MARRAKECH – At-Large Review Working Party
Saturday, March 05, 2016 – 17:30 to 18:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

HOLLY RAICHE: Slides up please, Ariel. Slides. Thank you. Good. Thank you. I am Holly Raiche, and I'm actually Chair of the ALAC Review. We have slides coming up, I hope. There we go. And I should introduce Larisa who is going to be the Structural Improvements Review Committee person.

LARISA GURNICK: Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

HOLLY RAICHE: Whatever. She's up there.

LARISA GURNICK: [That's] the Board.

HOLLY RAICHE: I've got to tell you…it's…shall I tell you about my time clock which has got me, I used to be sound asleep right now?

Between us we will be talking about where we are up to with the At-Large Review. I'm going to start. Could I have

the next slide, please? At any point, Larisa, if you want to chime in, this is fine. There we go. This is so much better. See? There's your title – Larisa Gurnick, Director, Strategic Initiatives, and I'm the moderator. Could we have the next slide, please? Thank you.

This is what we are going to talk about. As those of you who have been listening for the last probably two meetings, we have the review, the actual process has been started. We have reached the phase we're up to now which is to review what we have learned from previous reviews to start with, and Cheryl has promised that she's going to actually talk a little bit about it after she puts her lippy on.

We're going to review our timelines in terms of objectives. The timeline that Larisa has done and maybe possibly might slightly alter, but not really. And a little bit more about the selection of the Independent Reviewer, which is where we are up to now but we'll review all of the tasks.

Then the thing we have to focus on for this meeting is how we need to support the Independent Examiner, whom we think he or she needs to talk with, what meetings he or she should attend, the documents that he

or she should read, and the plans that we think should be put in place for the next meeting in terms of the review of ALAC. Then if there's time for questions and discussion – which I hope there will be – we will move to that. Next slide, please. Thank you.

This is just a review of why we're doing this review. And taken directly from the Board Bylaws, which require a periodic review of the performance and operation of each supporting organization – by the way, we are one – sorry, and each supporting organization Council Advisory Committee, which we are, and Nominating Committee.

So into the Bylaws we must be periodically reviewed. We were reviewed in 2008, and we're up for another review. Next slide, please.

When the review was held back in 2008, the RALO ALS structure was barely in place and the decision was made that in fact we wouldn't review either the RALOs or the ALS structure. We would focus on the ALAC itself, and so in fact this review is going to be far more focused on the actual RALO ALS structures.

For those of you who have actually read the review – and in fact the link to that report is on the bottom of this slide – it was an extensive review and there were a huge

number of recommendations, most of which were completed, some of which were not. But if you actually review what is listed as, it's called "complete and ongoing," a lot of those areas are the very areas that will be looked at in this review.

There were 13 areas for improvement and if you print it out, you may run out of paper so don't. Most of those have been implemented. Next slide, please. We'll look at the actual areas that were covered in those recommendations.

There were some changes or additions to the Bylaws that were recommended. (Hello, Ed.) The actual structure was looked at and some of the ongoing stuff comes out of that structure.

It talks about ALS education and engagement. Now some of those recommendations indeed we need to pick up or re-look at in light of the fact that we're looking at RALOs and ALSes.

Some talk about strategic and operational plans, which was very interesting. Obviously costings – and this is a pet topic for all of us. We can revisit those costings.

Public comment period – There was a fair bit that was talked about in terms of how long does it take an ALS to feed back into a RALO to feed back into a public comment process? And some of the recommendations came out of that and were followed, not all of them.

Translation – We have done better. We have done a lot better in terms of translation. Are we there yet? I don't think we are, but that's alright. I don't know what the next slide – wait a minute – it's blocked off here.

We are seen as the home of the individual Internet user. What does that mean now in terms of the structure and in terms of the RALO and ALS relationships? How do we get input from consumer representatives? They are the members of the ALSes and how does that feedback process work? And there was a look at policy mechanisms.

Now at this stage, Cheryl, do you want to add a little bit of the lessons learned? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly. I'm happy to give you a little depth and color on some of these things. I think what's important just before I go into specific lessons learned is to

recognize particularly good job or jobs done well and what the ALAC and its At-Large Community did do, and this was specifically engaging the RALOs at the time.

In terms of our implementation of all of these recommendations and how Heidi cannot be hanging her head going, "I remember these headaches" now, was put in a huge amount of time in specific Work Groups to look at great detail in how what in some cases could be quite pie-in-the-sky recommendations can actually be implemented.

Now, I'll put that in the same package as lessons learned because we were assessing the risks and likelihood of success early, and when we look at how much of the recommendations and how many pieces of work are listed as "completed," I would credit this process. So this is less of a lesson learned and rather a strong suggestion that that process be repeated.

Now, for example, if any regional At-Large organization wants to look at models and mechanisms for effective input into the policy development process, we've got flow charts and materials that are on the shelf and they need to be dusted off and they need to be revitalized and looked at. So I'm hoping that in the process of our next

EN

review we could very well be able to review and resuscitate and revive excellent work done by community members designed to complement and implement the recommendations from our first review.

Our first review was a nightmare. We're now getting to lessons learned. It was a little bit like, as I would tend to say, a dog's breakfast – which is, believe me, not a pretty sight. Sorry, was I not supposed to be frank and fearless in my conversations here?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Not everyone understands Aus.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it's part of the language services. They'll have to work that out. You're our team. You get me. Thank you.

One of the issues was a mechanism of mandatory review which was thrust upon us. It came down from on high. It was luck of the draw as to how effective, how interactive, and how viable the working with the external consultant was. It turned out okay, but it could have turned out not okay just as likely. There was none of what is being done now – and that's credit where credit's due, to your department – because we have had a great deal of

ownership developed in this process from the very beginning.

Obviously we've had the lessons learned from the first cab off the rank, which was GNSO, as we all know these things cycle through. And even watching the difference between the review process from, well, GNSO to us, but then us to the following SOs and ACs, we had a vastly different working mechanism. Still not engaged enough up front. We are now, so it's not even a lesson learned, it's a recognition that professionals have come in and gone, "Well, this could work better." And I'm very pleased with how it's working now.

One of the things that concerns me, though, is looking at the GNSO Review I was unconvinced, and I suspect those of you who worked so hard to get what input you did in will perhaps agree with me here. I was unconvinced that sufficient external information and scrutiny was brought to bear in that process, and so I would like to suggest we must do a better job.

The nature of our work, the nature of the community we are here to act in the best interests of, is very broad. It is the grass roots, it is the edge communities and we have to ensure – and this comes down to the selection of how

we talk and who we talk and where we collect the data from – we have to ensure that there is a fairly broad and wide-scoping to collect, it doesn't need to be thousands, but just touchpoints in a very wide part of the community. That's the community external to ICANN as well as the community internal to ICANN.

One of the most important lessons learned – and I will wrap up here, Holly – from the first event is how bleedingly little and mostly erroneous understanding the other parts of ICANN had about what we were and why we did it. It was astonishing how many misguided interpretations were circulating about what ALAC and At-Large did or did not do.

We still have echoes of that, but because of the effectiveness of the outcomes from our first review – and they have been effective and it does work and I do support it – because of that, we have less of a critical mass of people who just don't understand. But we still have some pockets that need working with and I think if there's an opportunity to do a little bit of outreach and education as a result of this, that would be very valuable.

You've indulged me far longer than you should have, and thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Cheryl. And it was not too long. I'm sure there are lots of lessons learned. I think what that points to is probably some documentation that should well and truly be read by the Independent Examiner in terms of the stuff that's already been done. Let's not actually repeat the work that we've done. Could I have the next slide, please? No. Alan? I'm sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to comment on one or two lessons learned. And with respect to Cheryl's last comment, given what some of us have experienced in the CCWG Accountability and listening to discussions surrounding it, there is still a lot of misunderstanding of what we are doing, misstating – often deliberate, I think – misstating of what we claim to be doing, and of some deliberate, I'm not sure what word to put to it…

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Misdirection?

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Misdirection. So I think the reviewer is going to have to be aware of some of that. That's number one. The other lesson learned that I don't think you referred to, but I will refer to, but I may have missed it, is how we addressed the recommendations. We took those recommendations and broke them down in such a level of detail, we stressed the capabilities of Excel to build spreadsheets. As a result, we meticulously addressed the recommendations and we spent the good part of the next two years doing nothing else. I'm exaggerating slightly but just slightly. And I think we have to think about that, going forward because as important as the review might be it shouldn't stop us from doing everything else that we're actually supposed to be here for. Just a thought.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Alan. And he's not kidding if you do try to print out the report, just make sure you've just bought some huge pack of paper. Next slide. Sorry, Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Thanks, Holly. Hello, everybody. Very important lessons learned. I just wanted to interject that another lesson learned from the recent GNSO review and the process

that is probably very useful for you to know about as we're just starting the process here, they're winding down. The end game was for the review Working Party the counterpart to this group on the GNSO side. They ended up having 36 recommendations by the Independent Examiner that were delivered, which is a lot.

You speak to workload issues which are very, very, real and something that is quite critical to think about. I know the Board also talks about prioritization and wishing to see some amount of that happening. So I guess I'd like to claim some early successes, some early signs of hope and templates that we hope to use here. The 36 recommendations were evaluated by the Working Party through a very reasonable methodology that helped them categorize them into several groupings. So now they have a group of recommendations that they say, "Sounds pretty good. We agree. No reason not to agree."

Then there is the other side – recommendations that they absolutely don't agree, very contentious, problematic, from their perspective, so that's another group. And then there are two things in between which really speak to, "These sound like good recommendations but not clear, not sure what you mean, not sure how to go forward." So if they're to be accepted they need to be modified and

clarified so that perhaps the implementation is not so much boiling the ocean or trying to do a whole Excel spreadsheet's worth of work.

And finally there is a category that says, "This work is already being done. Good recommendation, but nothing that needs to really happen." And that helped a great deal. So where they are in their process now that they've adopted this methodology, it seems to be working well. It's still in process, it's going to the GNSO Council either this week or subsequently, because I know they have a busy schedule.

That's the mechanism that will be used by the Organizational Effectiveness Committee to view this so there is direct feedback from the people that were involved every long deliberation of the review process in saying what makes sense to implement and what doesn't. So I just wanted you all to know that that is an option and the mechanism and hopefully a goal for this group to work toward that same point.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Larisa. Alan has a question?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember the exact words you used, but you said there were a few recommendations which were not understood, not clear, didn't quite know what to do with them. How do the recommendations go through the process of being vetted and comments from the community and stuff and get all the way through and in the final version you say, "Huh?"

LARISA GURNICK: Excellent question. Something magical happens perhaps when something gets published as a final document. When people start moving into the implementation phase, it's a different mindset because it's really beginning to think about, "Well, how would this happen?"

Another lesson learned was that, while it's not the job of the Independent Examiner to specify what a successful outcome would look like for any given recommendation, it is really a useful exercise for people that understand what the recommendation is suggesting to give that some thought. And that's a process that they're also going through now saying, "Well, what do you really expect to achieve with this recommendation?" Because that helps clarify what it's intended to do.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Sebastien, you had a question, and then we'll continue. Sebastien?
SEBASTIEN BOCHALLET:	Thank you. I have a question and a comment. My question is, when you speak of the Independent Examiner, in English you say "he or she." Is it he or she or is it a group of people or is it a single person who is going to undertake this task? That's my question.
	And then I have another question so as not to state anything. In the Bylaws, there is a provision on the ALAC review. It's a clear provision on the review of the At-Large Advisory Committee, not a review of At-Large. So are we going beyond the scope of the Bylaws by speaking of the At-Large review? Should that be the case I won't want to extend our work here, but I think we should bear that in mind and know whether or not we should amend the Bylaws so that the At-Large review can be considered as part of the Bylaws. I think the main issue at ICANN is that no one understands the difference between ALAC and all of our structures – so ALAC, At-Large, RALOs, and ALSes.

Then lastly, I think we should also consider the way in which the lessons learned and the way in which the Board dealt with the recommendations made, specifically I'm thinking here of one of the recommendations that's always been problematic to me which is the recommendation that ALAC appoint two members at the Board and we only have one designated director. So the Board has not here applied the proposal that the Examiner made. How can we improve this in the future so that we won't once again be in the same problem? Thank you.

LARISA GURNICK: Sebastien, a couple of questions. I hope I caught all of them. I think your first question was, "Is it he, she, or they?" It's really they. It's an organization. It's not he or she, and we don't even know who he, she, or, they might be because we're still conducting due diligence. But certainly given the breadth and the scope of the review, I'm pretty certain it wouldn't be a he or she. It will most likely be they – a large "they" that is up to the task.

I learned so much when I started working on this review. One of the early lessons was that there is a hyphen in "At-Large" and that ALAC and At-Large are absolutely not the

same thing, so I really think I understand the difference now.

Can't speak for how it was conceived when the Bylaws were developed, but I think we've had some really productive conversations with this group to really understand that this review should in your interests and from your all points of view encompass the entirety of the At-Large organization, which is the ALAC, the RALOs, and the ALSes. That is how the scope has been defined. That is how the RFP has been stated. That is what we're looking to do, with particular focus on the ALSes and RALOs but also ALAC.

So everything that we're gearing up for the Independent Examiner to do is that as the scope. How that factors in with the Bylaws is a really good question, and I will make a note of that to ensure that it's clear. But I think if I'm understanding correctly, the spirit of what this group thinks would be useful, it is the broader interpretation of all the structures of the At-Large organization.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Larisa. Let's just move quickly through because I think we've got a bit of a deadline. Could I have the next slide, please?

These are the last of the outstanding issues that were identified as part of the 2008 review. I think we don't need to go through them except to note that these are still issues. Translation is still something we talk about. How we actually talk to what we mean by "users" or "consumers," how we do the policy development, and talking about PDP.

Olivier, given that you're the one who wants time afterwards, you're taking from it right now. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Holly. I'm not going to respond to this. I'm way too relaxed at the moment. I'm having tea and a bit too much coffee.

Just Translation Services, of course this also includes Interpretation, perhaps you could call this Language Services to be a bit more precise. I'm being precise for this time, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think it's even wider than that. I think when we talked about some of the issues, I think some of the pressure that we put on for IDNs was just a part of a recognition of the issue of language and culture and the differences in

languages and cultures from who we represent. Next slide, and we're going to gallop right through these. It's hard to read that slide. I do apologize. Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to get a clarification. Sebastien was saying something about that during the 2008, the experts recommended the second Board member. I didn't see it as one of the outstanding issues that were listed and I wanted to ask, has it been followed up or something?

HOLLY RAICHE: Seun, if you want a list of all of the outstanding issues, I'm happy to do that. I was just summarizing, trust me. In fact, I'm glad it was brought up. I hope that all of you who are really interested will have read through the final recommendations of the 2008 – what's happened, what hasn't happened – because there are very many similar themes to the things we are still talking about. In fact, some of the reviews and the work that's being done in terms of ALSes – how do we measure success or not – all those sorts of issues that were first raised then have been continually talked about.

So there's not too much new, but there's plenty. I would suggest everybody go back and at least read the several pages that are involved in the recommendations to see what we wanted then, what we still want. I'm sure in terms of the documents that should be read by the Independent Examiner, the review and its recommendations will be amongst those – top of the list, actually.

If I can just get on with here the assessment by the Working Party. This is part of the review. This is looking backwards, looking at the improvement, what happened to most of those recommendations.

Another important question, "What significant developments have impacted or will impact on the At-Large organization?" Well, At-Large has changed considerably in terms of both the way that the structures have developed, the rules that have been written around them, and indeed it probably behooves us all to look at what, if anything, needs to be changed in our rules of procedure because Alan keeps talking about it.

There are plenty of things that we've learned since the At-Large review. Finally, the questions that Larisa asked me ages ago: What actually worked? What didn't work? And

what improvements should be made? All of us need to think about those things because when the Independent Examiner – they if I can use the term "they" – will be asking those questions of us and we should have thought of some of the answers at least. I'm going to gallop through. Could I look at the next slide, please?

Lessons learned. Now this is something that Cheryl referred to in terms of what happened in the GNSO reviews as well as what happened in the At-Large. I would suggest you read this slide, but one of the most important things is the need for buy-in, which means all of you, and particularly the Working Party, need to be part of this review.

Now I think rather than the pages that Alan referred to, or even the 36 recommendations, we want to be careful how many recommendations we have. But in the end we do need the buy-in of everyone.

I think the other lessons reviewed – standard policies, procedures, guidelines – I won't read this slide except probably for the last one: "Support for the data-driven, measurable outcomes." We are actually looking for outcomes that tie in with the sort of issues that we've been looking at anyway. And what we would hope is from

EN

the point of view of an outside person looking at us, the ways in which we can measure our success as well as achieve our success.

I would point to project management, discipline is essential. And I've also just had a little look at the membership of the Working Party and some of the membership has changed, so I'm going to be recirculating a call for members of the Working Party just to make sure that everybody is still interested and still involved. Next slide, please.

This coming review – It's not only about what happened at the last review, but it's again the focus now on the whole of the structure, which in particular looks at – and thank you, I'm glad you saw the hyphen and understand the hyphen – regional RALOs and their relationship with At-Large Structures and in fact the whole box and dice of ALSes, RALOs, and ALAC, and relative to specified evaluation criteria is what we're going to be doing. Next slide. I'm trying to leave a bit of time now.

These are the evaluation criteria. This is why we're going to be holding up our Independent Examiner people. It's going to be starting with "Fulfillment of the Mission, Adherence to the Policies and Procedures." It's going to

be actually, I'd look "Accountability and Transparency to the Public." Going to be looking at the membership processes and in fact we've had a lot of discussion about the various member ship criteria in terms of individual members or not and ALS membership as well as ALS membership in RALOs. We've had some of that discussion today. I'm sure that this is a discussion that's going to be continued.

Governance Structures – Does it still work? And its effectiveness in the implementation of the prior review. Now most of that was implemented, but the caveat on that was it didn't spend much time at all on the RALOs or the ALSes, so in fact there's probably a lot more work to be done. Can we look at the next slide?

This is where we're up to, okay? Right at the left is the appointment of the Independent Examiner will be some time this month. We're still doing due diligence. I'll know more in the next couple of days and that's really all I'm going to say, but we're really taking the time to make sure that the selection is the right one.

What I did forget to point out, and thank you to everyone who provided additional criteria, but we actually as ALAC participated in the development of selection criteria and

added some of the very important issues that were identified in terms of cultural awareness, dealing with language, dealing with volunteer groups, so forth. So, in fact, this particular selection criteria is very much crafted as much by this group as it was by the general criteria that are applied to At-Large Reviews. Okay?

Just a look at the road map so you know where we're up to, we are at the stage now of appointing Independent Examiners. Fairly soon we'll understand when the review is launched. Then the rest of this timetable, the next thing we need to concentrate on is probably what we want to happen at the next ICANN meeting in terms of just who should be interviewed by the Examiner, what documents they should have read and so forth, what meetings they need to attend. Because we're looking at essentially preliminary findings by September or October, which means that the work of the Independent Examiner should be taking place fairly soon and it will span two ICANN meetings at most. Next slide, please.

If you look at the selection criteria, I have shortened these considerably, but what's in italics and unfortunately hidden a bit were the criteria that we added. This is a summary of it, but what we asked for was experience with NGOs and non-profits. We spent a lot of

time saying we wanted a diversity of a knowledge base, experience with culturally and geographically diverse people and organizations.

Another thing that came through very strongly was experience working with volunteers because all of us are volunteers. So the criteria or the measurements you may use for effectiveness of a workforce is not going to apply when you talk about how effective we are because none of us are getting paid.

Going back to the human rights/slavery question, which we'll leave, and experience with multi-stakeholder organizations. So those are the sorts of things that we asked to be looked at when we selected the criteria. Next slide, please.

It's finished? Good. Fine. Now I've left plenty of time for questions, and then you get your half hour.

First of all, where are we up to, maybe you could fill us in on where we're up to. Do we have any more on the timeline for the Independent Examiner? And then we want to ask some questions that you were asking in terms of who should be interviewed, what documents should be looked at, what meetings should be attended.

EN

There's a whole area of discussion where we can participate just to help you out. So, Larisa, over to you.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you, Holly. The RFP process and all the inputs into what's important for the selection of the Independent Examiner, that all transpired between Dublin and the end of the year roughly. And the RFP was launched on January 5, I believe. The process is working through its normal standard steps, which involve publicizing the fact that we're looking for bids. We've done that through the typical standard announcement on the ICANN website as well as tried some innovative techniques and using LinkedIn and posts in different languages to try and really reach a slightly different audience perhaps than our typical audience. I think many of you also took that information to heart and said that you would share it with people that you know that you might think would make good candidates and should submit a bid.

We've received bids. We're going through the evaluation process right now, doing the due diligence, making sure that all the selection criteria have been adequately met. I will be able to provide a more precise update as to when

the Independent Examiner would be appointed and contracted, probably within the next couple of weeks.

That answers the question of where we're at. I understand also how critical it is that interviews and a lot of face-to-face interaction be done at the June meeting, so I take that to heart and will consider that very closely in our plans and our schedules.

Then as far as all the information that Holly outlined, that was very helpful in terms of what this group can be doing now to gather and prepare for that point. We're making notes of all the useful information that we would want to share with the Independent Examiner, but anything like that that you can flag for us as staff we'll make sure that this information is packaged and ready for the Independent Examiners when they arrive, lists of people that they should talk to, lists of issues that people feel are important for them to address, all of this very, very, useful information as well as meetings, conference calls, in-person meetings, any gatherings of your community where it might be helpful for the Independent Examiners to participate, please flag that for us as well so that we can make plans for them to be at key strategic opportunities to be face-to-face with the community.

And then while I have the floor, a little shameless plug. You all signed on to be in this review Working Party, and we're very excited that people are interested in this. Some of you may have a better understanding of what reviews really are and maybe others are still wondering how does this work exactly and how does it all connect. We will have a session on Monday at 10:45. It's called "From Newcomer to Review Enthusiast." You'll get a button. You'll understand everything you ever wanted to know about reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sign me up.

LARISA GURNICK: Alan, you are not invited because you already know about reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I'll get a button.

LARISA GURNICK: You can get a button.

In all seriousness we uncovered a real need. Many people just know that reviews are important maybe but don't

really fully understand how all the pieces come together. The criticism is not of all of you, the criticism is of us because this is very complicated and we've certainly made it very complicated.

With this session we're trying to demystify, uncomplicated, and speak a simpler language that people can understand and really inspire people to participate in reviews. Thank you to Cheryl for agreeing to speak of her experiences with reviews. We have several experienced review community members coming to the session to inspire those that are on the fence. I would very much appreciate it if all of you could come or at least tell others that they should show up and learn more about reviews. We would much appreciate that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Larisa. Now, before we give some time to Alan and Olivier, do people have some suggestions. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. This Sebastien [one] is quick. I do believe that to understand for the committee that will be selected, the guys that will be selected, they should join beforehand the monthly calls for all RALOs because even it's in

another language maybe, but they probably have translation so they could follow. And even the few problems with the translations and the discussion in different cultural behaviors, those could be the best thing to do because it's very hard. Every group has different problems, so they need to have a whole view about that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BOCHALLET: Thank you. Going back to the slide where you presented the different items on which the review should focus, I'd like to suggest that we add the items under discussion today within the Working Group that deals with ICANN's Accountability. I think for instance adding the fact that accountability and transparency towards the other ICANN organizations, not merely towards At-Large participants, but also towards other ICANN stakeholders would be useful. I think it would be useful to get a view from them as to the diversity in our structures so that we can try and show, given that this is under discussion within the CCWG, then to try and show all this for the

Work Stream 2, which is the second part of our job. So it would be good for At-Large to give an example in this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Sebastien. Cheryl, did you have your hand up? Okay. My suggestion would be obviously to the people to be interviewed would clearly be your past chairs, probably your RALO Chairs. I think Vanda's suggestion of actually listening in to all of the RALO meetings would be critical. And at least talking to members of the Working Party. I would imagine they'd be going further, though. Wouldn't they be talking to for instance the GNSO's view of ALAC, the SSAC's view of ALAC? It would be interesting to have, I think, how other people see and understand ALAC and its role.

LARISA GURNICK: Yes, absolutely. Whether it's done through direct conversations or whether it's done through surveys, whatever the appropriate data-gathering tool is, there will be an expectation that the Independent Examiners look at the important relationships between the At-Large organization and other ICANN structures.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a clarification. There is no GNSO or GNSO Council view of ALAC or At-Large. There are individuals within the group who will have opinions, sometimes very strong, perhaps very diverse opinions. The group itself will not.

HOLLY RAICHE: I stand absolutely corrected. I'm not going to say anymore. Anything further? I think that we've almost run out of time. But are there any further questions of Larisa? Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: A question. Would there be made a distinction between relatively new members of the ALAC or the At-Large community and relatively old-hand members which are interviewed so that you can maybe draw some conclusions from how it's looks like for a newcomer and how it looks like for an old-hand participant? I think this might be an additional point to look at in order to evaluate the interviews. Thank you.

EN

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much for the question. Absolutely. Part of the criteria under, I forget which category it is, but it falls really in just about every category is making sure that the membership process and the experience of new members coming in is working as well as it's designed to and the speaking to newcomers and making sure that there's a way for newcomers to come up and get involved and learn and so on is very much a part of the scope of that criteria.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I think I was not very clear. I was actually thinking about the assumption or the view how the ALAC is functioning or how the At-Large community is functioning might be different from a newcomer's perspective. Not how to come into that community. I think that's not my concern. But thinking about myself and I came into or when I joined the ALAC or the At-Large, I might have had a different view on how effectively or how we are working than I have now six years later. I think this would be an interesting approach to go. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Sandra. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have a question extrapolating from that. Does a reviewer go to other constituencies to see how they see At-Large? Is that part of the process? Okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, if I may? With that, the design of the questions in a survey, the team will be putting in things that will ascertain the person who's responding, how much actual knowledge they have, how much actual experience it is. There's clever ways of doing these things, and I'm sure the professionals will do a good job. We'll just make sure they do a good job.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl made a comment before saying people from other parts of the organization may be misunderstanding what it is we do, how we function, whatever, and of course in their own minds they will be absolutely adamant that they are correct. The same will be true for newcomers into our own organization and perhaps for some old-timers who are absolutely sure how things work which may bear little connection to reality. Of course, that's a

EN

challenge in doing any survey, and somehow it has to differentiate.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Alan. Are there any other questions or comments for Larisa? Otherwise we can let you go.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you all for your time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]