
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Review Implementation Working Group call on Tuesday, 13 November 2018, at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Jonathan Zuck, John Laprise, Eduardo Diaz, Alfredo Calderon, Ricardo Holmquist, and Alan Greenberg.

We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Daniel Nanghaka, Alberto Soto, Javier Rúa-Jovet, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Lianna Galstyan, Glenn McKnight, Humberto Carrasco, Marita Moll, Bastiaan Goslings, Joanna Kulesza, and Sébastien Bachollet.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Our interpreters are David and Marina on Spanish. And on French, we have Jacques and Isabelle.

We also have an apology from Sergio Salinas Porto.

Before I begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their names for the record and for the interpretation. Thank you, and I pass it over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Claudia. Our apologies in not having put in the wiki space that Sergio had, indeed, sent his apologies well in advance. And, obviously, the wiki will be updated [as well as the notes here] to note

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.

him not as a dial out participant for today's call but as an apology which was, indeed, sent in good time.

Let me start by, first of all, apologizing that you've got me to put up with as running today's call. Obviously, those of you who, like me, have had nothing better to do in the midnight hour – well, actually, a little before midnight for my time zone – [inaudible] not entertained by other ICANN commitments are aware that the IGF in Paris is running and we are low in numbers with apologies from several people who are attending that today, including [Maureen].

With that, I'm wanting to make very clear what happened between – thank you, John, in the chat for attempting to explain my giggle. John Laprise just putting [inaudible]. I'm going to take a couple of minutes to try and bring everyone on today's call up to speed but also more importantly those people who are [inaudible] on some of these topics and obviously will continue to be so as we go on to the actual implementation work, not just the writing about the implementation work that we've been doing so far, who are not on the call today and who hopefully will be reviewing it in their own good time via transcript or meeting recording.

We have had one or two people mention in the last 12-24 hours [inaudible] to make edits to the [Google doc] and it is now the only and we've been locked out and things have changed and now there's a new document that we're going to be dealing with in the call today. And the answer is, yes, glad you all caught.

We also received comments that went along the lines of, “Hang on. We didn’t realize that there was any hard deadline.” Well, on that one, I just want to remind you all and for the public record that our hard deadline by [resolved resolution] of the ICANN board is to have in their hands an implementation plan, including specific [prioritization] and budget implications based on their criteria of having lowest complexity and lowest cost being implemented first no later than 23 December 2018. Now most of us would call that a hard date.

It was worked out in an earlier call that if there was any attempt for taking what we put through, our work via the ALAC [for any sort of enforcement], we needed to be finishing our draft by no later than our expiring date which was 15 November. Yes, do look at your calendars, people. That’s less than 48 hours away even on my calendar. To have a final draft [document] so that the ALAC could consider it [intersessionally] and that it could be in the hands of the Organizational Effectiveness Committee no later than the week of 20th but preferably somewhere on or about the 14th of December. So sorry if we didn’t [inaudible] a printed out hard date or hard timeline for any of you, but rather foolishly I suspect now, some of us figured you could do the math.

So if you caught my drift, we’re not apologizing for the fact that Maureen, Alan, myself, and key staff – specifically Heidi and Evin – at the last 24 hours or should I say [coming up to] the hour that was 24 hours in advance of today’s call made some radical edits to the document to what [we thought would] tidy it up and best reflect what [was needed] to meet the Organizational Effectiveness Committee’s requirements for the initial [inaudible] of documentation. Note: we

have to launch no less regularly than every six months anyway on progress reports. But if any of you have your noses out of joint because of that, well, I for one [am not going to lose any sleep] over it and you probably wouldn't expect [inaudible]. And we will pretend to get down on [inaudible] and apologize if that's what you want.

Okay, having set the scene then in more than five minutes I suspect, let's jump into this document. And remember that this is [inaudible] a drafting exercise, but what we don't want to do is worry about minor [inaudible] formatting. That will be fixed up in a final run through. What we do want to do is bring [inaudible] along with us on the journey of where the document is at this stage and, in fact, also open for any brief discussion [inaudible] dire need to make any changes.

I'm aware that at least Alan may be in the document at this time. He still has edit rights. There was a fiddling with some of what he [inaudible] earlier on before we closed this document off and sent it to you. Something that was accepted or not accepted correctly, so he should be the only one other than Evin in the document as we go through it making any changes, and he'll be limiting himself to Number 13. So he should be well out of there before we get into it.

So if I could ask you now to – and, Evin, I believe you going to be sharing your screen as well. And I would encourage you all to open up the Google doc in a separate screen. We've got that capability. It will make your life much easier as we go through. I [inaudible] like some of you, you've got a couple of [inaudible] screens in front of you.

What I'd like to also do is ask you to focus in particular on the – I can try to speak a little louder, Claudia, but again I'm having to use this ridiculous Adobe Connect limitation. [I can but try.] Apparently, the interpreters are having trouble hearing me. Right. Let's see how we go. I'm afraid I still am having phone issues. Apparently, people aren't able to dial out because I'd organized a dial out but I'm not receiving any calls even though I'm able to make calls. Thank you [inaudible] but I will indeed push on.

Right. So if you can, please open up the document separately. That will certainly make things easier. And also if you can, pay particular attention to the prioritization remembering it's not what we think is most important here. It's what is least costly, lowest risk, lowest resources, and least complicated.

So with that, let's jump right in. And thanks, Evin, for sharing [your] screen. You'll notice since you last looked at this document we've extended the Executive Summary. Obviously, we've also changed significantly the formatting of the document. For those of you who have had time to scan through it, it now is in three sections, and the Executive Summary reflects that three-section design [where] we called out the eight implementation activities that we are committed to since the Board resolution and [are dealing with those all in [inaudible] Section 1. Then we simply list and have not taken a great deal of time and energy in the editing of it as yet, but will do before finalized.

The next section which [inaudible] issues which were five issues that [inaudible] to Section 2, and they're things that we established were being continuously improved and already being addressed before we

made our final report into the OEC on our feasibility assessment and that we also basically have three issues which [inaudible] listed them in Section 3 for completion sake. We have now [inaudible] ongoing activities planned to do [inaudible] focusing on the [inaudible] view of what we have to do to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee effective on the initial eight activities be implemented that are now outlined in Section 1.

Where you've got red text now a little bit further down, again, please don't worry about the color that you see in any of that. It will all end up [inaudible] in different editors colors here. It is our intention also to try and follow better design and formatting. So you'll now see an Introduction section, and that includes the Board resolution details. Please continue to scan down, thanks, Evin.

As we move on, you will see a section now where it is intended, before we get to Section 1 thanks, we will probably include a [table]. Just stay there, Evin. Don't go too much further. You can stop at Section 1 please. A small table that will show which of the eight issues are given which of our priorities and [is there] yes or no of whether or not they have budget implications and perhaps a small annotation as to whether or not it's going to come in the 2019 or 2020 financial year budget cycle.

So let me pause there. Hopefully, while I've been rambling on those who are pretty quick at reading will have scanned through the new text, if they haven't already done so in preparation for the meeting, and I'd like to pause to open up for any comments and questions on that preliminary text section. Obviously, if you have any suggestions on

anything that has missed out on or that desperately requires to be [included], please let us know now.

[Alan], over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Just a minor note. In the Executive Summary, there needs to be a change made that should have been made but wasn't describing the three issues that we're not focusing on at all. And two of the three are not being focused on because of budgetary constraints. One of them was to find brand new funding outside of operational funding for At-Large, which is just out of scope completely. The other one is to ask for a lot more travel funding, which I don't think we're likely to do at this point, not if we want to have any credibility with the Board and with senior staff. And the third one is to revamp all of our election procedures, which we decided we're not going to do. So there needs to be a budgetary reference in the Executive Summary. It's already in the Introduction. It just needs to be [replicated]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Good catch. That's exactly why we are going through this as a group now in this meeting as we're hopefully finally polishing or getting toward final polishing of the document. Can I ask, Alan, do you want to own doing that perhaps even while we're going through today's call? And then we might be able to move back and just have a read through before we close. [inaudible] improvement.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to try to do it, but if you look at the last paragraph of the Introduction, it says what needs to be said. Just those words have to be fitted back into the previous sentence.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Then I'll ask if Evin can do that later after the close of today's call. I'm trying not to put too much strain on Evin while she was managing the screen and real-time edits, that's all. Sorry, Evin. I tried. I'm sure [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: The context of the sentence is a little different, so it's not just a copy-paste. I'm happy to do it. I just prefer to focus on the meeting right now and not do editing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I appreciate that. I had just said, perhaps before you joined, that you would be the only person other than Evin doing any of the editing today. We'll leave it to Evin. I'm sure she'll make sure that the grammar [in the sentence] is appropriate. [inaudible] I certainly appreciate you focusing wholly on the meeting.

Okay, let's move now [inaudible] unless it's done immediately after this call because it really needs to be something that this group can come back to for possible – I would like to have thought during the meeting, but if not, it will have to be immediately after it.

But Section 1 and Issue #1. For those of you who haven't had a lot of time to go through this new document, you'll notice one of the things that is now missing is the ad nauseum description of the issue. That is now missing along with, in fact, any reference to any of you who are [lead] on issues. The Organizational Effectiveness Committee doesn't care who amongst us is doing what, simply that the ARIWG is doing it, and so [inaudible] brutal in our deletion of things as we've gone through.

I wanted to thank Jonathan for slipping in under the wire with his edits on this in the ARIWG Comments section and send a virtual smiley face to him. But first of all, take you through this initial Prioritization coding that we're using and we'll just understand a change from extended column to a [inaudible] there. What we're talking about when you see a 1.1.1 or a 2.1.1 or a 2.2.3 is whether or not the resourcing is low, the 1, medium being 2, or high being 3. Whether the risk or the complexity is the same in the next [inaudible], low, medium, or high. And whether or not therefore based on that we are suggesting that it should be a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd priority. Here we've [inaudible] thought 1st will be, strangely enough, first things to do, 2nd second things to do, and 3rd third things to do or probably [inaudible] program not at all. Is there anyone who is confused, concerned, or desires discussion on how we used the prioritization in this document? I love silence. Excellent.

Let's move on. Do take a moment to have a quick look at the radically modified comments that Jonathan has provided. Don't worry about the multi colors as I said before. And if any of you are uncomfortable about anything in that, then you definitely need to let us know now.

The only thing when I read through this that I might suggest is we've mixed and matched full names and initials. So, Evin, I would suggest, I know you know who EE is, is we delete reference to the initial matching the staff member responsible for policy or we give you a full title. I prefer the title. Thank you for doing that. It's just a formatting thing but if we could catch that now, it certainly I think would be good [form]. Of course, in the exception to using initials where we've gone through this document, early on some of us were using initials. Again, when we get to the Status of Improvement Effort, I would suggest where initials exist, full names. But when it is staff needs to be put in. If it's ALAC or At-Large or [inaudible] or obviously that's not names anyway.

The [inaudible] minor change that will need to go in here, not [inaudible] in the next one, is we don't leave blank cells so where there are no Activities, If Any, which are dependencies or dependent upon, we need to put in an N/A. And Evin [inaudible] my thinking, so well done you, Evin. [inaudible] worked with me far too long by now. You'll see who is to do the work, etc.

Please note that Heidi has thought deeply of the anticipated resource requirements, full time equivalencies, etc. And Alan and Maureen have thought extensively along with the leads where the leads had put information on what sort of tools, etc., are required in each of these [inaudible]. I think it would be presumptuous if someone with my [inaudible] to suggest that Heidi's estimates of what staff time needs to be would be modifiable by me. So I'm going to suggest that we very much try to and leave the Anticipated Resource Requirements where it talks about staff time allocations very much alone. But obviously, if

there is a tool or critical resource that we have missed, please do let us know as we go through the document.

Obviously, the Budget Implications are a best guess and carefully integrated with the [inaudible] issues. And so you'll see, for example, where the additional staff resources are required that we've constantly much to Alan's [inaudible], he's got to get tired of it I think, cross referenced to Issue 3. When we get to Issue 3 shortly, you'll see [inaudible].

Some of you will note that the Implementation Steps have been brutalized. And Evin, unless anyone objects, I want to get you to change 3 while we're here on the fly, removing [JZ2] and change the first word ought to say "Production of" instead of "produce communication." These need to be positive things now, so it should be "3. Production of communication materials...." So you'll see the sort of thing that we're trying to do today and hopefully some of you are reading ahead slightly so if you've got some comments, we can get to them in a timely manner.

[Reading] down, there are Metrics required which we've made a fair [inaudible] [putting them] or guessing or [inaudible] perhaps we thought they were too voluminous. As you go through, you'll see all those changes. And from the Metrics but more importantly linking back to the original documentation that was given to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee and which they based their resolution upon, it has watch carefully [inaudible] implementation [inaudible] everything.

Again, don't worry about the format. Issue #2 will not be orphaned at the bottom of the page by the time we [inaudible]. But before I move to Issue #2, I want to open any questions for Issue #1. And I have Alan. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. There's a lot of stuff under ARIWG Comments that don't seem to be things that we want to put in a Board document. "The wiki workspace is a macro that may be edited" and all sorts of stuff there. I'm not quite sure what the intent is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Jonathan is on the call. Jonathan, would you care to [inaudible]? I certainly....

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see Jonathan on the Adobe Connect.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I believe he dialed in [inaudible] in the AC but [inaudible]. I know he had to drop [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I heard him in the roll call.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, he's there. He's just muted. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not muted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Jonathan, over to you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: There you are. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We can hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I didn't mute myself. Somebody must have muted me. So, yes, I guess I could have been confused about the structure of that document. I didn't mean for the stuff in ARIWG Comments to be copied whole cloth into the document presented to the Board. I think the areas to really focus on, frankly, in that section are the implementation steps and the metrics because they've been boiled down to their essence, which is basically threefold.

One is categorizing our statements in a more granular fashion. The second is providing the means to sort by and filter on those categories so that people can more easily navigate the page. And the third is

adding a section for end user justification for a particular statement. So that's really what this whole to-do boils down to, and I don't know that we need an awful lot of commentary around it.

I didn't write that as prose to be copied in. I could still do that this evening if that's helpful, if we need something like that. But the real issue is the first paragraph of that I guess and then the implementations and the metrics. Does that make sense?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so it still needs editing. Fine.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Jonathan, thank you for that clarification. I will ask Evin to edit exactly as you ended, which is the first paragraph [inaudible] embellishment there is deleted. She may just need to double check with you briefly, and I hope [inaudible] available to do so in relatively short order, that her edits are a proper reflection as opposed to what obviously was assumed to be a full narrative in the first cut.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you need prose for the final report, I'm happy to do it in a couple of hours. Like I said, I was more focused on implementation steps and cleaning and streamlining those. So if you just need prose, I'm happy to do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm all for less rather than more, and I'm sure the OEC reading all of these pages would be keen on less rather than more as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That first paragraph is pretty much it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So let's keep it simple, especially as we have an awful lot to get through.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, sounds good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perfect. That's what we'll [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, I'm going to jump off the call, but I'll look for any to-dos that I have afterwards. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Jonathan. He may be muted.

All right, let's continue. Obviously, I'm assuming Alan will type if he's not happy with the edited proposal Jonathan has just suggested.

Okay, on to Issue #2. Again, it's relatively wordy in the beginning here, but I'll remind you that this is one of the critical foundation pieces of all

of our implementation [era], our improvements. And the text that you're reading at the top of this Issue #2 is, in fact, what was approved by the Board. So it's not that we suddenly got very, very wordy. It's just that a great deal of attention to detail was included in our previous documentation to the OEC, and that is reflected because it was that documentation that [inaudible].

So with that, you'll notice something different here in Prioritization. Here, we've got a staged implementation of prioritized activities. We have initial phasing, and we have long-term phasing. The initial phasing is seen as low resource needs, [low risk], and therefore 1st priority. But the second or [inaudible], the long-term one, is recognized as high resource needs, high risk, but after considerable debate between several of us has maintained 1st priority.

With this, the champion of maintaining the 1st priority approach to this particular issue, Alan Greenberg, I'm going to ask him to explain. I was the one who tried to champion the two-phase approach, and he was the one who tried to champion the 1st priority. So the two-phase approach seems to work, but just to help you all understand why we have a 3.3.1 and a 1.1.1 together, Alan, would you briefly bring everyone up to speed?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, well, I can't see how this proposal which is the core of our improvements can be anything other than a high priority. The Board's instructions were that we should stage implementation, deferring efforts that have budgetary or significant staff implications. Overall,

Number 2 has very significant budgetary and staff implications, but the initial phases do not. So I find it hard to justify that we don't start on it immediately, and once we segment the work it meets all of the qualifications for the Board's motion on working on it immediately. So I think it's a natural one, but since we only have a single line in this chart to express that I thought it was reasonable to divide it into the initial steps and the ongoing project, which both are high priority but one of them has significant resources and one doesn't.

I can try to explain more, but I think that's the logic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yep. I was just tired of hearing my own voice. Thanks, Alan. That's perfect. Is everyone else clear on why we've got this bifurcation in prioritization [inaudible]? Great. Love it when you're all clear.

Scanning down, again the staff leads are noted. We do have, in fact, some implementation dependencies and they're carefully outlined there. In fact, there's very few, well, it's actually half of or just over half I should say, of the eight issues are interdependent [inaudible] satelliting off this Issue #2, as you'll see there. If you think we've missed a dependency, let us know posthaste.

The only other thing is, Evin, as we go down it strikes me that the Organizational Effectiveness Committee who do not necessarily [inaudible] may not know what a RALO LT is, and so we probably need to change that to a RALO Leadership Team just in case they think we've got some other structure somewhere.

And with that, the same guidance taken with FTE and equivalent [inaudible] in terms of resourcing and the budget [inaudible] clearly are annotated [inaudible] Expected Budget Implications a two-phase approach in staged implementation [inaudible]. Any questions? I'm not planning on – thanks for embellishing it [inaudible].

We have some fairly extensive Implementation Steps on that but, again, I'm unapologetic about that. It's one of the key pieces of work. The Metrics are relatively clear and obviously have a [nexus] themselves with our metrics Issue #16. And we've said, no, we'll start now and [run it for the] next two years at least. So any conversation, discussion, or contributions to Number 2 before we move to Number 3?

All right, Eduardo from the chat: "On the Implementation box, it should be divided into initial phase and long-term phase to split what is in which." Okay, all right, we'll take that on advisement, Eduardo. I'm not going to do that on the fly, although I see Alan's hand up. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

My hand was up for something else. Just we should make a note that in the final editing we should be consistent with issue numbers. Do we precede it with a # sign or not? We're doing it very inconsistently right now, so just a note in the final pass.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, my vote counts it's obviously going to include the # sign, [inaudible]. We shall indeed be consistent.

Okay, so Eduardo, we'll take that on advisement and have a look at how that can easily be done. It may be that there are actual activities that can start without additional resources but will morph into requiring additional resources, and that may or may not clearly go into two separate groupings. Some things, in other words, may be a continuum. I shall ask both Alan [and Sebastien] who I think or if I can remember who the topic lead was. It doesn't matter anyway. I'll ask Alan and Maureen and Heidi to look closely at that in the next few hours. Obviously, there may be some overlap, but we'll see whether or not that's going to be – if your enhancement is going to, in fact, enhance or not. But we'll take that suggestion [over] and, Eduardo, thank you for it.

Issue #3 which is, whilst not a critical core, whilst it's not a core activity issue, it is a critical issue if many of the implementables are to in fact happen, and that is the one on staff resources. Remember the staff resource issue is one of those times where what the identified issue as stated in the initial external examiner's critique is not exactly what [inaudible] feasibility addressed. They talked about improving preparations [of] policy advice, etc.

Our final proposal language is very specific that its aim is to ensure that our volunteer community has sufficient support [inaudible] their volunteer time. And most importantly, we noted that it may require a shift or development of skills among At-Large staff as well as additional staff. So we did mention additional staff right back at the last document that we handed to the OEC. Here it is a high resource need because we would be talking about a full-time equivalent in terms of an employment situation.

That doesn't mean it's necessarily one person, but it's the equivalent of one person cut and diced however it may be that ICANN can manage to do so, if indeed ICANN can manage to do so. And I will ask Heidi to perhaps intervene in a moment and explain to us far more clearly than I'm able to how ICANN works its FTEs and [inaudible].

The risk is listed here as high because [inaudible] financial climate of ICANN we are well and truly aware that there is a hiring freeze on, for example, and if someone leaves ICANN, they are not likely to be even replaced in this current financial climate. And so, whilst it is important and if not dare I say essential, it is listed as our 2nd priority.

Heidi, is there anything you want to say now before we quickly scan through the comments?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you, Cheryl. Basically, it would be an equivalent of one FTE. Now whether that is an FTE, whether that's a professional service or a contractor, or whether that's actually just bringing in additional existing policy support staff to help with a certain particular area, the key aim here is really to ensure that you are able to implement the At-Large review and the goals that you've [set for] yourself effectively, efficiently, and successfully. So we need to show flexibility, but we do also need to get that work done. So that's what this issue and this text is primarily saying.

Again, it's written that the need for policy support development, and that includes many things including [inaudible] knowledge of the policy issue at hand [including] knowledge of the development process,

including communication. It might include also the understanding to bring in the impact of end users. All of that is within the broader area of policy support, and looking at the other priority areas, looking at the hours needed, it does look like there is that need for that one full-time equivalent. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Heidi. Alan, I see your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Something I don't recall having talked about recently, we did much earlier in the game. In the first At-Large review, ICANN ended up hiring some temporary staff to help with the overall management of the review process, of the review implementation. Not to implement specific things but to sort of manage the process. We had talked about that earlier, and I don't recall if that was still something that we had thought we might be able to do or not or whether we need it. I'm not sure, but I'm just raising the issue. Is this something that we need to be thinking about, or is it just off the table and we're on our own? I guess it's a Heidi question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: My kneejerk reaction is to go to Heidi. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, that person was a contractor who was there as a management for the actual development of the implementation of all of the requests

that were in the first review. [This is] slightly different. That was temporary, and that was only for the duration of about 18 months. So we could explore that, but looking at what is being requested in this review, in this implementation, it seems like there is broader need [inaudible] need for more extended support for that policy development.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, to be clear, Heidi, I wasn't removing what we have there. I was just pointing out that we did have some additional staff to help in managing the process of the implementation, and I'm just wondering is that still something that is on the table. And, yes, I know it was temporary staff and was for a limited period of time. The answer may well be, no, we're not, and that's fine.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Well, we're asking for that for FY20. So that might be something that we begin with, some sort of part-time temporary, and then that might lead up to something that is a little bit more permanent and more full-time. So all of this should be explored. All of this should be perhaps put into the document, and we will then explore what is possible. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, so thanks to Alan's intervention, it would appear that we are now making additional text changes to Issue 3 and we're [inaudible] you will notice a tone in my voice in which [inaudible]. It is deliberate, I can assure you. Gilding the lily with the opportunity for perhaps bringing in

some more or less objective newbie to do who knows what with our implementation. Gee, were my biases obvious? Anyway, if there's a leverage point that Heidi believes could be useful, then I'm going to encourage her to come up with some text based on what she and Alan have just said posthaste to put into this section. If there isn't a leverage point, then I think we just give up on throwing good money after [bad]. Alan, do go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you. As Cheryl has indicated, our experience last time was not the most positive one. I wasn't really advocating that we replicate it this time. I was just asking the question, is this still on the table or not? And I'm not unhappy if say, no, we will have to make do ourselves instead of bringing a newbie in who slows us down more than he or she speeds us up. Just trying to clear the air. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Well, [inaudible] silence may have been more [inaudible] than intervention there, but let's power on, shall we? Just so you all know, Alan and I have worked long enough to have these little jibes with each other and take absolutely no offense, I can assure you.

Anyway, moving right along. Heidi has introduced the rationale of the text. This is text that she's had a great deal of drafting contribution to and seeing as it would be Heidi who would have to go in to bat in budget discussions and debates with ICANN org to get any of this, I'm very comforted to very much leave this with her.

This, I should hasten to add, is in keeping I believe with the discussions that she and Holly and other key staff have had [to date] on this. And again, the gory details and the actual implementation and, indeed, the actual applications during budgetary processes are still to come. So fear not, [inaudible] and those of you joining them, there is plenty left for you to do. Right now, we're just trying to put a plan and proposed budget ramifications together.

To that end if we move down, you will see that the one FTE equivalent is listed as Anticipated Resources and Heidi is literally making edits as we speak to the Expected Budget Implications, which is terrific. And of course, those of you who before you ask it want to know what ARI is, it stands for the At-Large Review Implementation. In other words, the project name that the working group draws its title from.

Going down on [inaudible] Metrics are listed, and we looked at how long it will take to implement this plan.

Holly, the series of steps were, in fact, deleted. And I should make it clear to all of those of you who are devastated that any of your hard [wrought] text is no longer sitting in this document, it is in fact sitting in the original [inaudible] that you contributed to. Nothing anyone has typed up and created has been lost. This is separate. The work you've done remains in a working document that will later on be open for your commentary and edit and [actually] will be utilized and fleshed out as we get into implementation as opposed to an implementation plan or short order presentation to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee. But I must say we have tried to take Occam's razor to this document, and I'm not sure that's a bad thing at all.

Any other questions regarding Issue 3? The good news is some of the bigger pieces of work are now behind us. Let's jump straight into Issue 4, and that is ALAC and the At-Large Leadership Team. This is [a doable] as far as I am concerned. I don't know who is incapable of believing what was continuously reassured and [inaudible] to the wider ICANN community about what the leadership team does or doesn't do. It still managed to trickle through as a concern and end up in [Issue 4].

To that end, we've got the proposal as approved by the Board was that "The ALAC Chair will work with members of the ALAC and staff to better communicate the role of the ALT ensuring that it is clear what the ALT does or does not do." And Evin, there again we need to use longform words, [so that] is to read "activities of the ALAC Leadership Team" and then have ALT in brackets after that. And after that, we can use ALT.

So this is low resources, low risk, and high prioritization because, to be honest, I think [inaudible] actually already that was the work you did in Barcelona. But we will continue to try to promulgate it out to the obviously confused [inaudible] community or perhaps the [willingly] deaf [inaudible] community that got this wrong in the first place.

To that end, are there any particular questions? You're all familiar with the organigram. This is one of those [in] virtually no resources other than needing to now do something [clever] as you all agree you would be doing in terms of web pages, etc. No existing resources required. Some steps are there which [are] in keeping with what you all decided. And it should be done by February, at least certainly March in a perfect world [since we don't live] in a world.

Do note, however, there is an asterisk under the how long it will take. It does say two to three months, and that's certainly all it would take our expert staff to do it. But because it is web pages, not just wiki pages that need to be edited, changed, and updated, it means that work order from our staff will have to go to IT staff, and IT staff run a program of changes, and that means that we may have to fit in with whatever schedule they have. But we can only be in control of our work. So our work will be two to three months. How long it takes IT to actually implement our implementables is not up to us.

I'm just checking on chat. I don't think there's anything in there that we need to [inaudible]. Eduardo, sorry, mentioned the Metrics would be finished within two to three months. Okay, yes, we can modify that. The metrics update will be "The page changes should be implementable" perhaps, Eduardo, "within two to three months" rather than implemented. Just so we don't fall [inaudible] of our own metrics if IT program changes means that it's pushed out in time. Thank you for that. That's a good catch.

Now if I may briefly pause to see if anyone else has any input. If not, then let's move on.

We still have another 30 minutes, and I am idealistic enough to think that we may actually get through our primary work [inaudible] that.

All right, Issue 7, the thrill-packed and exciting world of At-Large Working Groups. The Proposal as Approved by the Board was a recognition that we've already started to review and rationalize the working group. That we had recognized that there was not only a need

for representing web and wiki presences but that some of that work had already been started. And we had agreed, the last ALAC had agreed, how to manage those groups that are no longer active and, obviously, are however still archived.

The Prioritization here is low resources, low risk, and 1st priority. The Comments there are fairly self-explanatory. My only confusion is why the spellcheck decides workstream is a word it doesn't like. I notice here we've got some edits that simply need to be resolved. I'm going to do that now. That was actually a catch of Alan going through the document where the "Staff Leads" has somehow been deleted off that cell. So thank you for that, Alan. That's a great catch. And then I would note...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, the second part is we actually need to identify the staff lead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And I took the words out of your mouth this time instead of the other way around. That's exactly what I was [saying], and it's true. We now need to say who the staff leads would be. In which case, I'm going to say, Heidi, who is the staff lead going to be [inaudible]?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

I would say that I'll lead with Evin [and Gisella].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right, [inaudible] she knows [inaudible], that's great. All right, so to that end, I think we're okay with that cell. The Activities, again, self-explanatory. Who Will Implement is also. The fact that this is no additional resources [inaudible] we will shuffle their workload around to do this and no additional resources are required.

And at the Metrics here, I'm not sure how we test it, but we certainly would like to the perception of the issues rectified [inaudible] timeframe. I'm not sure whether we do a pop quiz in the policy meeting and ask people if they have any opinion or what, but certainly we can only do our bit. We can't actually change people's perception I guess [is where I was coming from]. And, again, this is another one of those things where six months is our timeframe but because we are talking about web page as well as wiki page alterations, we would be at the mercy of the IT program of changes.

Any questions or comments? Sure, Eduardo, we noted that we have used a shortening of CPWG without a full term being used. Thank you. We'll deal with that.

Okay, Issue 9. No, Ricardo, please go ahead.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Do you hear me? Do you hear me well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: [Cheryl], I have a question. This is like a third working space we're having. We have the wiki, we have the [prior] Google document, and this is a new one if I understood from the beginning with a redo of most of the things. Now I put some things for Item 7 on the wiki, and they're still there, [were] not in the Google doc last week. But I see a complete redo of the things that are here. There are some things in the wiki, for example, the six months that you're leaving there in the Metrics and things like that [that I put] longer than that. How can we [inaudible] the three documents? I don't know if I explain myself.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, you explained it perfectly clearly. I must say that the Google doc should have reflected what, the overall working document Google doc should have reflected whatever was in the wiki. If it didn't at last week's call because that's when we last checked, then I am concerned about that. Anything that was in the working document at last week's call which was when the copy was captured and then radically altered to be the new very much shortened document that we are working on now, not as a working document but as a document to get to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee within the next month, if there is something critical that you believe is missing, then can you please put it into the chat now. Go to your wiki or whatever, copy, and then come and paste it in here. Because it may be that it isn't actually even required to be part of the process, but we can review it today if need be. But there should be nothing that is on the working Google doc that is not on the wiki and vice versa. Well, if said that more or less the same last week, I don't know why the disparity between the two [things] was not picked up last week. Wasn't it my job to check that it was done. It

was my job to work with a copy of a document captured after last week's meeting. So you're saying that what you did is no longer on the wiki?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello? I'm sorry. I don't have the audio. Is this on my end?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, Seun? Help me, Seun. Can you help us with the missing material from Ricardo?

SEUN OJEDEJI: It was silent, so I was wondering whether I have issues. Okay, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You may have had temporary issues. [inaudible] been silence for the last [inaudible]. Ricardo, please type what you think it missing, and we will deal with it during the rest of this call. Okay? Thank you very much.

All right, moving on then, if I may. I see [inaudible] additions going on in Issue 7 in the Metrics. I'll come back to that if need be. I'm assuming Ricardo's comment was [in relation to] Issue 7. While we're waiting for him to help us understand what it is that may be missing – if it's missing, it's missing from the working document – we can then decide, obviously, it will go in the working document if it's in the wiki. But we can decide if it does, indeed, need to make it into this document because it might, in fact, not need to make it into this document.

On to Issue 9. Issue 9 is looking at the social media work [inaudible]. We've got recognition obviously is not only the importance of social media, the importance of having specific skill development with our staff that supports the work of the social media working group.

And here we see this is medium needs, medium risk, and a 2nd priority, noting of course that the activities of the social media working group are already continual or have already been continuing. So this is one of those things that we're already doing anyway in terms of use of social media but wasn't being planned. And what should be implemented is the opportunity to additional staff skill development in this area of social media.

But before you panic, it's not that we think that social media isn't being well addressed now under John's working group. What we're doing is looking at the opportunity to get specific [inaudible] training done for the support staff [inaudible] work with. Hopefully, while I'm being distracted by far too many Skype messages, that [inaudible] why it's medium needs, medium risk because it will have a cost associated to it, and therefore our 2nd priority.

The Comments here do go a little beyond a pure social media but recognize [inaudible] for social media [inaudible]. We have noted in the Status of Improvement Efforts that Heidi – and again this is one of those times where initials need to go into full names – Heidi and Evin are already reaching out to the communications policy liaisons, both the LA-based communities director and the MEA-based ones, looking toward the arrangement of some training that is going to meet the needs.

With that meeting, if I can get you to go past the Who Will Implement, it's the ICANN organization who needs to implement it. They do staff training. Heidi is supportive of it being either face-to-face or training modules. Whatever works out most cost effectively. We noted that there are Budget Implications here with a best guesstimate of \$3,000-5,000 USD which would possibly be a future ABR. [inaudible] implementation it will fall to the At-Large Social Media Working Group to define the training objectives whilst it falls to ICANN org to do the actual implementation. We would need to [inaudible] here that once such training is resourced, it should be a three to six months' timeline.

John, you're on the call. What's your comfort level with that?

JOHN LAPRISE:

I'm comfortable with all of this. I just have to carve out time to raise the game with Evin and Heidi. But they've expressed strong interest in improving, and I've got lots of ways. There's a lot of low-hanging we can avail ourselves of to improve our social media game, and I am well invested in that. So I'm full speed ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Terrific. Thank you. That's music to my ear. Or both ears actually, not just one of them. So unless someone else has some interjection on that, let's move on to Issue 13. Issue 13, again Maureen is not able to join us. In her absence, and she has [a big commitment] with IGF over the last few days, so Alan has picked up the lion's share of modifying this section here, looking at more systematic RALO participation in regional events. Noting again, this is one of those situations where what we agreed to

was not what the issue was identified. I'm going to hand to Alan to take you very briefly through the highlights [inaudible] of this document and note if there are any additional text inclusions that need to be made. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm a little bit mystified, I'm afraid. I did do a revision of this that matched what the proposal was. It has been changed significantly after I saw it, so I'm not really sure I can explain what is there. I did have a comment under the ARIWG Comments pointing out that the issue raised by ITEMS International had no relationship to what they were recommending. In fact, MSSI pointed out this out to us. What they recommended was that we have a single portal which identifies all funding opportunities and reports. And we modified that to say it wouldn't have all the information but it would be pointing to it because we wouldn't want to replicate things that are already in other places on the ICANN website. But it seems to have morphed back to a proposal, rather the Implementation Steps map more to what the issue was but not what we said we would do. So I'm a little bit mystified at this point, and I can't really speak to it because we seem to be talking about improving the outreach process, but that isn't what we said we were going to be doing. So I'm a little bit mystified, I'm afraid.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, sorry to hear you're mystified, but I can help you perhaps be demystified.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I don't know why the message didn't get through to you because when I checked with staff whether it had or should have had, I was [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Passed on to you. After you made your edits, Maureen raised with staff her concerns that it appeared to be too solely focused on travel funding and opportunity, and she wanted to have it softened. I assume that by returning some of her original text at least as placeholder in I think a different part of this document section that it was an attempt to at least remember what some of those other objectives were. Does that help demystify you?

ALAN GREENBERG: It does. I wasn't aware of any of this, and it doesn't match the actual proposal. So, obviously, we can do whatever we want. I'm just a little bit confused as to what the rationale is based on what the proposal is, but I will step away from it and be glad to let it be done what is done.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The intention was not to confuse you, Alan. In fact, the intention was to ensure that Maureen's concerns were raised and discussed at this meeting. So we're at this meeting. We're at the point in this meeting where it should be discussed. And we have the ability as Evin or indeed you to reverse the addition of those prior points, which I think actually came from the earlier version of ARIWG Comments and were popped into I think the Implementation phase as just a placeholder.

You're positing to the rest of the group any other activity [inaudible] of the ALAC beyond what [inaudible] in a reporting on [events] portal or dashboard does not belong here and that any [aspirational] stuff like that as very nice as it may be is not responding to implementing what was approved. Do I have that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct. You can read the words under the proposal yourself there. As far as I know, we said we would implement a web page or set of web pages. A dashboard as I believe you've been calling it. And all the other stuff is good stuff related to outreach, but I'm not sure how it relates to the proposal we made. That's my only comment. I'm not saying it's not things we shouldn't do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Nobody's suggesting they are things we shouldn't do. But you're suggesting that it does not belong in this implementable. Maureen's concern over apparent focus on travel funding and resource availability may then perhaps need to be softened by some sort of change in the comments text. I'm not sure whether you can see another way then of

meliorating her concerns or alternatively with the backing of today's work group [inaudible] we can say sorry, Maureen, your view did not prevail. And I'm perfectly happy to do that as well. [What's the view of the meeting?]

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Hadia. Hadia needs another dial out.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Cheryl, I think you heard Hadia's name as she was coming back into the call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah, excellent. Sorry, I thought [inaudible]. Okay, great. Glad you're back, Hadia.

All right, what's the view of the meeting? Go with Alan's Occam's razor, which I have no problem with and I will transmit to Maureen that her view did not prevail. Is that it?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, no, no.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, what do you want then, Holly? [inaudible] no, no, no. Give us an opinion.

HOLLY RAICHE: There aren't enough people on this call. Given that there are so many people at the IGF, including Maureen, I just think it's a little bit premature for us to make that kind of decision. If we're going to make this decision, then I think at the very least Maureen should be here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Holly, can you tell me when do you believe we can finalize? Maureen can argue back with the list. That's fine. But this document is supposed to be finished before Maureen returns, and that's what Maureen asked us to do.

HOLLY RAICHE: Well, at the very least, send out an e-mail setting out the two positions so that everybody who is at the IGF and totally unaware of this discussion and the implications would at least have the possibility of expressing their views. This is a minority vote over a majority group, and I just don't think that's fair to the other people who are not here and aren't aware.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Holly. That's fine. As usual, we will not get to Metrics in the five minutes we have in the remainder of this call. I had hoped to at least [inaudible] the item we were currently on, but seeing that you've raised

a point of order, I'm going to ask staff to work with Maureen to find a short order date and time that suits her to reconvene this meeting to deal with this item Issue 9 and to complete Issue 16. And if the rank and file leadership of the ARIWG are not able to get themselves up to speed on our discussion with the recordings of this call and are unable to attend that call which will be designed to suit Maureen, then I suggest they make their views known through the list or through commentary on the agenda. But this document has to be finished certainly no later than 18 or 19 November. [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Can I stay in the queue?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I've had a point of order. Seun, I'm sorry that you're confused. The meeting is about to end. We have not finished. Holly has raised a point of order that because Maureen, a single opinion, is being challenged by another drafter and Maureen isn't here, that we cannot as a group of apparently far too few at 15 participants make any ruling. Fair point of order, and with that, a new meeting will [inaudible] and we will start from Issue 9 and do Issue 9, Issue 16, and [loop] back [inaudible] has been [inaudible] Ricardo's earlier intervention.

With that, I'm not asking for any other business because any other business will [inaudible] at our reconvened meeting. This meeting is not ended. This meeting is [postponed]. Thank you one and all. Goodbye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]