and dependencies forms, that our steps ensure that we do make the request or the proposal to actually implement and achieve what we want to achieve for our RALO's and why it's important that they do participate in regional events. It's sort of like we've got to persuade ICANN that it's important, so that's

something that we can work on and of course, ALAC had a lot to say about that one.

The last few, number 14 is one that sort of like really intrigued me, the issue itself and I agree with the other comments that were made. ALAC is supposed to be and funded from ICAAN operational funds. But, what I liked was that a need for an innovated approached to funding and a revitalized At-Large. If I left out the funding, I think would actually basically get what I consider a descend for what it is that we're trying to do in this particular activity and that's, we're trying to find innovative approaches to create a revitalized At-Large.

It would be divine justice for us to be using their own words to create something for At-Large but we do want to revitalize At-Large and we are trying to find innovative ways of making a sustainable approach to developing a revitalized At-Large. The fact that the auction proceeds would be a suggestion may not be appropriate but I may be speaking for myself and that anyone who takes that particular issue onboard may find otherwise.

I've generally found that in the survey's that we've taken and we've always given a point of view, I've always been an outsider anyways, it's best if somebody else looks at that and looks at how we might be able to resolve that. Funding At-Large is an important issue and it's going to be a biggie, we probably need all our finance guys working on that particular issues.

Number 15, reinforce impact of outreach and engagement activities, I mean that's related. I think again, that's related to the next issue, which

is metric. I think that if we can include metrics into a lot of the things we're actually doing, any other issues, the 15 issues, whatever proposal that we make, we must ensure that metrics are included and that they really do help to justify what we're trying to achieve in this particular instance in getting the Board's buy in to accept what we as a team of At-Large participants think is the best way forward for addressing the issues that were raised by the reviewers.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I have a question about the target completion for 14 and 15, it is not applicable, is it something that we're going to skip or are we just going to mention something like you said? I think it's not applicable, that's what was approved, right?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yeah, I think the proposals were approved and the targets I guess were. I think that Cheryl explained that not applicable was sort of like ongoing I guess. For issues that they felt were outside at ALARGE, that we didn't really have any say.

For example, their recommendation that we use auction proceeds, that's not anything for us to say. However, at the same time, I think that there is a reason for us to be a little more innovative and perhaps taking that on board and perhaps there maybe two scenarios. If auction funds were available, there may be an option or what other alternative ways can we make it so that At-Large is funded appropriately? Okay, we can look at that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, hopefully you can hear me still. When say not applicable in this particular document, that is where we basically whole thoroughly rejected their recommendation. The item issue was recognized but basically, we have said, "You're just wrong, don't be idiots, we already do it, bugger off." So, there's no target completion. No applicable should basically read, no, just no, you got it wrong and the perfect example is the suggestion that auction funds should be a mechanism of funding At-Large activities.

Imagine if you will, all those in the At-Large community feeling that they were free and unvetted in their activities, if the funding for their activities was subject to vagaries of content, string contention auction delegations in what would then need to be regular if not continuous rounding of new gTLD applications, that's how lunatic that is.

The total lunacy ones are the ones that have not applicable but we still have some that we basically rejected but we were already -- we recognized some of the issue and we were already doing something and they've got ongoing. When it says not applicable, we may as well just leave it off our list for now. I have no problem with using people's back against them however, remember how we no longer interact with them.

It would be perhaps satisfactory to our own personal egos but would not make one iota difference to the independent examiner but certainly but the innovative approach to revitalize At-Large is exactly what we're

doing with all of the implementation of all of recommendations that we have picked up on.

Hopefully if you think of the ones that we've said basically not applicable for, they're things they just got so wrong that there's no point in us even bothering with them. That doesn't mean they're closed books in some future time, for whatever reason it suddenly becomes important that a proportion of At-Large is not funded out of operational expenses, can't image why but if it ever happens then that's a then situation not a now situation. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Based on what Cheryl's saying, for this document that we have to put together for December, really, we're talking about 14 recommendations based on what Cheryl said. I'm not saying [inaudible] engagement activities but for the purpose of what we're doing here, that's my understanding, correct me if I'm wrong please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's not 14, I believe it's 13 if memory serves but yes, basically it's not all of them. I think it's 13 but yes, correct.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, I think there's another one that's also not applicable. It was ALAC have got a coordinated ICANN outreach sub optimal. I said I don't believe -- what was not applicable, I mean as you say Cheryl, it was their recommendation and that's why I'm saying, if they felt that there was an issue and somebody may have a brilliant idea, I think that's got nothing to do with their suggestion -- I think what we can do is focus on the 13 because we've got a few months down the track and somebody may come up with something, which is one of the reasons why I wanted people to, if possible, put their ideas down on the Google Doc.

When I'm having discussions with people I come up with all these brilliant ideas and I say, "Put it on the Google Doc, so that we keep it there and whoever takes charge of that particular issue, has got something to work on, as well as their own ideas of other people's they may be working with."

It's really important that we're not doing the same old same old. That we're actually looking at new ways of doing things. It's a revitalized At-Large that we're trying to create here and I think as long as we have lots people coming in with lots of ideas, that's what we need. Putting together constructively, in a way that is appropriate, that is doable and we can actually get -- if it needs budgeting, the budget has got to be realistic, it's got to be appropriate to the purpose and we can work on it from here.

Having gone through all those and refreshed our memory about what we said we were going to do and what the reviewers said was wrong and what we were going to do about, I think that one of the things that we've got to do again is to start pulling things out and finding out what

are the things that we can deal with straight away or the next month or so? Give people three or four weeks to put their ideas down on paper, in that document, that's what you've got to focus on because that's the way that the Board wants it.

You will all get a copy of that document so that you are all focused on making sure that your ideas gel with what it is that we all because also, we have to follow that overview of all the recommendations, there has to be some sort of consistency, as well as finishing off the executive summary, which is the overall picture of what it is that we as a team decide to do to address the whole review issue. By the time we finish this, we should be ready for the next one. That should be something to look forward to.

If we were going to prioritize this and going through them, is there anything that anyone feels like they would like to pick up? Perhaps we can be starting to look at some penholders, volunteers?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl's not volunteering for everything I can assure you. The Google Doc presents area in topic, that's all very nice but of course our next document for the organizational effectiveness committee can't be organized that way, it actually has to be organized in a set cluster to this, instead these ones are cheap and easy, these ones are more complexed but are not going to require budget cycling with the ICANN budget for additional funds, they're going to be more complex and take more time.

These ones have specific costs for staff allocation resources, which is in a cost itself and those ones that are costly are going to need to be meshed in so that any funds for implementation of those recommendations go through the normal ICANN budget cycle, which as you all know is like a two-year event, okay 18 month event, unless you're talking about IANA function stuff, then it is a two year event. But, it's so far in advance anything we want to be implementing in 2020, we need to be putting into our budget requests now, literally now.

It is important that we go through these, which of us to be attend to list, those that are rejected outright and have no applicability, reprioritize those that are cheap and cheerful, albeit that still and workout in what order we need to do that rest.

Maureen, I wonder whether we might find it useful if the table form that we've all got quite use to now and is the middle section of this document you've taken us through today, whether or not we could extract that as a Goggle Doc and have a -- well it would be a Google whatever the Excel equivalent is table form and allow us to perhaps put an additional column or two on it, so that we can start getting suggestions from our people on the prioritization on whether we call it band one, two or three or phase one, two or three, it doesn't matter what we call it, it could be apples, oranges and pears for all I care but whatever call the various of lumps of implementation work, we need to allocate that between now and your next call I think. That might be suitable in the Google Doc as well?

Obviously, we to then bring those things that we are going to be clustering initially and secondarily and deal with them in the pro-formal

way that is going to be easier for the organizational effectiveness committee to go through on a recommendation by recommendation planning and Maureen's already showed you one of those templates as well. I'm just a little bit keen just to remind you all that of these about half of them are ones that we are already doing something about and so whilst we're already doing something about them, they still need to be put into our implementation plan, in band one or start off or whatever. Let's put something into Google.

Obviously, Maureen and one or two other staff members and probably Alan and myself and Holly maybe, might get to be editors on it and have the rest in suggestion mode and we can then talk about that as straw poll in our next meeting. I don't think we're quite up to penholders yet Maureen, in as much as once you've got your initial band, your start up, whatever it is you want to call it, let's stick with apples for now grouping, then I think you should look at penholder or penholders, to look at the template and start filling out those that are in the apples barrel, to fit the proforma.

There will be another piece of work that's pretty important however at the same time and that is as Eduardo pointed out earlier on, there is a lot of additional information that needs to go into whatever timeline and charting tools that we want to use and while staff would actually be the primary penholder in as much as creating the actually thing, it would probably be worthwhile having a call or two with Heidi and whoever in her staff is going to be doing these things, whether it's Evin or here I don't know, whoever is going to be doing the timeline and ganting and just make sure that we've got a small group that can work

very reactively based on what they hear from the rest of us to get that timeline part of the proposal looking really good.

Remember, we still haven't actually finally decided what type of ganting or timeline charting you all want to use. I clearly bias towards the hybrid model as I said in our last call but you haven't actually finalized that either, perhaps that's an agenda item for our next call, if not the one after. And I shall sush up again now, thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl, very valuable. We've got Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: I have a question. I think I have already asked the question in our previous meeting but I don't have it clear in our mind. There are recommendations for budget request. When the report is over, when report is finished, before being submitted to the Board, we need to have those recommendations with the budget requests, so we need to detail the resources and we need to have that budget request on the recommendation because then we need to set the priorities, otherwise if we have a request after the budget request period, that would be left for the next fiscal year, right? Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Good question, Alberto. I'm not quite sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Alberto, you are absolutely correct. Anything that requires budget allocation outside of our normal operational costs of At-Large and they are limited, so anything that requires additional staff for example, additional training, additional tools or anything like that, let alone travel or such, any of those sorts of things which will require to go through budget allocations in the normal ICANN budget cycle, will need to fit with the normal ICANN budget cycle and as I said just awhile ago, that means that anything you want to spend 2020, you have to be applying for now.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are we going to make it in time? Oh, yes, we will, we will because if we have this -- if we get this plan in my December, it means that our budgeting will be ready for 2020, won't it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: By the skin of its teeth, but yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That means you got to go really, really fast.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It also means it has to get approved. If it doesn't get approved in that budget cycle, then it doesn't get approved.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, so our arguments have got to be really, really good too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Additional budget request as well core and it's the core budgets that the public comment happens. Now, more significant expenses tend to go in the core budget pile. If for whatever reason we felt Heidi needed an extra three staff to do one of these things, this is just an example, Heidi don't get example although I'm sure you'd make good use of them but that would be a significant change to the budget that she's allocated every year and so that's the sort of thing you'd expect to go through as a core budget request.

If we were looking at something in additional budget request line, then you need to remember that of course that comes out of a pot of money in any given budget cycle which is limited and which is shared across the community and that is a competitive process. Either means we need a strong and prevailing argument for the money to be allocated but anything that would need to go into core budget would be one that would need to convince the wider ICANN community to support and there are parts of the wider ICANN community to by definition will be anti-anything if it were At-Large or the letter AL or AC associated with them, so we need to be very aware of that.

The miracle of the ATLAS3 should be considered use that, a miracle and I think we owe a number of Board members and members of the organizational effectiveness committee our undying and ongoing humble appreciation and thanks for pulling off said miracle because it is very well unlikely to happen again. The finance session at Barcelona, is going to have -- that's where we should be discussing and trying to

prioritize anything that we need to go through the budget cycle.
Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. One of the things that I just wanted to mention, just addressing Eduardo's [inaudible] ready to go for that. On the Google Doc that is online at the moment, there is actually a column that is for priorities and timelines and that kind of stuff, so there is a section available for other comments that can be made. I'm a little bit worried about actually starting to create the document which we've actually had issues with in another working group. If we can just keep everything on one page, the information that we need.

I think there are definitely discussions that we've had already as Cheryl has highlight, there are definitely areas that we can already take off and things that we can do almost immediately. Because we've already made a start on it but once they're brought out in details, including what we're already done but those details but be included to show that the process is actually being implemented already.

Just looking at for example the point about the fact that there are groups of similar or related activity and I think that in those sorts of things then we would actually highlight which of the ones that we do first among of those, within that there might social media, might be outreach, it might be policy development. Detail those things that need to be there because within the areas, for example social media, they will have a strategy, if there are things that can be done quickly, if they can

be addressed initially and then get the harder ones, leave the harder ones for later to give more time for them to sort those ones out.

Again, as we've mentioned, if there are budget implications, they're going to need more teamwork, we need to bring them back to the team and have some real discussions about how we address those and how we approach them because we don't want to be putting all our eggs in one basket. We need to make sure all the issues are addressed and perhaps we can be a little more flexible in how we use those resources across different issues but we've got to be mindful of ICANN's being very limiting, restrictive, constraining about it, it's distribution of funds, we have to make sure that what we do is absolutely essential and can be very meaningfully visualized within our program of event.

We've got a few more minutes, is there anyone else who'd like to ask a question, make a comment? Would you like to finish a few minutes early? Thank you very much? Eduardo had a question.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Working up from this meeting to the next one, we're going to have this Google Doc in place and we should be able add comments -- we should have some prioritization by the next meeting, right?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

We'd really appreciate if people would like go to the Google Doc and put in what they think is something that -- they can contribute to the prioritization process.

Okay, so any other questions, queries? No final words Cheryl? Okay, so our next meeting will be Tuesday the 25th at 1900 UTC, that's okay for Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It would not be suitable if it was 1900 UTC because --

MAUREEN HILYARD: You want use to change it opposite, so we can do the 400 UTC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do another 1300 one and then you will be out of sync, okay?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Cheryl, the problem is ALAC is also on that evening, so you're going to run into problems there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Am I?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, it's at 10 o'clock Sydney time and if have a later time I suspect it's going to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 1900 UTC and 1300 UTC are not 10 o'clock Sydney time at all.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, can we do the 1300?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I suggested we did a 1300. Yes Holly, that was my suggestion, that we repeat.

MAUREEN HILYARD: All we all agreed them. 400 UTC but that's okay, we can make it 1300. How does 1300 UTC fit in with everybody else? Is that better than 400 UTC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry, my apologies, it's 1300 my local time, it's 0400 UTC. It's this time slot.

MAUREEN HILYARD: This is the time slot you would like us to have on the 25th?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, and that doesn't clash.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We'll be alternating opposite to what they're alternating. That's cool for me. Can I see some text to see if it's cool for everybody else? Great, awesome, that's enough and Justine, great. Okay, that's what we'll do.

We'll be at this time 400 UTC on the 25th of September. Thank you very much. Thank you everyone for today, I really appreciate it and really good to see that Holly finally got on.

HOLLY RACHE: I've been on the phone, I just haven't been able to get into the room at all.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, I think you have to reload your Adobe Connect. Thank you very much guys, I will see you all on the 25th of September. Thank you.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]