ANDREW GLANDON: Thank you. We will now officially start the recording of today's conference call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the At-Large review implementation working group call held on Tuesday, the 5th of November 2018 at 04:00 UTC.

On today's call we have Yrjö Lansipuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Sébastien Bachollet, Ricardo Holmquist, Amrita Choudhury, Marita Moll, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Harold Arcos, Jonathan Zuck, and Alan Greenberg.

From staff, we have Evin Erdogdu, Heidi Ullrich, and myself, Andrea Glandon on call management. We have apologies noted from Eduardo Diaz, Joanna Kulesza, Judith Hellerstein, Ali AlMeshal, Humberto Carrasco, and John Laprise. I would like to remind all participants 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. Yeah, I've just adjusted my headset a little bit. Is that a bit clearer now, everyone? Yeah. Cheryl? Okay. Welcome, everyone. Thank you very much for coming this evening. This evening for me, this morning for Olivier. We are going to be going through the eight prioritized topics that we had a little go at on our last day in Barcelona.

What I've done is that – well, Evin has actually prepared a Google doc, and what we're going to be doing is we're going to be working through the tasks that are actually on the Google doc, which is just a complete transfer of the implementation across to the Google doc, which is what we're going to be using as our main draft of the prioritized items. And we're going to start working on cleaning some of those up.

We'll leave the community Wiki space that we've been doing our work on, we're going to leave that as is, so we'd rather that people didn't make any changes on that page anymore, because most of our work is now going to take place on the Google doc. So if you can get into that, which is the – Evin's just put it in there – draft area [with] milestone report. So if you can get into that, that will be really good and we can start working on that one.

Okay. We won't worry so much about the executive summary, because that's something that we can work on later on. If we go straight through to the first item, which is Jonathan's one which we did spend quite a bit of time on initially because it's always been our first cab off the rank and also because it was used as our example.

So, if we're going through that for a start – and I don't mind if we all go and have a look at what can remain. For example, the final proposal as approved by the board, that section, each of those items will remain because that is a direct copy of what was actually in the original document that came from the board. So that's an okay one.

And then we go to prioritization. I think that some of these things we probably won't need to worry about too much because these are things

that we will probably clean up. I'm considering getting a small working group to work with me on doing the final cleanup, but we do want to focus as much as possible today – and I only mean to take 70 minutes, not 70+90 – on this task.

So the first item, of course, is the ARIWG comments. There may be some ARIWG comments that are particularly relevant to the steps, so I guess we'll talk to Jonathan and ask him what would be relevant for the steps that he's actually proposing. Is there anything in there that needs to be retained, or are they just discussions and can be removed? Jonathan? Is Jonathan there? Yes, he is. No.

ANDREA GLANDON: Jonathan, are you able to speak? It looks like your microphone is connected.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. That's okay. When he comes back. Early status of improvement efforts, that was a staff comment. Is Heidi there? Heidi or Evin, is that a comment that we can retain?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, the comment is what?

MAUREEN HILYARD: The already underway continuous improvement to continue. You have that as a comment in the status of improvement effort, which is a

comment – this is obviously an area for the staff to make a comment. We're still doing number one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, I'm wondering if it would be useful, as I note that we have around 14 people logged into the Google doc right now, and I'm just wondering if it would be useful if we had Evin share her screen and we could edit as we go along.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Whatever is appropriate.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Would that be better? My concern is that –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: If that would be useful –

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think yeah, because –

HEIDI ULLRICH:	– with one person editing what the group is thinking, if that would be useful.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Okay. I'm just getting comments at the moment, I wouldn't be editing anything. So okay, we'll use Evin's –
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Great.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay, so let's go ahead and do that. Thank you so much, Evin. That was fast. So I think if we could all agree that Evin is going to be doing the editing.
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Yes. We had just been looking at, first of all, the first section which was the ARIWG comments and whether these comments were actually [inaudible]. Evin? Whether these comments were relevant to the steps or whether they could be removed. I think they could be removed myself, but it's not mine, it's Jonathan's. [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, so to be clear, you're looking at the final proposal as approved by the board, and you're wondering whether – what the exact question is –

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, I'm looking at issue number one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And we're going through it. The final proposal as approved by the board, that stays. Prioritization, [we can fix that up]. The ARIWIG comments, whether they're relevant to the steps or not and whether they can be removed. I just needed to get okay from Jonathan, but he's not able to join us at the moment, obviously.

HOLLY RAICHE: Do you want to take all of that text out? [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, is there anything in there that's actually not just discussion? This is where I needed Jonathan, because he wrote a response to that.

ANDREA GLANDON: Maureen, Jonathan, it looks like his microphone's not working, but he has sent a message in the chat.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, good. Okay. We can take all the text out. Great. Thank you. That's great. Good, so that can all go. Let's clean that up now. So that's gone. Evin, are you going to get rid of it?

HEIDI ULLRICH: But just to confirm –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, moving on to the next – thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Maureen –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: My question now that we have no comments in the ARIWG comments, should that be – I'm not sure what you want to do in the final report with that space. Do you want to include [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, what we need to have is what is a relevant comment to put in there if this was just discussion. Unless you put in what the discussion included, but it's up to Jonathan as to what he wants to leave in there.

What he could put in there perhaps is a summary of that discussion. But I need some other input as well here. Yeah.

So that would go for everyone's sections, is looking at a summary of the discussion in each of those spaces. Okay. So therefore, if we leave that – and Jonathan can write a summary – the next one was –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Oh, sorry, Cheryl. Yeah, go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think I'm on now. Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [I'll just leave my hand up. Excellent, Jonathan.]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Jonathan, you've been given the lead, so go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Sorry about my microphone, I don't know why it's not working. I just downloaded a new version of Adobe Connect, maybe that's why. So [I sent a message at] the staff to really look into implementation steps, because this is largely a step-driven exercise the way that it was

promised to the board. So I'll remove most of the text [that I've created] and it'll resurface elsewhere as I make my little proposals along the way. But as far as this particular file [inaudible] ask staff [inaudible] to sit down and figure out what the [inaudible] implementation steps are for item number one. Does that make sense?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. [Yes, it's okay.] So are you asking the staff to actually do that summary? No?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I'll do it. This is a case where as we've discussed, the actual promise made to the board, there's very little resemblance to the issue [inaudible] because we, I guess, disagreed with the finding so that it was just a misrepresentation. So I thought I would sit down with staff to try and figure out what needed doing and then I would create the summary. That's all.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. How to say that. Yeah. Cheryl's got her hand up, but she might be able to answer that. So this is to do with the ARIWG comment being, the working group comment being that the steps didn't address the issue that Jonathan was referring to [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And we decided that we don't care about that for the purposes of this process. That's all. This is what we agreed to. We're not going to

promise to do more than we agreed to do. That's what we ended up saying in Barcelona. So I feel like I need to go in and look at what the actual issue is that we promised to correct, and then I'll write up the implementation steps. So that's the point [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. So just make it as a comment but just carry on with everything else as directed perhaps.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Make a comment [inaudible]. Okay. Cheryl. Oh, go to Heidi next. Okay. Heidi.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] I'm next.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Cheryl, I think you're next. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh for heaven's sake. Fine.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible]. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] comment made. So whatever.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was noting that what we have here is the [inaudible] MSSI-derived and is designed to make the Organizational Effectiveness Committee review of it as simple and as efficient as possible. And to that end, where we have the opportunity for ARIWG comment, if there is a relevant ARIWG comment, and at this stage I would suggest this one is one where there is probably a very high level of [helicopter sentence] that may as well be put in, this is the place one can point out that in fact, the opportunity – sorry, Andrea is now trying to do something with me. No, you cannot dial out to me, I have no freaking telephone. Haven't had on since last Friday.

Now, on a brighter note – it is what it is, so if I'm inaudible, tough. I'll type it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I can hear you. Right, okay. I think that Cheryl was saying, Jonathan, that a relevant comment in that section as you were mentioning would be appropriate. So yeah, go for it. So we can delete what's in there and you

can write your comment. That'll be fine. And that can be – you can do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what I'll do.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Great. Awesome. Thank you then. Carrying on, Heidi, are you okay with the already underway continuous improvements to continue? [inaudible]

HEIDI ULLRICH: So I just wanted to comment that I went back to the development session action items and noted – I'm just putting it into the chat, some of the actions that were discussed, and I believe that they're relevant to this one on how to make not only the Wiki and the work pages more clear but just to make policy more clear.

So those discussed are about policy briefs, are about a global newsletter, just a paragraph or up to one page, an At-Large message on the issues related to policy, global content on those newsletters, podcasts, videos to be produced by CPWG co-chairs, etc. I'm just wondering if those were related to that and that should be included in there. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I really don't understand why we're trying to make this far more complicated than it is. All those things that Heidi mentioned are really great things to do and they may be related to number two, but they're not related to what we said the problem was and what we're trying to fix in number one. I really don't know why we're trying to make our lives more difficult than it is. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Okay. Well, I think we're just going through – I think what we'll do is, Jonathan, if you can – Heidi, if the section you've just read out refers to number one, then you might work with Jonathan to see how he might put in what he was thinking of putting in there with what is in here as well.

I will get to number two soon and we'll be able to look at whether that might fit in [inaudible] as well. Cheryl said that we leave it blank. Well, I think that Jonathan's got something that he'd like to put in there, and I think that he should be able to put it in, and we can always come back to it next meeting or if we get through the other seven before the end of the hour.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, but let me take it as a homework assignment to make some progress on that and let's move on past number one, because we're spending too much time on something that we really didn't promise that much on.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Awesome. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. So, right, we're moving on. Staff are starting to write in things that are important to them. That's great. Moving down, activities, if any. There aren't any there. There was something that – moving down, are there any activities? No. Who will implement ICANN staff in conjunction with [inaudible]? Yeah.

Anticipated resource requirements, staff up to point two, FTEs, and December 8th, 2018 to 2019. Is that – yeah. Any comments? No. Expected budget implications, nothing additional beyond allocated resources to At-Large. Is that implying that the 0.2 FTEs are coming out of – where? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I'm not sure where that .2 came from. Does that mean current, the equivalent of a current staff person? I'm not sure what that means. I'm not sure where that came from. So Jonathan or Evin, do you recall this? Does that mean that it's going to take [the current] FTEs .2% of their time?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect that number was an estimate when we had a huge, long list of things to implement. I may be wrong, but correcting a few webpages is not going to take ten-person weeks to do. But I have no real knowledge of where the number came from either.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, I see. Right. Okay. So that would have budget implications. Yeah. Sorry, Jonathan. Yes. Okay, moving on then, we'll have to look at that and see about, Heidi, whether .2 is actually required, bla bla. Okay, the implementation steps. I think number one's always going to be the hard one, of going through it, and hopefully the others will go through a lot quicker because we've got a better understanding of what is required for each of these items. So please be looking at your item to see what is actually going to be required.

Now, the steps, Jonathan, [are these] actually what is required to implement the activities that are expected?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I guess that's the point, I need to sit down and figure out what those activities are. I think we should move past one, because it now bears no resemblance to what was promised to the board. There's nothing to salvage from what I did, because what we promised [inaudible] barely anything, and we just need to figure out what that is, and I will then document it. But this is no longer anything to use as a model.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Alrighty.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. I should have done this sooner.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I missed this up because I dug into it trying to deal with what I thought the problem was, and I wasn't taking the minimalist approach that we agreed to in Barcelona. So I think none of it is relevant, so I will replace it all.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Alrighty. We'll leave number one. Let's go on to number two. While we're getting on to number two, just Marita, if you want to have a look at what's on the screen, Evin gave the link to the Google doc, but we're sharing her screen to actually make the changes. You're free to look at the screen.

ALAN GREENBERG: In the agenda.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's on the agenda. Okay, issue number two, which was to do with [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, before you go ahead, do we really need or want the continuous improvement section in the report that's going to the board for the first checkpoint?

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, it doesn't. That is ours section so that doesn't need to be in there, no. That's one thing that can get taken off.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen – Yeah.

MAUREEN HILYARD: But what we did was we just transferred the whole lot across, and this is our chance to sort of start culling out what isn't required.

HEIDI ULLRICH: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: [So moving on to number two –] Yes, sorry. Yes, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. So you're saying that you would like staff on this Google doc to remove from all of those templates the row that reads continuous improvement. Is that right?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: You better save a copy somewhere first though.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, it's on the Wiki. We're not touching the Wiki. This is only the Google doc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As long as it hasn't been changed since then.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, no. The Wiki will remain, and this is the doc that we're actually preparing for the board. So that's why we're pulling things out that aren't necessary that were part of the discussion. But if we need to get them back again, they're always on the Wiki. So we don't want to touch that, we just want to use what is actually relevant to the document that we're working on.

Right, what are we looking at? Again, although we've [already] gone past it – are we looking at number two? Okay. Right, the final proposal stuff, that was all in the board document so we don't need to replace anything there. That will be fixed up, tidied up. So, can we move on to the next one? Evin? Okay.

Again, the ARIWG comments that have been made here, there would be a summary made of – as we proposed and – are we looking at number two?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Evin, we're on item two, issue two, ARIWG comment.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, ARIWG comment. So there's quite a lot of comment made in this particular item, which was to do with – this was quite a complex one. [inaudible] quite a few issues in there. So the ARIWG comment based on the comments that were made are relevant, and it'll be interesting to see how those comments have been implemented in the steps.

That's right, so those will be tidied up, that's Sébastien's activity, Sébastien's team. So the comments will be tidied up. So we know what we're going to do in the comments, so we can move on to the next one. It's really getting to the steps. [inaudible]. Moving on. Can we move on?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Evin, are you able to scroll?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Evin, hello. Yeah, can you scroll? Right, there's quite a lot of comment in that one. Okay, Heidi, no comment from staff. Activities, if any. Again, that's a comment, but I think that what Bastiaan's got to do is incorporate that comment into a statement. Who will implement ALAC – bla bla. Yeah. Next. Let's get to the steps.

Right. Okay. Well, there seems to be a little bit more work that needs to be done to tidy up the implementation steps, just making them – meld them together. And this one, because there are different issues, the steps actually relate to the different issues. Is Justine on the line? Yeah. Justine, can you just go through how you assume you're going to put those into a set of steps that we can actually say we're going to achieve what it is that has to be achieved in this item?

HOLLY RAICHE: Justine's typing.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Right. Cheryl, the [inaudible]. Alan, you may take the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. This recommendation is essentially the bulk of what we have to do. I would strongly suggest that what you want to do in this report to the board is outline the first steps. If you're outlining all of the steps going through, it sounds as if you've already done the full analysis of how we are going to accomplish this, and I don't think we've come

anywhere near there, so we have lots of ideas to what might work and we can suggest things that we are contemplating, but I would not try to outline the two years worth of work in this first report. I'd outline the methodology of what we're doing to be able to approach it over the next two years.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. I'm sort of looking at it as – like for example with the membership application, that issue, there obviously seems to be [in this data, we need to do better and asking] why organizations and people join a RALO, going through that whole assessment of the application process and that. Each of those things is a whole lot of steps because there are steps within the steps that are being proposed here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, if I may interrupt just for a moment, the problem we're having today is we wrote the application without thinking about what we wanted ALSes to do. And we don't want to do that again. So I think first of all, we have to think about what is going to make a good ALS, what we expect of them, and then out of that will come redoing the application process. You really want to think about the endpoints and how you get there, not just start by the easy parts, which may not address the problems.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, so we're going to have to write this in a way though that – it obviously needs a lot more consideration. I think the work that I've

done is try to make sort of a set of steps that encompasses the full process, but – so you're saying that [inaudible] application thing should actually be sort of down the track because it's all the other things that need to be taken into consideration about being a good ALS. So the criteria [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Now, remember, we did a lot of that work already. Now, this ALAC and the review implementation team may decide what we did last time was crap and want to start it all over again, or maybe we can just cut and paste. I don't know. But if you look for instance at number two, identification of experts willing to enable to contribute, well, that's a step way down the process.

It's certainly not the number two step and what we're going to do right now. We can't identify experts until we have more volunteers, and we don't have the volunteers. So I think we need to think of it in a logical way of just how are we going to tackle the problem? Because it is the problem. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Right, we'll probably need to rethink. I think some of the things are okay, we just have to [rejig] those. For example, looking for effective methodologies to bring new volunteers in and what the criteria are for what it is that we're looking for, and then we look at other [things, like are we –] okay. This obviously still needs some work, so we will look at that later and we will work with Justine and Bastiaan on that to see [what we can do] to fix that up. Can we move down then, move on?

Because there are other people who've got other things we might have to consider as well.

Okay, staff resources. Go for it, Holly. I know you've done a bit of work on this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I haven't done much since Barcelona, but we did start to look at – first of all, we looked at the original ITEMS report, which does have a list of the staff resources available, and I checked with Heidi who confirmed that that report and the staff allocated is largely correct, so we know what staff we have.

We also started talking, and on the Wiki page, there were a number of suggestions on how we might use staff and what things people would like to do. I think also from Barcelona, what was very clear from the briefing we got from Xavier was there's not a lot of extra staff floating around, that if we're going to have additional resources, it's probably going to be reallocation of perhaps what one staff does, possibly 1.5 from another area in ICANN, but there's not a lot of staff to play with, frankly, other than what we've got.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Holly, just one thing. Is that going to go into the comments, or is that going to go into the steps?

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, where do you think? Because that's what I've done. And the final thing that has to be done, I think there are three steps. The first is to check what's available, and that's the input from both Heidi and Xavier. The second is to find out what – really from the ALAC and the At-Large community what actual task we want [and] prioritize.

Now, people did contribute to the Wiki, and that was very useful. And this was discussed a little bit in Barcelona, not very much, but that consultation has happened. The next step, if we're going to actually achieve a balance of staff and tasks that have to be done, is probably to go back to Heidi with suggestions and then come up with a final proposal. That step I haven't taken, but I would want to go back to the Wiki.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can we move down a bit, Evin, so we can see those steps?

HOLLY RAICHE: Because those steps I outlined to you before Barcelona –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right, okay, so you [have to] tidy those up don't you?

HOLLY RAICHE: So those were the suggestions that have been made.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. I don't want to delete them because those were some of the things that staff had as ideas if we have spare capacity. I think what is clear from Heidi and from [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, that could then go up to – yeah, those ideas can go up to the comments I think in this thing, and [inaudible]

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Because don't forget, you won't have lost it. Even if you delete all that, you won't have lost it, it's on the Wiki page.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

MAUREEN HILYARD: But I think we need to have the implementation steps clear. But the discussion that you got already, that should be fine in the comments, and the comments are fine.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Alright.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, those can go up, and the steps will be consultation on available staff, I suppose listening to Xavier, I think reviewing staff needs, talking to the executive, talking to Jonathan about – and then prioritizing, [it'd] probably be an item in an ALAC discussion, it's prioritizing where staff is best allocated. And then it's going to be working with Heidi and you to see if we can, as a consequence of the review, make a case for some additional staff, and we have to, at that point, spell out the justifications for that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think those are [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan's got a comment in the chat, but he may want to refer to it. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's just what I said in the chat. This is an umbrella item that's saying what we're doing, particularly in the other areas, may have staff

implications. So there's no way we can map out all the staff implications now when we haven't done the other work. So I wouldn't agonize over having a detailed plan, and even staff estimates here, because it's going to be contingent on what we find in the other areas, particularly number two. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And I think it's something that we sort of – in the ARIWG comments, you'll note that a lot of the items, it was stated that they're dependent on other items.

HOLLY RAICHE: Exactly.

MAUREEN HILYARD: So [inaudible] to be a little bit of collaboration between the different [inaudible] to look at, including that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. So that's why really the third step, which has to wait until we've identified, A, what's available, B, what's needed, and not just from one area but from what's needed as a result of the review, and at that point, then actually make the case. In our response to the board, we've already said we should have additional staff, but I think it's pretty clear that it's going to be not easy to do that.

So we have to prioritize in terms of everything that we say we're going to do, what actually is going to require staff. and at that point, we can actually ask for it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alright. Okay. No, that's good, because [inaudible] at least you've got an idea what it is that you've got. And any changes now will take place on this document.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're not going to touch the Wiki anymore, because we want to keep that clean. We'll want to keep that untouched, because that's got all the ideas that we've come up with during [the eight] weeks. Now they're all transferred here and now is when we're actually going to cull and just clean everything up so that it's ready for the final touches, which are filling in the other gaps, and then based on the steps and the comments - so those are the two main areas that I'd like the teams to be working on, the comments section and the steps section, getting those up, and we can very easily manage around the other side. Okay, moving on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. There's some comments coming up in the chat too, which is great. Issue number four, okay, that's me. Right. And this, of course, looking at the leadership team. in fact, I've actually sort of put in here

the steps that I actually developed as I was putting the organogram together and looking at how the leadership team would become over the next year. And I think that the steps were basically around – like for example it's been developed to show the new At-Large leadership model, demonstrates that the leadership roles are [dispersed,] and really focusing – what I tried to do was to focus on the fact that the comment was made that the decisions were [made, the leadership team is to do with] discussing key issues, sharing key messages with regional members, which is why the regional leaders are part of the leadership team, and that it is an open meeting. So there's no secrets.

The only thing is that really, what I've described is basically what the process was, and this is what we said, except I've actually just sort of made them more explicit and used the organogram as the model for it. So, if there are any questions on it – so those are the steps. There were comments made in the comment section, which I have yet to make into a summary, but I will do so. But if there are any comments to be made on this, please feel free to pass those on to me. [Nothing? No questions?] Okay. Moving on. Next. Evin.

Okay. Uneven contribution of At-Large – was this one of our – we've been going through one, two, three, four. What are the numbers of the [eight?]

ALAN GREENBERG: One, two, three, four, seven, nine, 13, 16.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen –

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible]. Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have no idea if anyone can hear me, but I shall try again.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I can hear you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. This is why I suggested that we run it in three sections with the eight agreed priority issues in section one. The additional ones that are already under continuous improvement in section two, and the [inaudible] couple in section three. That will mean that it will be clear what [inaudible] prioritizing. And we won't have issue five having anywhere near the attention put to it. Anyway, [inaudible] my suggestion [within] the document. Take it or leave it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. I knew when I got to number five that we were in a different territory. The issues, you'll notice that the issues that are in green are the ones that we actually gave the first priority to. So I was looking for that. Thank you, Alan.

The next one is number seven, and it is one that Javier and I think Ricardo were working on, and I sort of gave them a bit of a hand, but there were already comments being made on that, and it's to – sorry, could you just go back to the top again, Evin? Just to that first section. Yeah.

Okay, so it was to do with the excessive amounts of At-Large community time was spent on process and procedure – now, I must admit [they] sort of belabored that one – at the expense of ALAC's mandated responsibility to produce policy advice and coordinate outreach and engagement activities, and too many internal working groups are a distraction.

So what we've looked at in this particular instance therefore is that I did sort of mention that it was some collaboration with Jonathan's activity because [I did mention] that we needed to put more focus on policy advice. With regards to the working groups, I think that that's where the creation of the CPWG has helped to eliminate some working groups that may not have seemed to be being very effective and didn't seem to be operating as effectively as they could have been.

But I think that that's where we need to incorporate into this the formation of the CPWG to address that, plus the outreach and engagement [inaudible] given as an umbrella organization for key and active working groups. So that we'd have one, two or three working groups, the capacity building one being one of the important ones, but those that are active are the ones that have to report back, and really, if they seem to have outdone their value to the whole scheme of things

for At-Large, then they can be discontinued and other groups may form in their place.

But I think that what we've got here, the ALAC has developed goals and objectives for 2019. These are the activities. There's a staff member designated to regularly update working group Wikis and working group websites. This is what would be needed. And the CPWG Wiki page regularly update issues discussed and progress statements. Oh, that is something that perhaps Jonathan might need to discuss with these guys. Alan, do you have a comment?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I do. We're focusing our time on the issue which is written by a bunch of people who didn't know what they were talking about. We really need to focus on what the proposal was. Remember, the source of the problem was if you click on – at that point, and maybe still in some cases, if you click on the list of working groups, there was about 50 of them.

Most of them were defunct, some of them were groups that exist but are specialized membership only. We advertised things like the ALAC Appointee Selection Committee, the BCEC for a board member that had long been appointed, the BMSPC for a board member that had long been appointed, a variety of working groups that hadn't met or existed in four years.

So the problem was we were advertising dozens of working groups that looked like we were busy with all of them, and most of them effectively did not exist anymore. And that was the largest single problem. So let's

look at the proposal and implement what we said we were going to implement.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Evin, can you just go back to the top again? Evin? Yeah, okay. But I think that we were – this is the proposal that was actually in the – this is taken from the board thing, so we're actually addressing, it says, "Too many internal working groups are a distraction." And what you're saying is correct, but I think what we're doing is we're focusing on the fact that there are changes, that we're going through the steps of making changes anyway. So I think –

ALAN GREENBERG: Too many working groups are a distraction was the issue the ITEMS group wrote.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, but it's in the document.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. it's the issue.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, I know. [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: That was verbatim cut and pasted from the ITEMS report.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we said, sorry, that's not correct, but what is correct is we have very poor documentation. In addition to that, we have also started a review which started a year ago, you have done a significant part of that to update the working group structure, so the answer is we still need to clean up the Wiki and the web if they have not been fully cleaned up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have already implemented a great new working group structure. It's almost done.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: [Take credit for what has been done, but –]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, remember [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: But like the policy one, the web and wiki still have to be made to show that we're a nice, tight operation, not a loosey-goosey one.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Alright. Well, Ricardo –

ALAN GREENBERG: Take credit for what you've done.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, but these guys have got to explain that. Okay, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: We can.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes. I have [inaudible] I was one of the ignorant who [inaudible] without reading anything [inaudible]. Second, I put some comment yesterday on the Wiki page. I didn't know it would be only on the Google doc. So the end of the comments are not there in the draft.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alright.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: We need to put the date of [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: [inaudible]. I agree with Alan, the work was done. I put that mostly at the end in the proposed implementation steps, and then in the continuous improvement and the metrics. I changed this to include that in the Abu Dhabi in ICANN 60, we [do] most of the work that was required here, because we clear all the working groups, and the continuous improvement is to do that once a year or something like that. [inaudible] in the Wiki page, it's [inaudible]. Not in the Google doc.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. It's okay, we will get those comments transferred.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you, Ricardo, for that. Heidi, sorry, I didn't see your hand.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	No, sorry, that's an old hand. [Green was Alan.]
MAUREEN HILYARD:	Okay. Right. Thank you. Right, so scrolling down – please, Evin, when you're finished – Okay, stop at those steps. Okay, so we will go through those and we will tidy those up into a more succinct set of steps, a little bit more clear, and we'll – no, that should be fine, and we'll incorporate Ricardo's – okay.

Yeah, Cheryl's reminding us that that we really need to be looking at the final proposal, and the issue and the final proposal have to go together. Yeah. Okay. Ricardo, is your hand still up for something new? |
| RICARDO HOLMQUIST: | Yes. The proposed implementation steps was one of the things that I [changed yesterday, and] [inaudible] continuous improvement [inaudible] how long will it take to implement [this.] So those are the changes that were made yesterday on the Wiki page. [inaudible]. |
| MAUREEN HILYARD: | Okay. Alrighty. Thank you. Okay, so we'll go on to the next one after 7. 9, 11, 13. Evin, can we go on to the next screen [inaudible]? Oh, nine. Okay, need for increased At-Large community awareness and staff training regarding the use of social media. I think that I can't see John on the thing, but I think that John sort of explained a lot of what the Social Media Group is doing. Not quite sure about the staff training. Can we just scroll down to the steps and see if he has put any steps in there that relate to additional staff development? Which is in the proposal. No, he |

hasn't. Okay. So we'll need to get him to look at what kind of steps he thinks may need to be [inaudible].

So yeah, John will need to be contacted to look at stating what those steps are in relation to the training of staff in the use of social media and anything else that needs to be done [in his] implementation steps. Okay, next, number 11. Is it 11? Why isn't that in green? Is it not that one? Because there were two, weren't there? 13.

"Need more systematic RALO participation in regional events." "At-Large Staff working with relevant departments to develop a single location which will point to travel funding opportunities and documentation of what resources were ultimately distributed, to the extent supported by those ICANN entities providing funding and reports."

Okay. So this was one that was dear to Glenn's heart because he could mention CROP. And Heidi, "At-Large Staff working with relevant departments," I know that the GSE for example has been given a lot of air time, certainly in Barcelona, and we had some really good discussions with Sally Costerton about ways in which we could encourage greater collaboration between GSE and the RALOs.

That's still an issue for some RALOs, and so I guess it's like there's still a little bit of work that needs to be done there. Can we just move down to see if he's actually put any steps in there? Oh, 11. Was 11 one of the eight? Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No. No?

ALAN GREENBERG: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 13, 16.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, 16. 16 is metrics. Yes. Okay, so there we go, that's why, Olivier. Right, so probably – I know that Glenn is actually traveling at the moment so he can't explain these, but I think that – I thought I've read through that before, and I think this is looking good. I think if there are any budget implications or anything like that, we might need to look at that, and Heidi and I will probably go through that a little bit more carefully.

If we rush through this very last one, we might be able to do number 11 for Olivier. But the number 16, which is to do with metrics, which is the very last one, which is one of the eight that we were discussing in Barcelona as the eight that we were going to concentrate on as our priorities, and so Olivier may have missed that.

In this particular one, we're actually looking at metrics, and as you can see, [inaudible] ARIWG comments about metrics. So there will – if you just go down a bit more, and there are some extra comments in there that I have to include into that [inaudible] comment I've already made.

But really, just looking at steps, this is something that's going to be ongoing I guess, but we will reestablish our metrics working group.

There will be a subcommittee of that that will be ATLAS III delegates group that will look specifically at ATLAS III, but it will incorporate many of the metrics working group, and we'll be very happy to have you on the metrics committee, Jonathan.

So there are things that we need to be looking at. I'd like to see that in preparation for the reporting at the end of the year, that there is some sort of metrics that is actually sort of developed for each workstream and so that we actually have clear guidelines and clear directions as to what we're going to be trying to achieve and that we achieved them and report on those at the end of the year.

So those are the [three] steps that are actually included in this particular item, and if there are any questions or queries, please feel free to let me know so I can make the appropriate adjustments. So, okay, we've got a little bit of time, so let's go back to number 11, because Olivier obviously wants to tell us [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen –

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I've had my hand up for a while. Could we go back to 13?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. It's not there. Okay. Go back to 13?

ALAN GREENBERG: 13, yeah. I just want to highlight the danger of focusing on the issue and not focusing on what we proposed. The issue for 13 was need more systematic RALO participation in regional events. The recommendation was in the interest of transparency, a clear indication of all opportunities for At-Large travel funding support and the beneficiaries thereof should be published promptly and in one place on the At-Large website.

If you remember correctly, there was as mapping that MSSI did and they asked a bunch of questions. The question they asked in this one was while the issue addresses the need for systematic RALO participation in regional events, the recommendation is focused on travel funding. What is the correlation?

Now, why they asked us that question instead of asking ITEMS International is beyond me, but this points out the lack of consistency in anything original. The proposal was make things clear on the website to document funding, both access to funding and how people have used it, and what we proposed was to do that. So keep our eye on the ball. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Okay. So it might need a little bit of tweaking then if we're going to – I thought that he had actually focused on that, but as you say, it says final proposal as was approved by the board, provide a single location which will [point] travel funding opportunities and documentation. So we need to make sure that that is – okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we think we're going to use the At-Large review to get more travel funding, we're dreaming.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. True. Okay then, right, so now let's get back to our final one of the night, which will be issue number 11. Let's go back there. Evin? Thank you. Okay, yes, it's this one. I think it's actually sort of an empty one. Olivier, have you got something to say about this one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't. I'm discovering it as you're speaking to me. I'm not in the most awake of states. But I'm looking and seeing initials and then paragraphs after initials, and I'm reading those thinking, "Okay, what next?" I think that's what the thing is. I've read the initial intro to the document thanks to Cheryl pointing me to that, so I just had a chance to go through that as well. But what I do note is the comments that we have here are very varied with regards to the recommendation in itself.

Some of it is to do with – because I always felt issue 11 has got the issue of having the five years ATLAS meetings but also having more frequent regional meetings. And I thought that this in effect is just a

straightforward recommendation saying, "Yeah, we agree, we want the five years meeting but we also want to have more frequent regional meetings and we want to have our general assemblies being funded." That doesn't seem to be something easy to implement financial-wise, and the additional comments that we have underneath seem to be sometimes about the content, about specific issues with some participants, etc. I'm not quite sure where we go from there. Rather than converging, we're diverging here.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. This is one of the unfortunate things for you in that this is not one of the prioritized eight, so you have got forever – not forever, you have got more than we have to actually think about and contemplate the means by which you will persuade the board that we will have the five-yearly ATLAS plus the general assemblies.

But I guess it's like how innovative can you be, and [I would expect that] they're going to say, "We've got no money. How are you going to implement that?" So [those steps] are going to be very valuable, but I'm sure you've got a team of people who are waiting in line to discuss with you what you might be able to include into that.

But the thing is that I think in this particular instance, the ones that are not one of the original eight that we're concentrating on, this is where the comments that are made that you think are relevant can be sort of incorporated into the ARIWG comment section. But for the other eight that haven't been prioritized, the steps can be a short explanation of a long-term program of developments to implement the actual proposal.

And that can be – it probably needs to be a little bit vague, but we do need to say that we definitely are working on it and it's a work in progress, and that we have a plan and try and describe as simply as you can what that plan might imply. Heidi says, "The board document only includes the eight priority templates with a brief summary for the other five." [Of the 16?] Oh, I see, there were three that were considered not even necessary to even make a comment on, 12, 14 and 15. Okay.

But we still have to make a comment about those. Right, okay, well, I think that everyone who's had to do a presentation tonight has got a [fairer] idea of what needs to be done if it all possible for next week's meeting. I know it's been a bit of a trial with people having to listen to arguments about what goes into each individual item section, but I think we've all had a chance to at least reflect on what we need to do in each of our sections.

And I really do appreciate the efforts that's going into this and the fact that we're doing it as a team. Thank you to everyone who's actually remained online with us. It's been really good, and I'd have to give [inaudible] to Olivier who got up in the middle of the night to come to this meeting. Don't worry about the fact that I will attend the [inaudible] meeting at 2:00 in the morning, the [CPWG] from wherever I am, probably it'll be New Zealand. So I'll try and stay awake during that, just like he has.

But thank you very much. The meeting next week, I'm actually going to be at the Paris IGF. I have mentioned to Heidi that the meeting has to continue, so I'm going to be needing to have somebody take over the meeting so that we actually do get it done. So I'll be asking a volunteer

to lead the meeting next week. But please, if at all possible, it will make things go a lot quicker if we can just work on – if you [need any questions,] use the rest of the team to get some feedback and to help you to incorporate what you think you need being done. But thank you very much, everyone. I will now declare this meeting closed.

HOLLY RAICHE: Until next week.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Until next week. Thank you. bye.

HOLLY RAICHE: Bye.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes [the today's conference.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye, everyone.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]