

---

ANDREA GLANDON: 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 9<sup>th</sup> of October 2018 at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alfredo Calderon, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Daniel Nanghaka, Eduardo Diaz, Marita Moll, Kaili Kan, John Laprise, Glenn McKnight, Jonathan Zuck, Ricardo Holmquist, Yrjo Lansipuro, Vanda Scartezini, Hadia Elminiawi, and Alan Greenberg.

We have apologies noted from Humberto Carrasco, Satish Babu, and Bartlett Morgan.

From staff, we have Evin Erdogdu, 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 very much, and welcome, everybody. It looks like a pretty good team of people today. What we're going to be doing today predominately is to go over, to do a review of the progress of the templates. I know that there's been a lot of work going on, not just directly onto the templates but also within the group which is really

---

*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.*

---

heartening. But we do have a deadline to meet. I guess it's sort of like trying to get as much of the work done as possible before Barcelona. But, if there are any issues, I really need to get ... I need to find out what the issues may be in relation to getting started and that sort of thing. I was thinking that I'd like to call in the SSR group just to give us a bit of a direct overview on what the expectations are. I just feel that maybe I'm not getting it quite as well enough as to how what things might be required. I do think people who have actually made a start on it already [inaudible].

There's going to be just talking about ... Later on, we'll be talking about the [inaudible] ICANN 63 and there's going to be ... The [inaudible] plan will take quite a bit of time during that meeting, so it's quite a bit important.

So, just before we start, is there anyone who wants to bring—

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we can. Is that Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. This is Seun.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we can hear you, Seun. So, if there's anyone who has any other business that they want to raise now? We can always bring it up during the [inaudible]. Are there any questions anyway, starting from now before we get going? No? Okay.

I'm hoping that you will all be able to connect onto the prioritization and dependencies page because it will be very handy for you to be able to see that as we talk through the different template and clicking onto edit at the top of the page so that it opens all the templates. So, is everybody ready to go? It's showing up on the screen anyway and I'm assuming that everybody has scrolling rights on this.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, that's correct.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's great, okay. So, just going through, number one. This is Jonathan's section. One of the things that I think is really important for people to focus on is the focus is on the [inaudible] required to fulfil the implementation of the proposal document that the board agreed to. Let's see. When we're going to prioritization, that's a priority for us.

I have actually ... What I don't want people to lose sight of is that within some of those priorities, the items that you're working on, there will be ... We could look down the track as far as continuous improvement. So that people have actually – are doing both and I think that this first item is probably an example of that. Alan, you had a question.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, I was going to let you finish speaking first.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I know. I'm fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to point out – and I think you were just getting to it which is why I was going to let you finish – the difference between continuous improvement and what we promised. This is a good example. You recall the original issue and the recommendation was we have to change how we decide what to comment on and we have to cut down significantly on the comments and we said we demonstrated numbers that shows we had done that. There was not a lot of evidence that we were commenting on lots of things that we shouldn't be. But what we said we would do is we would correct the website and number of places where we gave a very wrong impression based on how things were titled and grouped together.

Here we have an example of that's still what the commitment says, but when you look at the implementation, it's all about changing our processes. So, changing the processes is fine and refining the process is fine. But, the question is do we really want to tie it to the At-Large improvements and put it in the timelines and in the details that we're providing to the board? So, the question is, to what extent do we want to segregate the two saying, yes, these are good things to do, but it's not what we committed to in the At-Large improvement, and unless we've decided that the proposal we made was just wrong and we need to change it, how do we want to handle these?

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. I think that's probably the issue that people are actually trying to come to terms with and they're doing their implementation of the set because the set, the proposal, is a little bit of confusion for some people about the proposal and actually, whether it actually addressed the objective of that proposal.

For example, I know that, on this one, quality versus quantity of ALAC advice, the fact that it was actually focusing on the website just seemed to miss probably what the issue was really about. I see that this is, when going through the set, that this is where [inaudible] incorporate. Other things have been incorporated into it. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Maureen. It's good that Alan's hand is after me because I'm actually Alan a question in my intervention. So, I'm assuming what you are suggesting is that step one shouldn't begin with the part of the proposal that was ensuring documents are [inaudible] classified, etc., steps, but rather it goes back a little earlier and step one would be what an update from staff on state of rework of website and Wiki. Step two, review documents outlining the [inaudible] and classifications used to date, and then go into what's listed and I've got you right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not quite. Because what's listed is ... Remember, we have no control over what the issue was. The issue was identified by the external examiner and it is what it is. In some cases, we agreed with the issue

---

and disagreed with the implementation. Recommendation two is an example of that. And in some cases, we disagreed with the issue. And this is one of those.

So, although we may have problems with how we produce statements, it's all tied to getting people to work and getting more people involved. It's not clear that the issue that is we were producing too much garbage that we shouldn't have been commenting on at all was in fact true. I don't believe it's true. We spent a lot of time countering that position, but we said we understand why the reviewers thought that and therefore we have to fix that problem.

So, I believe what we should be talking about in the review – that is, what we're going to be sending to the board in December or whenever it is, and our reports and our timelines thereafter, are addressing the issues that we committed to. Other things in parallel, there's no doubt we should be working on them, but it's not part of the review process proper. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Alan, if I may, give us rough text for the three steps you'd have put in that block. I wouldn't said it was very close to what I said. Have staff tell people where we are in tidying up the misleading Wiki and website.

ALAN GREENBERG: The steps you identified were perfect. After them, it's fix the problems that still remain. All of the parts associated with deliberations and how we decide which comment to comment on, which is not really

---

problematic – our problem right now is we don't decide quick enough to start the work getting done. All of that I don't believe is part of the At-Large review implementation. It's something we need to fix. But, it's not necessarily part.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. And whether or not the group decides to put that down into [inaudible] is not a major issue from my point of view. It seems to me that if Jonathan wants to go back over the transcript and turn into some things of the English language as opposed to [Australian] garbage dribble, he might just be able to pop three more steps in and be ahead of the game. Yeah?

ALAN GREENBERG: Except, I don't believe the last steps are part of what we're committing to to the board at this point and then [inaudible]. That's the point I'm making. At this point, it's only one voice. If everyone disagrees, I'll shut up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand your point of view. I also hear Maureen who has given counterpoints in meetings and that's where perhaps Jonathan and his group may propose needing a number of the other fluffier last steps perhaps or just some of them selected out of the current steps into continuous improvement. So, that's fine. Just wanted to be sure we were talking from the same page. Looks like Jonathan wants to jump in. How dare you want to jump in on your own area.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl. Before we go to Jonathan, I just want to add that while we're going through the proposed steps, for example, I believe that there have been adjustments made already that we're actually already implementing steps that are going to ensure that what goes onto the website ... So, we're actually looking at what we are doing so that what goes onto the website is accurate and reflects more appropriately what it is that we're doing in the policy area. But, Jonathan, love to hear from you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I certainly don't presume to know the answers because I'm the new kid and I feel a little bit like mommy and daddy are arguing. So, I'm going to just hide in my room until this is resolved.

I guess the issue is twofold. I take Alan's point which is why sign up to do more work under the auspices of the review that they've already agreed that we need to do? I know that personally I was looking at the problem that was identified and see some validity to it. I guess Alan doesn't. So, I just went off down crazy land on addressing that problem, but I think Alan's got a fair point, that we might want to keep that out of the conversation with the board because it's more of our own knitting. So, I'm still committed to kind of reforming the policy development process within the At-Large and engaging more people, etc. Things we talked about. But, it doesn't need to be part of this process. If all we've done now is agreed to do more stuff than they're even expecting us to



---

do, which is what I think is Alan's point. Let's do our own knitting separately from this process.

So, I'm happy to do it either way, to either move it to a section where the stakes are lower or take it offline and work on my presentation for ATLAS for whatever the right venue is for that reform, separate from this more minor renovation that's being proposed as issue one. So, I'm happy to execute either one as you wish.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Jonathan. One of the things that I have neglected to say that a continuous improvement section that we're actually including in this template would not be put into the final presentation that we will provide for the board anyway. That's purely for us and continuous improvement. But, I completely can see and I have tried to say that the proposed implementation steps should address the proposal, the original proposal. We shouldn't be going too far away from that in regards to – because we are making more work for ourselves.

However, the continuous improvement section we probably could incorporate some of those things because when we're working down the track, we need to know where we need to go. And with respect to some of those things that came out of the review that address that maybe there are some improvements that we can make, like we do have to take [inaudible] into account.

Jonathan, is that an old hand?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, that's old. I'll put it down. Sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I agree with the conversation up to date. I think that it would be a shame to lose a lot of the proposals that have been made in terms of improvement. In terms of reporting back to the board, fine. We can actually report back to the board on the limited amount of things that we agreed to do. But, I don't think that should stop us from doing what we also were looking at doing, which is improvement. And in some cases, I know for example issue 11, which I think Olivier will talk about, what we agreed to do was not even clear. It just wasn't very clear.

So, in terms of how to take that forward, even things like the first step has to be, well, what the hell did we agree in the first place and is it as limited as it is or is it something else? And explain that and agreeing now that bifurcation of what we're doing.

In the first place, we agreed to do this limited thing, but actually, that's a part of a larger project and maybe simply framing it that way means we're not going to slow ourselves down, but we'll be careful to say this is what we agreed to do and we are going to do X. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Okay. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. I've been trying to follow the conversation. I just want to reiterate what I understand that is being discussed so I can follow it through. What I am hearing is what we have heard is the final proposal and approved by the board. That paragraph there is what we said and what the board said that they approved. So, there, we're just talking in that paragraph about Wikis and websites and fixing them. To me, that doesn't have anything to do with what the issue is, which is what Jonathan was talking about, about processes on how to do better quality of the policy.

So, what I'm hearing is let's get to answer for the board just what is there, website and Wikis. So, am I correct about what I'm understanding about this conversation? That is my question. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Eduardo. Yeah, you are correct. I think I'd like to get from Alan ... And I think you have explained it, Alan. But the only thing is that it does ... I think this is where the confusion arises where people see beyond the proposal, that it was actually suggested to the board and what to put more into it because they think ... And I think, going back to what Holly said, that first of all, we address a proposal, but say that rather than going into the full continuous improvement direction, just highlight those proposed implementation steps that the issue will be dealt with with another step. You mentioned another step. Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Look, the major problem that Jonathan's list is addressing there and a real problem we have is not so much that we are not being selective in what we comment on. The problem is that the process, once we have decided that we don't decide quick enough and the process, once we decide it, is not always effective, that comes down to the reviewers issues under number two. That is, we don't have enough people involved with enough expertise to do the work properly. It's an aspect of that directly related to responding to public comments and giving policy.

The substance of their issue was we are responding to far too many things and we are issuing policy on far too many things and that was because our website was labeled everything policy. We went and corrected one page on the website and they found another page in the next update of their report that we hadn't changed the title on.

So, that's why I'm suggesting that we focus on the problems that we have said we're going to address. There's lots of other things we have to do that the reviewers didn't focus on. We know that. But, let's not intermix the two in terms of having to document it and report it and meet specific timelines. This is an easy one, but there's some of them that are going to be much harder to do if we intermingle them. That's only my recommendation. That's all. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. I think that this is a perfect one to be discussing the issue about, though. Thank you. Alfredo?

---

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes. Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Yes, we can.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Okay. I'm feeling just as Jonathan is feeling. There's a fight between daddy and mommy and I'm listening to the conversation. So, this is my impression. I have to agree with Alan. We're trying to do too many things and I don't know how to reiterate what Alan just mentioned. We have to figure out how to fix the problem, not how to make the process better, but to solve the issue that has been identified by the board.

I mean, the ideas that Jonathan has presented and that I contributed in most of the issues are great, but that's thinking in the future, not how to solve the issues from the past.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Have you finished, Alfredo? Thank you. Yes. Alan, is your hand still up for a reason? Okay. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Maureen. I keep on wondering whether we're not just trying to dig a little too deep into these things. I heard Alan speak about this whole topic of too many or not enough advice being written and so on, and we're looking at it on a word-by-word basis. And we all know that within our community there have been people that have said

---

we should just give one statement per year like the GAC does. One statement at each one of these three ICANN meetings. We'll do one of these and that's it. There are others who say, no, we should have five and others who say we should have ten. It's just too much.

The way that I see what we're going to do here is let's do things to improve our community when it's going to improve our community. But, if we're just going to start doing things just to tick boxes and things, then let's not waste time on the ones that we have to tick boxes on. I'm really hoping we're not going to have to do too many things where we have to tick boxes because this is neither a good use of our time, nor good practice for our community to do things and waste time on box-ticking. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Olivier. I think that this has been a good discussion because it's clarifying things for a lot of people. I think that we have to ... The continuous improvement section, just looking at Marita's thing, is something that I was actually looking at is, first of all, focusing on the issue which was to be addressed for the board, the proposed implementation steps for moving forward so that we've actually got some direction for At-Large to be looking at where we go from here, following the implementation of those issues that have been raised with the board and okayed by the board. Also, taking into account, too, that their agreement to address the issues that were proposed that they do actually offer that if any resources are needed in order to implement those steps, justification for those requirements, given that they could be considered.

---

But, the continuous improvement section, of course, as I mentioned before, will not be included in the review document that goes to the board.

I think what it does mean, too, is that as we're going through and if we really needed to get this clarification because I felt that there was some barrier to what people – getting the steps down. And I think, too, with a little bit more clarity on how we might address them, that there be simple steps with regards to implementing the proposal and that there may be [inaudible] one thing moving forward that there might be something that might be mentioned, but not in the depths that we would have, that we will take the continuous improvement section out. But, I would still retain it because there's some very interesting information there that we can actually look at developing strategically for At-Large as we're going down the track about what we might want to do as an organization as such.

Are there any questions? I haven't been keeping tabs on the chat, except what I've seen passing through. Is there anything that anyone would like to raise that they may have mentioned in the chat?

Well, we've certainly given Jonathan and his team and I'm assuming, too, that people are joining teams when they can. I have really appreciated that there have been a lot of people who have been putting comments down into the comment section for the teams who are working on those templates to be looking through and getting, taking note of the comments that have been made to incorporate into the steps if they're relevant, and also that they're taking into account that

---

they may be relevant more to the future direction, to make sure that they are separated.

Let's just focus on what we have to do and then we can look at the other stuff later on. I think, moving forward, that's what we can do and hopefully by the time we get to Barcelona and we're having a major discussion on this in the development session, there's actually a couple of other sessions during the week where we may be bringing things up and if there's any time that anyone needs to have steps clarified or assistance with those, the time for us all to get together and actually help them out and try and get the 16 different items completed and out of the way before November, that would be really, really good.

So, if I can, if we can go through these, just to see if there are any ways in which we can support some of the steps that are being discussed. Section two, there was [inaudible]. I saw it before and hadn't changed it, but there was a template completely [inaudible] – actually, an old version. It has actually been changed, I think. Yeah, this particular one has got [Bastian's] name on it, but there hasn't been anything added to that one just yet. [inaudible]. Is there anyone who's working on number two who's here?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. This is Seun.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Has that group met, Seun? No?



---

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. My line has been [inaudible]. So, what [inaudible] that you mentioned [inaudible] explain that there is [inaudible] we are now discovering which are actually [inaudible] recommendation to the board. I think that [inaudible] implementation which exactly [inaudible]. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm sorry, Seun. It was hard to hear what you were saying because you were very quiet and also it was a little bit muffled for me. I'm on my mobile phone which isn't all that great.

ANDREA GLANDON: Maureen, we're going to redial to Seun because the interpreters weren't able to interpret either with that audio, so we're going to try and connect him again and see if we can get a better line.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, thank you. Thank you. That would be great. Because we'd like to hear what was said. Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that part of number two is our whole structure of ALSes and individual members and there was a fair amount of work done a long time ago on a group that was called I think the ALS Criteria and Expectations group. I think we're going to have to go into that because a lot of the discussion was already had on what do we have to do to make sure that we have a community out there that has an interest in what we're doing and perhaps can participate in it. So, although nothing has been ... Not a lot has been done in this particular group. There is a history of stuff that has gone before us and I may be the only living person around who was heavily involved in that and remembers what it did, but I'll be glad to share that to the extent that it has any value.

MAUREEN HILYARD: My memory is pretty gone on that, too, Alan, so grandma can help.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. There's two of us then.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're the grandma and grandpa now.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] on weak legs.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I suggest that you put forward some suggestions on proposed implementation steps so that ... I mean, I think Justine has made some comments there. I think we just need to ... If anyone's got any suggestions to assist because I know ... I mean, everyone is really, really busy and it's trying to get this work. I just know the first one is a biggie. As you say, there are lots of different issues being raised in this, so trying to address just a few steps to address all of those issues really does make it. It's quite difficult.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may, for just a moment, number two is really make At-Large work. It's easy to find little parts of it and that's not something we're going to do. It's something we progressed with significantly compared to five years ago. We're in much better shape now and we still have a way to go and ticking off – to use Olivier's comment, ticking off the boxes for this review is not going to finish everything. Two years from now, which is I think our implementation line on this item, is hopefully we will have made significant progress but that is going to be a work in progress going forward. So, we have to be realistic about this, but we have to start doing things. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. There's some good suggestions that have come from other members, so I think that there's good options there to be able to construct some steps. The difficult thing I think that people are finding is one of the legitimate questions that's actually in the template is how long will it take to actually carry out the implementation side of things.

---

So, we do need to give them some idea of how long we think – will we get it done before the next review in June, that kind of thing. Work a little bit harder, I guess.

So, Alan, have you got something else to say?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. I was just going to ns your last question which is not as frivolous as it sounds. The answer is are we going to make things perfect? Well, I don't know any part of ICANN that's perfect and we're not going to be. Are we going to be able to achieve the quantum changes that we believe are necessary before the next review and within the two-year timeline? I hope so. I think we can and should.

Again, to review history just a little bit, we started work on the ALS improvements I guess about the time I took over as chair, which is four years ago, and we were making good progress until the IANA transition came along and took away all of our energy. And then accountability. The path has ... And then the At-Large Review. These make-work activities, so to speak, got in the way. Now this one is highest on our priority list and it's about time we finished it.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yeah. I think that this is one of the things, too. I like the way the CPWG works. I like the way this could possibly work, too, is that everyone is involved and everyone can contribute to it. And although I've assigned leads, they're the ones I sort of see as the coordinators and [inaudible] anyone that they think has contributed a comment that they would like

---

to contribute to per the discussion. I really think that this is our opportunity to work really well as a team and to get things finished. It would be nice to think that we can actually finish this in our lifetime. Yes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, I had to step away from the laptop. I did put that in chat, Maureen. My apologies. I'm just on audio at the moment.

At the risk of deflating the Kumbaya team-building moment that we're having right now – sorry, dear. I can't help myself sometimes. Let's look at perhaps getting the 8 of the 16. We disagreed with half of them. We explained why we disagreed with half of them. The board accepted that we disagreed with half of them. So, let's cleave those off, make them a different color. It doesn't mean we don't work on them. It just means that we do not work on them at this stage [inaudible] implementation of improvements and perhaps, Maureen, you can reconfigure your highly enthusiastic issue leaders and their accolades to – pardon me again, I really am in that sort of mood, team. Again, my apologies. Not really, but you know, it's nice to say those things. To focus on the eight that did say we definitely needed to do something about. In the November to end 2020 timescale.

Now, that doesn't mean we don't start the others, but we don't commit to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and the board to make that part of our AIRWG world. Just a thought. And now I'm going to go back on the bridge.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Just before I [inaudible], what I'll do is [inaudible] put some sort of indicator on the issue as to it's one of the things that we can deal with straight away and we can focus our energies on that. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm going to agree wholeheartedly with what Cheryl said but disagree with the number. For instance, number one is one of those disagreed with, but we said we do have a bit of homework to do. Clean up some titles on a few web pages. So, I don't think we should shelve those until later. So, it's just a minor refinement, because on a few of the ones we totally disagreed with, we said, "But, there's something that we should do to make sure other people don't misunderstand, like the reviewers did." So, just a couple of caveats around that one. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. There's definitely a few more understandings [inaudible] from that. Great.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, may I? Cheryl here.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just in response to Alan, perhaps you could just assemble one group of leads and accolades to go through all of those that Alan indicated, which I think can't [inaudible] more than three. Maybe it's four. And they could deal with those with a very light touch for this report. You know what I mean? So, not [inaudible] that I was brutally suggesting, but go to Alan's wavy line, but everything on that side of the waviness gets done by just one team because none of it should be a lot of implementation with more [inaudible] where are we up to, what can we do, don't let it fall through the cracks. Okay. Muting again.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm just taking note of a comment that Holly made. It says this is sounding like what we were accused of and focusing on process rather than actually doing stuff. In fact, if you have a look through all of these items, most of them are process. When it comes to actually doing, I mean talking about policy, number one was probably the one that related to policy as such, but there were other issues that were also raised and we're addressing those. But, if we do get the process right, hopefully we'll get the [inaudible] stuff done as well. Alan, have you put your hand up again?

ALAN GREENBERG: I did. It was just in response to Cheryl and I agree completely with what she said. I was counting issues, not work teams. But, we can certainly consolidate the easy ones into a single [inaudible]. Thank you.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: True. Okay. So, going forward then, Holly you've got issue number three. You're working on that one okay? You got any questions or queries related to that [inaudible]?

HOLLY RAICHE: Having done a little bit of lecturing, this is about working with staff to address how staff can better meet ALAC needs. There have been a lot of comments made not just on this template, but probably throughout the whole review where comments have been made which I've been looking at. But, I'm not going to actually start working on this until I actually sit down with maybe Heidi and others, probably at Barcelona, to say these are the issues. What's possible and what's not possible? Because I don't want to reply in a template other than to say what are the constraints and what are the possibilities and work through that.

If you go back and look at some of the comments that were made initially in the review process and throughout, there have been suggestions and I know that there are constraints on staff and what they have to do. So, I'm a bit reluctant to put too much on paper at this stage and I'd really like to have a sit-down with Heidi first. The aim is to have some flesh on this one by Friday in Barcelona.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, do make sure that it's not just you in that interaction. You've got a group of people working with you, some of which have actually



---

worked with staff over the last decade very closely. They might be handy to have in a sit-down as well. I do get concerned about this being a pen-holding exercise. It's not. It's an issue-lead exercise and [inaudible] working with team to – at least, that's what I understood from Maureen's outline back in the beginning. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm glad you put your hand up to work hard on it. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay. Moving on, then. Number four is my one and it's on the leadership. It was mentioning about the ALAC leadership team and saying it was making all the decisions, blah-blah. And that the ALAC chair would work with members of the ALAC and staff to better communicate their role and activities of ALT ensuring that it's more clear about what the ALT does and does not do. Of course, that will be – and I've been working on a plan and been talking to people who would be closely associated with that plan and it will be ... I think just about everybody has seen it already, but a final draft of it is to be built. It won't be saying anything more than we were trying to say before, that it's not a decision-making body. It's sort of like a high-level discussion, takes place and recommendations made for the ALAC. But, that's going to be ... And I think I have [inaudible] that in the [field] and I really do appreciate the other comments that have been made, too, so I'm working on that one. Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I put my hand up for number three, actually. Just pointing out that if you read the proposal it says continue to look for opportunities. That is a continuous improvement one. That doesn't mean we can't take a jump start on it and do something to begin with.

And on number four, that's perhaps the classic one where we said they're wrong. We will clean up some documentation, though, so let's not go overboard. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Fair enough. Okay. You've got the link to that. That's good. Is anyone else having problems trying to get through these pages? [inaudible]. Tijani, how are you going with yours?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Good evening, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Hi.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me well?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we do.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So, we are in item number five, isn't it?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you very much. As I told you by e-mail, I didn't work on it until the last few days because I had a lot of things to do at the same time and I didn't have time to work on it.

As you have seen in the subsequent procedures our comment on this initial report, the work was very well done because we have this Wiki page but also we had the mailing list. The most dense and important exchange was done on mailing list and this is exactly what we need to do for my group, at least, to come up with something which is I think well-discussed, not something which I put on the Wiki and [inaudible]. We need the discussion. And you know that we don't have the culture. Our community don't have the culture to go on the Wiki and to read what was done and to comment on it. This is something which is not very often done, unfortunately.

When we receive mail, an opinion on something, you respond. You answer. You give your opinion. This is what needs to be done for my group, I think. I think our task is more or less clear, but I prefer that we do that collectively, so all the group, I don't know the name of all people who are interested in. I see that I have only Alfredo and Nadira are contributing, and Maureen of course, but I do prefer that we have a mailing list open for everyone who wants to join and we discuss on it. I

---

think we may come up with something common, discussed among all the group and something that reflects the opinion of everyone.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Tijani. We've got the ARIWG email list if you'd like to put a question or query out. I just wanted to mention that we were looking at what the proposal that was approved by the board and it does actually mention that our involvement was I-star organizations and cooperation with the GSE staff when we're looking at outreach and engagement, so that it's quite important that you try to address those and how we're going to work better with those organizations in our future activities with relation to outreach and engagement. It's also taking into account that I think there's about 10 items within the 16 that actually relate to outreach and engagement, so that obviously sounds sort of like a preoccupation with the reviewers.

But, when I'm saying that [inaudible] outreach and engagement, they do impact in some way on outreach and engagement which is one of the reasons why I have actually made outreach and engagement a particular stream for At-Large to be working on and moving forward, along with their policies under the CCWG and the outreach and engagement are particularly important roles and is reflected in it as well.

Thank you, Tijani. I see that you're moving on. I think, for example, having a mailing list that's dedicated to it, as you say. But if you have any questions, because other people may have put their names down for the group, but there will be others who may want to answer a

---

question or query that you'd like to, if you have a series of steps that you're recommending they may want to comment on. And put it out to the group. That's fine.

I think a lot of people are already starting to look at the page anyway and adding comments to the various templates. That's another way of doing it as well. Let's get something up on the template to start off with.

Okay. Seven is looking at – oh, here we go. Excessive amounts of At-Large community time spent on process and procedure. [inaudible]. Is that what we're doing?

I gave this to Javier and I know that he's been in contact with me and he's meeting with his team on this one, so I think that he'll get that to us.

It was interesting that too many internal working groups are a distraction with the objective but we're looking at the ALSes are going to review our working groups and I think that having the CPWG and having the outreach and engagement and also the organizational stuff means that we get to focusing more on what's important to it rather than spreading around a whole lot of working groups that [inaudible] operating at the moment. We can cut down on those and keep things focused. I think that's going to be a lot better for us. So, that's Javier's work. If we go through these, I think there is—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Hand up on seven.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'm sorry. Okay. Go, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. With the work done with CPWG and [inaudible] organization for outreach and engagement, remember the original recommendation was abandon all working groups. We rejected that, but we said we would clean up what we have and make sure that they're effective and that we don't proliferate working groups just for the sake of having working groups. Remember, this was driven off looking at – again, looking at our website and finding a list of a huge number of groups, many of which doesn't even exist anymore, some of which were closed working groups associated with a past election but they were still there. So, this is one that I think you could probably say once you take over and finish cleaning up outreach and engagement done. You don't have to work for two years on each of them. If you look at what we're promised, it's pretty well done.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. But, under the new regime, Alan, the outreach and engagement, it's an overarching stream and [inaudible] all the sorts of working groups that actually impact in some way on outreach and engagement are to be coordinated under that particular, within that particular stream. I don't think we'll ever finish outreach and engagement, as such, because it's our ongoing work anyway.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, all we promised to do is clean up the structure and the documentation. The documentation still has to be cleaned up. We still have two long lists showing on the website. But, other than that, it's pretty well done. Take credit when we've done something.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, I know, but that's sort of like looking at the website. It's a website issue again. That's fine. We're doing that one. Cool.

Just moving on, though, eight and nine are John's areas to do with social media. I attended the meeting today and it was a great [position] and it's moving really, really well. So, I would say that ... John, you may want to make a comment, but I would say that there's lots of things happening in that area that are going to be very well addressed within these two issues. John? Can't hear you. Are you muted?

JOHN LAPRISE: Can you hear me now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Very, very quietly.

JOHN LAPRISE: Okay. Hold on. Let me adjust my mic here. Is that better?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. That's better.

---

JOHN LAPRISE:

Okay. Alright. Yes. On both issues eight and nine – and I'll address them jointly – we are making progress on multiple fronts. We have decentralized the Social Media Working Group to the RALOs and acquired basically leads in each of the RALOs who can post on platforms that are relevant on those regions as well as in languages that are relevant in those regions and we're working with Evin who has been doing great work to support us and we're just in the process of implementing Slack with Dev's help, to help coordinate messaging and share content. I'm envisioning it as a central content repository so people can go there, see what other people are sharing if they're not seeing it on a particular hashtag and using it as a repository and [inaudible] across among RALOs.

We're working on an editorial calendar. I think that ... Let me just take a step back. I think that issue eight is well [inaudible]. I will be drafting something to fill in some of these blanks. Likewise with nine. I think we're going to be limited on resources because we have Evin's support, but we're not going to get any kind of other dedicated support, to my knowledge.

One issue that continues to be fuzzy in my mind is the line that we draw with ICANN Org on communications issues and policy. We have the ICANN At-Large handle. We started using the hashtags, but again, the hashtags for the RALOs are not owned by us.

Just generally speaking, policy that we can disseminate across the organization for social media posting because we can't really police it.



---

We can just advise on best practice. And I'd like to conform to ICANN policy as best we can.

So, anyway, I think both of these are coming along nicely and that's all I have to say. I'm happy to take questions. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, John. That's great. I know that we were having a discussion this morning about Slack and introducing it to people, if this is an avenue that we want to follow. So, I'll have a chat with you later about how we may incorporate that. But, yes, I can still see that you've already got some steps clearly detailed already, so that's a really good start.

Issue 10 is going to [Dev]. It's looking at some communication channels. I know that this is, again, related to what John is doing in his work, but adding more of the technology side of things. So, Dev, have you been looking at what you might incorporate as steps for recommending with regards to At-Large? Can you speak?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Barely.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Dev, we can't really hear you.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Oh, dear. I'll try to [inaudible] type it up in the chat. [inaudible] and set us up so that anybody can now join the Slack group. [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, okay. Get a dial-out, okay. It's just that some of the comments that have been made because we're looking at multitudes of communication channels. It's the technology and the social media stuff that they've been working with John in relation to Slack and those kinds of platforms. But, other means of communication with our membership group have actually been suggested, so we probably want to look at the broader side of things as well, which Dev is really good at anyway.

Okay. So, then we come to 11 which is Olivier's section which mentions ATLAS-3. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Maureen, you want me to take you through this?

MAUREEN HILYARD: If you wouldn't mind. Just give us an update on how you're going.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for this. The problem we're faced with at the moment is that the original request here mentions ... Issue 11 mentions ATLAS meetings every five years and it also talks about the whole thing

---

of At-Large Summit and General Assemblies and it kind of mixes them together somehow.

One of the discussions that we've had is whether we should be focusing specifically on the forthcoming At-Large Summit or ATLAS-3, specifically, or whether we should be broader and just look at the overall schedule of ATLAS, of General Assemblies. To that effect, I've taken the table which I had put together quite a while ago. I'm going to copy the link and put it over in the chat, actually. Table of ATLASes and GAs. There you go.

This table was looking at the whole thing of how we were trying to get the board's attention to the fact that we were doing this rotation of General Assemblies and At-Large Summits. You can see that continuing it from the last At-Large Summit which was ATLAS-2 in London. We've had some GAs taking place in Dublin, in Hyderabad, in Johannesburg, in Abu Dhabi, and Panama City, and then nothing in FY19. Now we're going to have an FY20 with the ATLAS with no GAs either. So, I'm not sure where that takes us. And then move the GAs to the months afterwards.

But, I'm not quite sure whether we're looking at the right type of thing here and whether we're not jumping a bit too far ahead on things. That's why, so far, the only thing that my colleagues have put on there, the general activities and general vision, metrics, etc., that work around ATLAS – well, ATLAS-3, effectively – and we would appreciate some direction as to where to go with it. I think that's a right way to describe it. I just put a lot of things out there. Eduardo is on the call. Maybe Eduardo can actually ... A number of things that he's added on the list of

---

dependencies, because we have a very large – not very large, but rather large – page on this.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I just ... My comments are not here. In any case, I added some comments about [inaudible]. I think one of the things that we need to work on here is metrics because [inaudible] come out of this work that we're doing with the ATLAS-3. In fact, in number 11, there is some ... what we said that we were going to do is we were going to increase focus on [inaudible] and metrics. If we focus on ATLAS-3 – let's forget about the General Assemblies now. If we focus on ATLAS-3, we're going to be doing that work. We're going to be doing tracking and metrics. So, it would be a [fallout] of the one that we do with ATLAS-3, and that's basically what I'm saying there. Before I put some improvement there. And basically, what I'm saying is continue to [inaudible] the metrics going forward and learn from events and use lessons learned to continue improving the tracking and metric stuff is basically what I am putting there and that's the direction that I'm taking with this. So, any comments and feedback would be great. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Maureen. In my Utopia on this one, I'd like to see recognition of ATLAS-3 and its work, and obviously the nexus between the metrics which there will be no surprise to hear I wholeheartedly agree with. But,

---

I wouldn't want to see its sole focus on the next ATLAS, to answer Olivier's question.

I think part of what this issue could do is, in fact, recognize that ATLAS-3 is a slightly different beast than anything that's gone before it. It's not an uber gathering of what would be considered the normal attendees of General Assemblies. It's quite a different thing. [inaudible] what it is and we need to have it regardless of that.

But, I would like to see a revisit and a strengthening and an empowerment of that proposal that Olivier has outlined in the link. It wasn't appropriately picked up and accepted. Yes, we realize it's always subject to funding and, yes, we realize right now is a bad time. But, income is going to flatten out – is flattened out – and one of the strategic plan issues that is being highlighted for the next five-year strategic plan is the fact that there is, to close the issue which I took issue with in the webinar earlier today, a lessening of effectiveness and an increase in cost. I suggested that in fact a [inaudible] of effectiveness is not necessarily to be paired with an increase in cost of community involvement. You can, in fact, have effective expenditure and improvement in effectiveness for input. That's the sort of thing we're going to have to deal with.

So, to respond to Olivier's question, certainly do more than just a nod to ATLAS-3. Definitely recognize that in the nexus it was necessary metrics. But, go back to where we were before and see if we can [inaudible] it. Thanks.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. To me, this is an absolutely classic case where the actual recommendation focused just on ATLAS, but if you read all the material that came from the review and the comments, it is about the relationship because in the early stages of the review, there should be more general assemblies and less ATLAS and that was also responding to cost. It's a perfect case of, going back to the structure, we can easily say we've done very little, but the point of the review was to say look at the relationship between the General Assemblies and the ATLAS.

Also, if we're looking at move – I hate moving forward. If we're looking at one of the [inaudible] the review, it was about participation and how you increase the participation of the community. I think that's going back to Ed's point about metrics and participation and the inter-relationship between General Assemblies and ATLAS and how both can be used in terms of increasing participation of end users. I think there's a very small "we can tick that, we've done that" but I think there's a much larger "no, we can't tick that" but that's really what this point should have been about. I think if we're going to move forward, I think it would be useful for the working group to focus, first, on the easy answer, the easy, quick answer and then the much larger issue and a much larger set of metrics. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Holly. Olivier?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Maureen. I heard what's been said here and one thing that I would like to ask is you've seen how we've focused here on metrics and we focused here on ATLAS ... ATLAS-3 in that case, but we can just call it ATLASs. How much should we focus on General Assemblies? What proportion should we focus on those General Assemblies? Because the messages now are mixed. We've got the issue which says the ATLASs are hard to organize. More frequent regional meetings should be more effective in encouraging policy input and outreach.

And our final proposal as a group by the board says we will proceed with our plans as approved by the board. The thing is there was this acceptance by the board before this whole hoo-ha about IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability and having the whole community now having to vote on budget and the board shivering in their socks when they bring the thing over, go, "Oh, my God, I hope we're going to get that budget through," because it might be mixed by the community.

How do we have to adapt our language now and how much can we focus on these General Assemblies whilst also focusing on the At-Large Summit?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Holly, is that another hand, old hand?

---

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no. That's an old hand. Apologies.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Alan, can you enlighten Olivier?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm going to address partly Olivier and partly some other things. I would suggest we go back and read the final proposal. It says the ALAC will proceed with its plans as approved by the board, pending appropriate funding. As with all At-Large activities, there will be an increased focus on tracking and metrics.

Now, we have proceeded. We have secured funding despite Olivier's concerns of how the budget process works in ICANN. We have at this point secured funding. It may disappear if things get really bad, but that's not under our control and we are proceeding with planning. So, we are following our exact proposal to the board and doing it well.

The tracking and metrics that it's talking about are not the metrics leading up to ATLAS of how do we decide who to select. It's tracking the effectiveness of ATLAS. Do the people that we have here start producing better? Remember, we're not only going to be bringing existing people. We're going to be bringing people with potential. Do they meet that potential because of having been exposed to ICANN?

So, recognize the metrics are metrics measuring ATLAS, not necessarily the other metrics that we're talking about on an ongoing basis.



---

Now, Olivier does have a valid concern, but he didn't identify it specifically. The real problem is, going forward, GAs we have been funding out of the SO/AC additional budget requests.

Last year, or this current year, the envelope was shrunk by 50%. If it stays at that level, it will not sustain us being able to ask for a GA and that is going to endanger the GAs and I think we need to be working on that going forward. That's the part of this commitment to move forward with the plan approved by the board. That currently is a complete unknown and I think we need to be focusing on that. Exactly how we do that is not clear.

Again, let's focus on what we said we're doing. By the time we are halfway through the At-Large implementation, we will have held our ATLAS. It will have fallen flat on its face and been a disaster, or hopefully, it will be a success and we can point to the success and the benefits we're getting from it. Again, let's focus on what is there. That doesn't mean everything is rosy. In this case, Olivier is quite correct. The GAs I believe are problematic.

But, I'm not worried about the board. The board was asked by Goran whether they approved the funding for ATLAS and we got more than we were even hoping for. I think it's not all doom and gloom. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thanks, Alan. Sebastien? We've only got a few more minutes left. Thank you.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Maureen. I'm not sure that it's the right place to [inaudible], but I want to be clear, frank, and straight. [inaudible] hoping for. It [inaudible] the budget on top of the [inaudible] of ICANN ten years ago, nine years ago, and four years ago to the [inaudible] budget today. And if we take the [inaudible] two previous ATLAS we will see that we are really shrinking a lot.

The second point, we've even organized a GA the year before and the year after. It was to allow the money who could be used, that could have been used, for a GA to be together for an ATLAS. We will not have a GA. Therefore, I don't know if we can still call that [inaudible]. It's a small ... Bigger, but still small group of people [inaudible] compare it with what's happening in other parts of the organization, we are far from [inaudible].

But, I agree that we need to [inaudible] not just on the meetings [inaudible] Montreal next year, but also how we will organize the GA. The reason why the [inaudible] to allow one from each ALS to come. It's not anymore the case. Therefore, we are not doing what we wanted to do. ICANN is [inaudible] and I think it's very bad [inaudible].

I know that there are people who are saying that it's better to have 90 people [inaudible]. Okay, but what will be the result? We will make [inaudible]. If you take fellowship people, they can [inaudible] of ICANN [inaudible] also. It's not the [inaudible]. Therefore, I hope that we will not try to [inaudible]. I hope that it will not to be [inaudible] involved in the next [inaudible] because we [inaudible] just for that. Thank you.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Sebastien. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Maureen. You've seen what we've got on this prioritization and dependencies page. What I was hoping is we'd get a bit of feedback on this. As I mentioned to you, there was much focus on ATLAS-3. There's much focus on metrics. I feel there should be focus on GAs. The reality of things is, at the moment, we're getting something between GAs and ATLASSs. GAs are probably one of the biggest at-risk things, as Alan said. Should we add more to this? Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. Very briefly in response to Olivier. I think it's important here that this issue also notes the other nexus that exists beyond metrics, etc., with specific regards to the more frequent regional meetings would be more effective encouraging both policy input and outreach, while familiarizing more of At-Large with the workings of ICANN. That's [inaudible] several other issues. The new design on outreach and engagement, the CPWG, all of that are things that didn't exist when this was written and so I think I would just like to make sure that, particularly with regard to the purpose of general assembly we're very clear. General Assemblies are mere capacity building exercises and introductions to ICANN. Then, I think we need to look at whether or not we should be implementing wholesale

---

ICANNLearn activities instead. That said, I am a supporter of General Assemblies for entirely different reasons. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl. We're nearly to the end of our session and I think that when we're going through our list, if we can just go spend a bit of time on issue #13 which was needs for more systemic RALO participation at regional events, another outreach and engagement thing. Glenn, you've actually done quite a lot of work on your [inaudible]. Have you gotten a better idea now of what you might add or change? Is he still here? Yes, he is. Add or change to your template. Can you speak? I know he was having problems trying to get in before. No? Probably not hearing from Glenn.

Just while we're waiting for Glenn, the other two issues are related to issues that Cheryl mentioned, not our priority. But, of course issue 15 is a priority and it covers quite a few of the things and it's the one – sorry, not 15. 16 is to do with the metrics side of things. 16? Yeah, 16.

I know that everyone – it is a focus for us all, so we're trying to get ... I'd like some input into that one and I've had some good comments that are coming from Justine and others and I think we just need to probably focus a little bit more on how we do it. It's just a bit list at the moment, but it does need to ... If we're going to be looking at specific steps for actually achieving an overall picture of metrics, that's what we need to do. The other specifics I don't think need to be in there, though. Just as you will find, [inaudible] ramble on a bit. Then, hopefully, get it all together in a little bit more meaningful way with your help.

---

I don't want to hold you up too much longer, but I really do appreciate the contributions that people have made today because I think that it has clarified for me especially, and a lot of people, to help them move ahead. Olivier I know has probably got an issue with regards to the ATLAS because we've got the ATLAS-3 coming up, but I guess it's sort of like bigger picture and it might mean that we need to be asking people outside of At-Large to get some other information to contribute.

But, we will have further discussions in Barcelona and probably it would be ... If you can make some changes or if you need some help, we can organize working groups or whatever to actually get things a little bit more targeted towards meeting our goal of getting the [inaudible] by the end of November back to the board so that we can start implementing what we need to, what we say we're going to do.

Are there any other questions or queries before we sign off? No? Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. I'll see you soon in Barcelona.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: See you in Barcelona.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Maureen.

ANDREA GLANDON: Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**